

UNDP Kazakhstan

Outcome Evaluation in Civic Engagement

Rome, 18th December 2015

Final Report



TABLE of CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1 INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 Structure of the Report.....	4
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION.....	4
2.1 What is being evaluated.....	4
2.2 Link of the intervention to national and UNDAF priorities	5
2.3 Key partners	5
2.4 Scale of the intervention	6
2.5 Total resources	6
2.6 Context	6
2.7 Design	7
2.8 Scope	7
2.9 Evaluation objectives	8
2.10 Evaluation Criteria	8
2.11 Evaluation Questions	9
3 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	9
3.1 Data sources	9
3.2 Sample and sampling frame	10
3.3 Data collection procedures and instruments	10
3.3.1 Methods for data collection and analysis	10
3.4 Performance standards.....	11
3.5 Stakeholders engagement	15
3.6 Ethical considerations	15
3.7 Background information on evaluations	15
3.8 Major limitations of the methodology.....	17
3.9 Data analysis	18
4 FINDINGS	18
4.1 Relevance.....	18
4.2 Efficiency	26
4.3 Effectiveness	30
4.4 Sustainability	47
5 CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
5.1 Main Findings	54
5.1.1 Relevance.....	54

5.1.2	Effectiveness	54
5.1.3	Efficiency	55
5.1.4	Sustainability	55
5.2	Conclusions	55
5.3	Lessons Learnt	56
5.4	Linking Conclusions with Recommendations	56
6	REPORT ANNEXES	58
6.1	List of meetings with stakeholders	58
6.2	List of documents reviewed.....	60
6.3	Terms of Reference	62
6.4	Code of conducts signed by the evaluation team	82

Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to express her sincere gratitude and thanks to the UNDP staff for their availability and efficiency in providing information and all kind of support.

List of acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CA	Central Asia
CO	Country Office
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
DRF	Development Results Framework
DSG	Demand-Side Governance
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GoK	Government of Kazakhstan
HQ	Headquarters
HRBA	Human Rights-based Approach
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IO	International Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHRAP	National Human Rights Action Plan
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
RoK	Republic of Kazakhstan
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToC	Theory of Change
TU	Trade Union
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNPFD	United Nations Partnership Framework for Development
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

Executive Summary

The present outcome evaluation aims to assess the impact of one of the programme components of the UNDP's development assistance spelt out in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015, namely Outcome 3 which reads *"By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups"*.

Outcome 3 includes three specific sub-outcomes included in CPAP and UNDAF for the period 2010-2015: 5: National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all; 6: The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes; 7: Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner.

The Programme has been implemented through 13 projects implemented from 2010 to 2015. Two of them are still ongoing. The total amount of the programme is USD 4,152,632

The findings of this report have been elaborated following a mix methodology of data collection and analysis, including desk review, field visit, interviews with UNDP staff, programme and projects' stakeholders, other stakeholders related to the specific themes of the Programme.

Relevance

The Programme is highly relevant to UNDP policies and priorities, and is aligned with the overall strategies indicated in the UNDAF Framework and in the Programme document. The initiative is also relevant to Kazakhstan policies, in particular with regard to the priorities spelt out in national strategies, addresses and speeches about efficiency and effectiveness of state bodies. The programme formulation is the good result of a compromise between UNDP values, aimed at the development of society-driven changes, and the priorities set out by the GoK of efficiency and better functioning of state mechanisms for service delivery.

The articulation of the UNDAF Outcome 3 – based on three country programme outputs – is rather well structured. On the other side, the lion share of the Programme goes to Outputs 5 and 7, mainly concerning 'supply-side' governance aspects, whereas Output 6, which deals with empowerment of the demand side (citizens, civil society) has received less attention. Also, the differentiation among sources of funding (GoK, UNDP or bilateral donors) has contributed to a certain degree of fragmentation.

The programme structure is adequately addressing the needs of vulnerable people, although in practice this aspect was relatively neglected vis-à-vis the real demand for improved services for this target segment.

Effectiveness

The expected objectives were partially achieved. Continuous dialogue with partners and quality of expertise were undoubtedly appreciated by beneficiaries. Limited efforts were made to achieve objectives related to Outcome 6.

In many cases, the Programme has enhanced cooperation among relevant stakeholders and has introduced new tools which – when properly adapted and divulged – might effectively contribute to the achievement of CPAP Outcome 3. Actions addressing very specific issues – such as the cluster of three projects aimed at improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services, implemented with the MoE and the Presidential Administration – showed a high degree of success and fully achieved the expected results. Actions whose contents were more general and were not addressing specific issues

– such as the project on *Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan* – were limited in results.

In general terms, the scattered character of the projects – which only in few cases were designed along longer term strategies and presented coherent linkages among themselves over time - has hindered the achievement of more durable and tangible results.

In general, there is still a strong need to further capacitate not only state stakeholders, but also the civil society, to monitor and influence the delivery of services. In the case of civil society stakeholders, there should be continuous commitment from the UNDP to empower them in participating to the dialogue with the GoK on citizens' rights, and in contributing to policy making. This aspect should be strengthened in the next programming phase.

Efficiency

The UNDP Governance and Local Development Unit responsible for implementation of the Sub-Outcomes 5,6, and 7 of the “CPAP results and resources framework” has enough personnel and resources to effectively manage programme activities in the above areas. Administering ongoing projects and processing new ones is conducted within acceptable time-frames.

Limited data were available on efficiency in the use of financial resources. Reporting should be regular, unified –following standard templates - and structured around result-based principles. Finally, it would be advisable that a Programme management structure be included to oversee the achievement of strategic goals, ensure coordination and encourage reflections on its aims.

Sustainability

This issue has not sufficiently been considered in the project design phase. Projects under the three CP outcomes project did not include an exit strategy, which would be recommended, among others, to test Governments' willingness to further sustain and fund some project results which are considered particular relevant for the country. Ownership was relatively good, thanks to the continuous dialogue of UNDP with constituents and to the alignment of the projects with national priorities and areas of cooperation. It would be advisable to narrow down the project themes and agree on one-two priorities to be dealt within each CP Outcome in the next Programme period, in order to achieve a long-term strategic focus and developing actions aimed at more durable results.

1 Introduction

The present outcome evaluation aims to assess the impact of one of the programme components of the UNDP's development assistance spelt out in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015.

This evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. The evaluation will also assess the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UNDAF 2010-2015.

Primary intended uses:

This evaluation is being primarily commissioned as a formative (forward-looking) evaluation to support the UNDP and national stakeholders' strategic learning and decision-making for the next UNDP country programme starting from 2016.

The evaluation is expected to have a secondary summative (backwards looking) perspective, to support enhanced accountability for development effectiveness and learning from experience.

1.1 Structure of the Report

The report is structured in accordance with the OECD DAC requirements for evaluations and with the UNDP Evaluation template provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Kazakhstan.

The Introduction briefly summarizes the action.

Section 1 provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results.

Section 2 describes the evaluation scope and objectives and provides an explanation of evaluation criteria and questions.

Section 3 resumes the evaluation approach and methodology, especially related to data sources, data collection procedures and instruments, Performance standards, stakeholder engagement, ethical considerations, background information on evaluators, major limitations of the methodology.

In Section 4 – Findings, we discuss main findings in relation to each evaluation criteria.

Section 5 will discuss the main lessons learnt, conclusions and recommendations emerging from the programme experience.

2 Description of the intervention

2.1 What is being evaluated

The overall objective of the present evaluation is to assess UNDP's contribution to the achievement of the Outcome on Civic Engagement outlined in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2010-2015 between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The exercise concerns the *outcome #3* as outlined in the "CPAP results and resources framework"¹, namely *"By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of*

¹ Country Programme Action Plan for 2010-2015 between United Nations Development Programme and the Government of Kazakhstan, page 23

ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups”, including the three specific sub-outcomes included in CPAC and UNDAF for the period 2010-2015 and indicated in ToRs².

The evaluation simultaneously responds to two major needs of UNDP, namely: i) assess UNDP's contribution to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of effective governance and civic engagement; ii) fine-tune the current UNDP programme suggesting the most efficient portfolio balance and structure for the rest of the CPAP programming 2010-2015 and for the next programming cycle.

2.2 Link of the intervention to national and UNDAF priorities

The Country Programme Action Plan 2010-2015 provides the operational details for Government-UNDP cooperation. The CPAP is based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, signed with the Government in April 2009. Using this broad agreement, UNDP conducted consultations with key partners in the Government, the United Nations system and other partners in the civil society and the private sector in order to develop the CPAP Document that was approved by the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board in September 2009.

The UNDP country programme is linked to the national Millennium Development Goals and is also aligned with the on-going initiatives of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

In terms of national priorities, the intervention is linked to national priorities embodied in the Strategic Plan of the Republic of Kazakhstan up to 2020 (hereafter Kazakhstan 2020), that represents the next phase of Kazakhstan's long-term development programme until 2030.

2.3 Key partners

The key partners involved in the evaluated projects are governmental agencies of the Republic of Kazakhstan including: the Presidential Administration, the Center of Strategic Research and Analysis; Ministry of Justice; the Supreme Court; Academy of Civil Service under the President of Kazakhstan; Agency for Civil Service and Anti-Corruption; National Commission for Women, Family, and Demographic Policy (NCW&DP); Economic Research Institute, Center for Performance Assessment of Government Agencies, under the Ministry of National Economy; the Central Election Commission; the Majilis, the lower Chamber of the Parliament of Kazakhstan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA oversees the activity of the government - NGO Consultative-Advisory Body: Platform for dialogue on human dimension); the Academy of Civil Service (ACS) under the President of Kazakhstan and the Regional Hub of Civil Service under the ACS.

Non-governmental institutions include: the Nazarbayev University/Astana; NGOs including the Union of Women Entrepreneurs of Kazakhstan/Astana, Foundation for Support of Development of Parliamentarism/Astana, Kazakh International Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law/Almaty, Union of Crises Centers/Almaty, Intenews/Almaty, Namys (disabled group)/Almaty, International Center for Non-for Profit law/Almaty.

All the above government institutions were partners for the evaluated UNDP projects and either directly implemented the projects, contributed to their implementation, oversaw their implementation (as in the

² **5:** National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all; **6:** The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes; **7:** Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner.

case of Presidential Administration that was overseeing all the projects related to the promotion of the civil service reform and improvement of the performance of public agencies).

Interviewed civil society leaders were selected as they could provide their feedback on the overall situation in the civil sector, on the relationships between government and NGOs, civil society legislation and UNDP activities in Kazakhstan.

2.4 Scale of the intervention

The evaluation team assessed thirteen UNDP projects implemented within the UNDP results framework with a focus on Outcome 3 as outlined in the “CPAP results and resources framework” that includes three sub-outcomes (outcomes 5, 6 and 7). The total number of components under 13 evaluated projects is 39. Some of the projects were focused on central government agencies, others included nation-wide activities and covered at least 10 regions of Kazakhstan (examples include trainings for journalists in three regions; assessment of public services and performance of government agencies in five regions, or training for NGO representatives in assessing performance of government agencies in 10 regions).

The size of the target groups is not possible to determine as most of the projects do not provide data for the size of the target population.

2.5 Total resources

Total amount of evaluated projects is: 4,152,632

Project reports do not provide exact information on people involved in management and implementation of the activities. At the UNDP Astana office projects are largely managed by one person, a Program Associate at the Governance and Local Development (GLD) unit. UNDP procurement and financial officers are responsible for managing procurement and financial issues related to projects.

2.6 Context

For the last 15 years Kazakhstan has enjoyed an average annual GDP growth of about 5 percent³ and managed to successfully convert its resource wealth into growth in foreign investments and rapid development of infrastructure.

This period of growth, however, is currently facing challenges as commodity prices are falling down forcing the government to float Kazakh currency and reconsider many of planned construction and infrastructure development projects. Despite commendable pace of economic growth during last decades, issues of governance, accountability and corruption in government institutions continue generating wide spread public concerns. In Kazakhstan, civil society actors are too often discouraged to make meaningful input into decision making and government often distrusts independent CSOs particularly those with foreign funding. Lack of civic engagement and access to information adversely affect service delivery by government institutions.

To address the above challenges and promote long-term achievement goals, Kazakh government announced a set of ambitious institutional reforms to strengthen the Kazakh statehood. Proposed reforms cover five key institutional areas: (a) creation of a modern and professional civil service; (b)

³ Bloombergview.com/articles/2015-08-20/kazakhstan-is-the-latest-oil-curse-casualty

ensuring the rule of law; (c) industrialization and economic growth; (d) promotion of identity and unity in the multi-ethnic Kazakhstan; and (e) transparency and accountability of the state.

The above policy reforms have comprehensive character and pursue long-term goals. If implemented, they will transform Kazakhstan into a modern state with diversified economy and effective public administration. One of key reforms aimed at modernizing state institution is a plan to establish professional civil service independent from political appointees. Comprehensive reforms in this area include reforming recruitment mechanism, as well as promotion and salary increase system based on performance and results, implementing a set of measures aimed at strengthening the fight against corruption and adopting a new law on civil service. Ensuring the Rule of Law reform among other goals aims at introducing transparency and accountability of judges through mandatory implementation of audio and video recording. Establishing an Accountable State Reform promotes several related sub-objectives including creating results-oriented state governance system, introducing a new system for auditing and assessing public services and "the open government" system, empowering citizens to participate in the decision-making process through development of local governance and strengthening the role of public councils, and others.

Many of the above reforms are the result of continuing civil society pressure and donor community efforts, including UNDP projects in focus of this assessment. In Particular this is true to the promised reforms of civil service, measures aimed at improvement of quality of government provided services, empowering citizen participation, better access to information to citizens, court system reforms including introduction of court recording, and others.

2.7 Design

The design of the Programme well corresponded to the objectives set out under UNDAF Outcome 3.

Two main stakeholders were identified to achieve the Outcome objectives, the state from one side, and the citizens' representatives from the other side. Three specific Country Programme (CP) Outcomes were conceived, two of which related to the performance of state bodies to effectively deliver better services to citizens (Outcome 5, 7), whereas Outcome 6 was more specifically designed to promote *effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes*.

As we will see in Section 7, the original design was only partially followed in the implementation of the activities related to the three outcomes. Due probably to resources constraints, internal arrangements and other factors which was not possible to analyze during the mission, most resources concentrated on actions implemented with state stakeholders, and within those projects only limited actions were directed at strengthening the civil society. A proper reflection on this should therefore be stimulated, and appropriate decisions should be taken in devising and programming the next CPAP Evaluation scope and objectives

2.8 Scope

The exercise concerns Outcome 3 as outlined in the "CPAP results and resources framework"⁴, namely "By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups", including the three specific sub-outcomes included in CPAP and UNDAF for the period 2010-2015 and indicated as:

⁴Country Programme Action Plan for 2010-2015 between United Nations Development Programme and the Government of Kazakhstan, page 23

Outcome 5 National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all

Outcome 6 The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

Outcome 7 Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner.

2.9 Evaluation objectives

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation is *to assess how UNDP's programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of effective governance and civic engagement.*

The purpose of the proposed evaluation is *to measure UNDP's contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to fine-tune the current UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the rest of the CPAP 2010-2015 as well as informing the next programming cycle.*

The Terms of Reference (ToR) point out the specific rationale of this evaluation:

- To assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcomes of the CPCP determining whether there has been progress to the achievement of Outcomes 5, 6 and 7, and identifying possible challenges and innovative approaches to sustain their achievement thanks to UNDP assistance;
- To evaluate UNDP's role and responsibilities in achieving the outcomes, i.e. analyzing factors that depend on UNDP which influenced the outcomes;
- To examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP's inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a partner (current and potential), validating the strategic positioning of UNDP within the CPAP: specifically, the Country Office position will be assessed in terms of communication strategy (which substantiates UNDP's relevance) and in terms of positioning toward its partners (i.e. to understand partners' needs and offer appropriate relevant services);
- To verify the appropriateness and effectiveness of UNDP's partnership strategy. This will permit to endorse the appropriateness and relevance about the UNDP's contribution to the outcomes and to examine the partnership among UN agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.
- To identify lessons learned and best practices in order to stimulate and develop *innovative ideas* and *approaches* in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve related outcomes.

2.10 Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used in this evaluation have been provided in the ToR (i.e. **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability**) and refer to the main OECD-DAC criteria with the exclusion of impact, the proper assessment of which is premature at this stage of implementation.

The team has paid particular attention to the critical analysis of available data in order to assess the **evaluability** of specific programme components, through the following steps:

- i) study the programme history, design, and operation;
- ii) watch the programme in action (direct observation);

- iii) determine the programme's capacity for data collection, management, and analysis;
- iv) assess the likelihood that the programme will reach its goals and objectives; and
- v) observe why the evaluation will or will not help the programme and its stakeholders.

2.11 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions follow the format proposed by UNDP in the project's ToRs. They have been discussed and confirmed with the UNDP staff during the field mission.

Each key question is presented together with a rationale where the hypotheses to be fulfilled are explained, and sub-questions and corresponding indicators that have been used to answer them are presented. Evaluation criteria, data sources, methods for data collection and analysis are specified for each question including possible limitations and risks concerning data collection and data quality. All this information are included in the **evaluation matrix**, presented under Section 3.4.

3 Evaluation approach and methodology

The guiding principle in conducting the evaluation exercise has been wherever possible the use of participatory approaches, where relevant stakeholders are involved in the identification of main issues to be evaluated, which will constitute the evaluation *foci*.

The tight timing of the field mission and the unavailability of some stakeholders have to some extent posed a limitation in the implementation of this approach. It is considered that – should resources be available – a presentation of the report to relevant stakeholders might constitute a useful tool to promote discussion and reach consensus on the report's main findings.

3.1 Data sources

The sources of information utilised for this report has been:

- National Policy documents;
- UNDP documents;
- documentation obtained from civil society sources;
- programme and project documents;
- interviews with programme and project stakeholders, beneficiaries, and other sources of information i.e. civil society experts, legal experts, and in general stakeholders related to civic engagement issues.

The national documents have provided for an overview and analysis of national policies. UNDP documents have offered the desired information on the degree of relevance of the Programme in relation to expected objectives. The programme and project documents provided the background for the team's assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of single actions under the programme. Interviews with stakeholders have provided additional information for the analysis of effectiveness and sustainability. Finally, interviews with external civil society organisations and experts have been helpful in providing to the team relevant information on the overall significance and usefulness of the Programme.

The complete list of documents consulted is presented in Annex 8.2.

3.2 Sample and sampling frame

The list of the projects implemented during the period is provided in the ToR. On this basis, and on the basis of availability of project stakeholders, the attention of the team focused on some projects where more source of information was available, both in terms of documentation and people to be interviewed. The majority of interviews held by the team regarded state stakeholders, with some input from the civil society and the legislative.

3.3 Data collection procedures and instruments

3.3.1 Methods for data collection and analysis

Literature Review

The evaluation team analysed the CPAP, the programme documents including ProDoc and reports related to all projects on the specific context of the programme.

The list of documents includes project documents for each of the component (UNDP and Kazakhstan strategies and policies, logical/results framework, technical and financial reports, , research reports, awareness and sensitization material produced).

Country visit

The purposes of the field visit based in Astana were: to include relevant internal UNDP stakeholders in the preparation of the evaluation, as seen above; explore stakeholders' commitment and attitudes; verify country' priorities; collect information on the results of the various areas of intervention; assess the outcomes at final beneficiaries' level. To this last purpose the evaluators have meet CSOs, NGOs and in some cases end users.

During the country visit, the following methods of data collection have been used.

Semi-structured interviews

Interviews took place with UNDP staff and with stakeholders. These included: national authorities, national partners, civil society organisations (implementing partners and beneficiary organisations), other relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Projects

The list of the projects implemented during the period is already provided in the ToR. In analysing the projects, the team based its work on the available reports; due to limited availability of time, it was not possible to interview and meet all project partners.

Data analysis

Data for analysis have been triangulated through a mixed methods approach that included desk review, consultation with all main stakeholders, and an independent assessment of development effectiveness. The latest made use of a difference-based approach, to identify expected and unexpected changes. Process tracing was also used, to identify mechanisms of change and the likely contributions of UNDP.

3.4

Performance standards

On the basis of the Evaluation Questions included in the TOR, the evaluation team has elaborated a detailed Evaluation Matrix, including evaluation questions, relevant sub, indicators, and method for collecting data. The following evaluation matrix was used for this exercise.

Relevant Criteria	Key Questions	Sub Criteria	Sub Questions	Indicators	Stakeholders	Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance	<p><i>The extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation</i></p> <p>Are we doing the right things?</p>	Alignment	Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?	CPAP references, country reports		Desk review
		Validity	Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?	Country reports, Government reports, programme reports		Desk review
		Governance, Human Rights and Gender Equality	How has UNDP's support for the rule of law development positively contributed to a favourable environment for civic engagement in Kazakhstan?	NGO reports, UNDP reports, media	Civil society stakeholders, programme staff, National Authorities	Desk review, interviews
			Has UNDP made impact to empower the poor and the disadvantaged groups to participate in the development process and have their voices heard?	NGO reports	CSOs, NGOs	Interviews
			Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance, rule of law, participatory decision-making and access to justice	Government stakeholders, civil society reports and discussions	Civil society stakeholders, National Authorities	Desk review, interviews
			Has UNDP and unified stakeholders contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to improve civic engagement?	Evidence of engagement with influential CSOs within the institutional framework	Civil society stakeholders, National Authorities, programme reports	Interviews, desk review
			To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?	Existence and activity of participatory mechanisms in the implementation of interventions	Programme Staff	Interviews, Desk review
Efficiency	<p><i>Measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs</i></p> <p>Are we doing things right?</p>	Organisational Efficiency	Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?	Evidence of fund disbursement being appropriate to maximise utility	Programme staff	Desk review
			How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the civic engagement portfolio? Where are the gaps if any?	Evidence of decision making, timeliness, programme adjustment and learning	Programme Staff	Interviews Desk review
			How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the civic engagement portfolio?	Comparative advantage of UNDP experienced by stakeholders Evidence of a performance management system having been established and utilised for decision making Coordination with other relevant UN agencies	Programme Staff Other UN agencies	Interviews Desk review

			Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the improvement of public sector?	Evidence of alignment between the actions of interventions and the expressed needs of rights holders Comparative advantage of UN in increasing public awareness experienced by stakeholders	Civil society groups ,national authorities	Interviews
		Human Rights and Governance	Has UNDP successfully piloted access to justice for the poor and the disadvantaged?	Evidence of the groups constituting the main direct participants in programme activities and the most significant changes they experience	Civil society groups	Desk review Interviews Focus Groups
Effectiveness	The extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives Are the things we are doing working?	Achievements	How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2015?	Comparison of reports to work plans	Programme staff	Desk review, interviews
			What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2015?	Programme reports, work plans	Programme staff	Desk review, interviews
			What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?	Outcomes for which there is a plausible performance story (mechanisms of change) linking back to the actions of the programme	Civil society groups	Focus Groups Desk reviews
			Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?	Most Significant Changes reported by groups of stakeholders	Civil society groups, national authorities	Interviews, Focus groups, Desk review
			To what extent has the rights-based approach been integrated in CO development programming and implementation activities?	Existence and activity of participatory mechanisms in the implementation of interventions	Programme Staff	Interviews
			Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?	Contributions to outcomes that cannot be assigned to other actors or forces	National authorities Civil society	Desk review Interviews, Focus groups
			Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights in the legal and administrative systems?	Stakeholder analysis of forces/drivers of change	Civil society groups	Interviews
		Human Rights and Gender Equality	Has UNDP contributed to governmental institutions be more likely to solicit public opinions relating to issues of rights and access to justice and to public services?	Evidence of change in the dynamics of decision making with increased dialogue with civil society on themes regarding access to justice and citizens' rights Expressed ownership of national authorities for relevant human rights principles and standards Existence of platforms for dialogue between groups at policy level	Civil society, national authorities	Focus Groups Interviews
			How UDNP has used and promoted the rule of law system to improve the well-being of disadvantaged people such as persons with disabilities, oral mans (Kazakh repatriates), youth and women?	Existence of platforms for dialogue between groups at policy level Evidence of policy and legislative changes Perceptions of the civil society	National authorities, civil society groups	Desk review Focus groups Interviews
Sustainability	The benefits of the	Capacity development	How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as	Evidence of capacity gap analysis of key stakeholders and institutions	National authorities Civil society groups	Desk review Interviews

	<i>Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted</i> Will the changes last?		a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?	Evidence of interventions to address self-expressed and externally analysed gaps		Focus Groups
		Ownership	Are there national plans /reforms to promote the civic engagement legal – or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years?	Existence of required knowledge, skills, and financial flows within national institutions to maintain outcomes Evidence of high level political support for access to justice and citizens' participation	Civil society groups National authorities	Focus groups Interviews Desk review
			Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?	Integration of Programme outcomes into national planning, budgeting and monitoring systems Evidence of sustainability measures in the programme documents and analysis of their implementation	Programme staff	Desk review

3.5 Stakeholders engagement

Given the time constraints of the field visit and the limited availability of relevant stakeholders – due both to the post-holiday period and to the fact that many projects have been finalised long ago- the degree of engagement of stakeholders in this mission was relatively satisfactory. As said above, a post-mission discussion or debriefing with them would have helped to receive feedback and reach consensus on the team's findings.

3.6 Ethical considerations

The UN ethical standards in evaluations are based on the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct⁵. The UNEG guidelines note the importance of ethical conduct for the following reasons:

1. *Responsible use of power*: All those engaged in evaluation processes are responsible for upholding the proper conduct of the evaluation.
2. *Ensuring credibility*: With a fair, impartial and complete assessment, stakeholders are more likely to have faith in the results of an evaluation and to take note of the recommendations.
3. *Responsible use of resources*: Ethical conduct in evaluation increases the chances of acceptance by the parties to the evaluation and therefore the likelihood that the investment in the evaluation will result in improved outcomes.

The evaluation team has carefully followed the above mentioned Guidelines.

3.7 Background information on evaluations

This exercise was conducted by a team of two experts, for a total duration of 35 working days. The team is composed of:

- Ms Donata Maccelli, Team Leader.
- Mr Ivan Apanasevich, National Expert.

Their profiles are presented in the table below:

Name, position & expertise	Key qualifications
Team Leader Donata Maria MACCELLI	Mrs Maccelli has over 20 years of experience in dealing with all levels of Governments – including Ministers - and other State and non – State actors, providing assistance in strategic planning, design of policies and implementation of programs. Her main field of expertise are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public administration reform and restructuring, institutional building and human resources development; • political relations, democracy and civil society development, human rights, election monitoring; • justice and Home Affairs, fight against organised crime, reform of police; • education, vocational and management training; • social development with particular focus on women and other vulnerable groups Moreover, she has a wide experience in programme and program management and evaluation, policy advice, policy dialogue and coordination of external aid and in preparation and delivery of training programmes. With an in-depth experience in complex

⁵ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

Name, position & expertise	Key qualifications
	<p>evaluation and in the CIS regions and in particular in Kazakhstan, Mrs. Maccelli is a respected Team Leader, showing excellent team-building, communication, reporting and presentation skills. She is Russian mother tongue and fluent in English.</p> <p>Relevant assignments as Team Leader include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EC (2012) Evaluation of the implementation of the EU funded programme “Women children rights in Ukraine” • ILO (2011) Final evaluation of “Consolidating the Legal and Institutional Foundations of Social Dialogue in the Countries of Western Balkans and Moldova” • EC, (2009) “Evaluation/identification of Support of State Reform and Modernization Actions” in Kazakhstan
<p>National Expert</p> <p>Ivan APANASSEVICH</p>	<p>Mr. Apanassevich has over 20 years of experience in civil society strengthening and democracy promotion in Kazakhstan and in Central Asia. He has a wide experience in project management and project monitoring and evaluation other than in training programmes for NGOs.</p> <p>Mr. Apanassevich is specialized in supporting reform and social changes programmes supporting dialogue between the civil society organizations and government institutions on democratic issues. He has a vast experience in supporting the reform processes also providing capacity building activities, assisting in organizational development and providing technical assistance for the elaboration of relevant Action Plans or progress reports.</p> <p>He has recently worked as Program Director for Central Asia in the International Center for Non-for-Profit Law (ICNL), aimed at strengthening of legal environment for NGOs and also as Senior Adviser for Counterpart International in Kazakhstan for conducting advocacy assessments.</p>

Quality Control and Assurance has been guaranteed by Lattanzio Advisory SpA which runs internal quality systems certified as per **UNI/EN/ISO 9001:2000** a **ISO 14002:2004** (environmental certification) for management consulting, research and training, publishing, information systems development and event organization. The **Quality Assurance System (QAS)** intervened step by step providing the most appropriate type of quality support according to the phase of the process and the activity taking place. The QAS has been performed at three levels: Team Leader level, Project Management level, and Advisory level:

- The **Team Leader** (TL) as main responsible for the quality of the deliverables acted as the main focal point between the team members and ensured that each team member is completely aware of the tasks to be performed and able to provide high standard inputs on the basis of his guidance. The extensive experience of the TL in complex assignments supported the process for the quality check of each output;
- The **Evaluation Manager** (EM). She has been the supervisor figure and acted in the capacity of “certification of the quality process” following the pattern of an ISO system, ensuring that all agreed steps of the quality process were enforced and all building blocks have been put in place. The EM carried out a constant monitoring of the team of experts ensuring that they deliver the outputs on time and of the agreed quality.
- The **Quality Advisors** (QA), The LA senior staff with outstanding expertise in evaluation methodologies reviewed the quality of the final outputs.

3.8 Major limitations of the methodology

Limitation 1: the timing of the field mission – 5 days, after the summer holidays period – has impacted on the organisation of interviews especially at Government level.

Mitigation: the team and the UNDP staff have put maximum efforts to ensure a basket of relevant stakeholders for the interviewees. Acquaintances of both the Team Leader and the Evaluation Expert have also favoured relevant meetings with programme-related stakeholders.

Limitation 2: most projects were already completed since long time at the time of the evaluation and it was therefore difficult to identify the proper stakeholders, due to high turnover both in Government and among donor organisations (i.e. embassies of donor countries).

Mitigation: the review of the projects focused on general results of the Programme, and comments on single projects are reported only when relevant information is available.

Limitation 3: the material provided to the team is limited since reports and other material prepared under the projects have not been copious. This does not allow for an adequate desk review, thus limiting the team's assessments particularly on efficiency and in many cases effectiveness.

Mitigation: the team attempted to collect relevant information from all available sources, including Internet, social networks, civil society stakeholders. The report highlights the main achievements and challenges at programme level and – similarly to limitation 3 – quotes projects only where evidence is available.

Limitation 4: due to the above issues, a proper assessment at project level is not possible.

Mitigation: The team has focused its evaluation on programme, than project, level and has tried to identified general outcomes and results.

3.9 Data analysis

Quantitative Information

1. Budget: The database contains both the planned budget of each project and the funded budget at the time the project document was signed
2. Timeframe: The start date, end date and time frame as stated in the programme documents have been entered.
3. Funding Sources: Funding sources include recipient governments; bilateral donors and core funding from the UN agencies themselves. The amounts provided by the different sources have been entered.

Qualitative Information

The gathering of qualitative data focused on obtaining an overview of key issues and information needs. The data was acquired through consultations and interviews with key stakeholders and a review of documentation.

Interviews were held with over 20 people that were either staff of national government bodies, projects' implementing bodies, member of the civil society, or engaged in one way or another in CPAP related issues.

The documentation review was relatively comprehensive. At a minimum all programme documents made available to the team were skimmed through – some were studied in more detail.

In addition, Internet searches for evaluations have been undertaken.

The list of documentation used in this exercise is provided under Annex 8.2

4 Findings

This Chapter is structured in accordance with the OECD DAC requirements for evaluations and is in line with UNDP evaluation rules. In Section 4.1, we discuss the programme's design and its relevance to national and provincial priorities and EU country programme priorities and strategies. Section 4.2 discusses the programme's efficiency, including the conversion of resources (financial and human) into results. Section 4.3 follows with a discussion of effectiveness, in particular the contribution of the results achieved to achieving the immediate objective (outcome). Section 4.4 discusses the programme's sustainability over time.

4.1 Relevance

Definition: The extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation

EQ1. Did the Programme reflect the national priorities?

National and UNDAF priorities are set out as follows:

National priority

Establish an effective and up-to-date corps of civil servants and state-owned formations of Kazakhstan loyal to the cause they serve to and capable of acting as representatives of the people in achieving our priorities.

UNDAF outcome

By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups.

Country programme outcomes

Outcome 5: National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all

Outcome 6: The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

Outcome 7: Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner.

The table above clearly shows differences between the national priorities expressed in the programme document by the GoK and the priority objectives set out in UNDAF, where the latter formulates the need for developing the civil society as a necessary element of citizens' representation, whereas the former highlights the priority of strengthening and consolidating state structures.

The country programme outcomes 5, 6 and 7 seem therefore the good result of a compromise between two visions – at national and UN level– which propose two equally dignified approaches. The effort of UNDP to represent and reflect the needs of the civil society and the necessity to adopt bottom-up approaches, along with measures enhancing the consolidation of the Kazakh statehood, is to be highly praised.

EQ2. Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?

The following table resumes the projects implemented under the Programme, according to the three CP outcomes.

Country programme outcomes	Country programme Outputs	Projects	Project No. ⁶	Amount USD
Outcome 5 National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all	The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan	Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan	4	740,000
	The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented	Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan	3	300,000
	People have better access to justice through strengthened	Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the	8	487,993

⁶ The project numbering is taken from the project ToRs.

	capacity of the justice system	UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan ⁷		
		Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system	5	83,750
		Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan	2	240,000
		Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan	1	400,000
		Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of the Kazakhstani society	6	252,500
Total Outcome 5 (USD)				2,504,243
Outcome 6 The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes	Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration	---		
	Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services	Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups	12	87,200
Total Outcome 6 (USD)				87,200
Outcome 7 Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner	Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of regional cooperation	Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan	7	431,333
		Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services	9	750,000
		Strengthening responsive governance for MDG	11a, 11b	59,706,300,000

⁷ This project can also relate to CP outcome 7, last CP output, since This project can also relate to CP outcome 7, last CP output, since it supported anti-trafficking training jointly with another EU/UNDP project titled Border Management in Central Asia , Phase 8 (BOMCA).

		acceleration in Kazakhstan (2 subsequent projects)		
	Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance ⁸			n/a
Total Outcome 7 (USD)				1,561,189
TOTAL AMOUNT				4,152,632

CPAP Outcomes 5 and 7, more related to activities of the executive, have the lion share of the funding. Outcome 6, which is the most relevant in terms of empowering citizens' representatives (the legislative and the civil society) has been weakly dealt with, both in terms of funding and number of projects. Yet, the CPAP itself highlights among others that *the capacity of the governance system to convey the voice of people through social dialogue requires development. Effective local governance is crucial to democracy and grass-roots development, and capacity strengthening is needed. While democratic accountability addresses the effective exclusion of women, minorities and the disadvantaged, corruption undermines social belief in the willingness and capacity of public institutions to fulfil their obligations to the people.*

This imbalance is partly justified by the high percentage of Programme funding coming from the GoK, as we will analyse later on under Effectiveness; on the other side, it has been a missed opportunity, which – if properly considered – would have effectively contributed to further promotion of a participatory dialogue between the GoK and the citizens of Kazakhstan.

EQ3. Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?

The UNDAF Outcome is:

By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups.

This outcome remains valid for both targets (state actors and the civil society).

State actors

The last years have witnessed an impressive work on the establishment of national strategies. The GoK has produced three successive strategic documents, Kazakhstan Strategy 2050, 2030 and 2020. These documents constitute the government's activities blueprint and the roadmap for its policy reforms for the next 35 years, which applies to all levels of government and public services.

In particular, in 2012 the President announced the Strategy 2050, which sets forth a vision of the country joining the ranks of the top 30 developed countries by 2050. In line with this vision, the Strategy recommends seven priority areas:

⁸ See note above.

1. Creating a strong human resource base: value well-educated, healthy citizens who have meaningful jobs and are protected by a sound social safety net; build a modern education system from early childhood to post-doctoral research; and promote preventive medicine with patient responsibility
2. Effectively and sustainably managing the Kazakhstan's energy resources;
3. Achieving a green economy: preserve Kazakhstan's rich environment and enhance global competitiveness
4. Building balanced and efficient urban and regional economies: strengthen a decentralized, empowered, and accountable governmental structure; upgrade urban services; invest in ICT connectivity; expand local authorities' revenue and expenditure authority with clear oversight; and build strong local capacity for infrastructure and social communal services management
5. Building a diversified, modern knowledge economy on the foundation of the above five priority areas; support priority areas in a selective, transparent, and competitive manner; and develop world-class research universities and smart cities;
6. Continuing to be open to the rest of the world and ready to work with all neighbours: join WTO; provide leadership on Central Asian cooperation; and develop the transit infrastructure connecting its neighbours to the East and West;
7. Building a strong institutional capacity: implement agreed policies in an effective, fair, and transparent manner; create more space for private entrepreneurship; control corruption and pursue economic reforms together with political reform⁹.

Points 4, 5 and 7 well correspond to the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan and remain a good basis for the continuation of the previous cooperation between Kazakhstan and the UNDP.

Civil Society

The CPAP 2010-2015 observes: *Significant disparities between the objectives of local governments and their capacity to deliver, as well as the underdevelopment of civil society organizations need to be addressed in order to achieve inclusiveness and equitable access.*

The UNDAF Outcome highlights the need for expanding capacities of the civil society in responding to the needs of the population, especially the vulnerable.

Challenges in this	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Electoral Process	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Civil Society	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.25	6.50
Independent Media	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
National Democratic Governance	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Local Democratic Governance	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50
Judicial Framework and Independence	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50
Corruption	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
Democracy Score	6.29	6.39	6.39	6.39	6.32	6.43	6.43	6.54	6.57	6.61

⁹ Source: Kazakhstan 2050. Towards a Modern Society For All.

The ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 representing the highest level of democratic progress and 7 the lowest. The Democracy Score is an average of ratings for the categories tracked in a given year.

It is particularly worth considering the scoring of the civil society. The situation remains unchanged since 2005, and there are risks that the current geo-political situation will further affect its development. Moreover, the existence of GO-NGOs (Government driven or owned NGOs) is an issue in the country, and is common with other Central Asia countries. GO-NGOs tend to substitute genuine civil society, they act as the government's 'long arm' in the civil society whose purpose is to control it rather than provide a support to it and they absorb lion's share of public funds going to civil society needs.

Finally, the GoK is currently revising, amending or re-drafting a conspicuous package of laws 56 laws, some of which are highly relevant to the civil society, such as the Law on Access to Information, the Law on NGOs, the Law on State Social Order, the Labour Code. It is foreseen that these laws will be sent to the Parliament by October 2015 for debate and approval, and will be ready for implementation in the first months of 2016. It is almost certain that the new or revised laws will contain restrictive provisions which will put heavy limitations to the work of independent NGOs, by gradually submitting their activities under the control of the Government and carefully regulating - if not preventing - their direct cooperation with international partners.

Within this framework, the activities of UNDP under Outcome 3 of UNDAF have been highly relevant and utterly beneficial, although limited in terms of projects and resources, as we will have already seen and will see in details in the following chapters. Against this framework it is of paramount importance to continue the work done so far with the civil society.

EQ4. How has UNDP's support for the rule of law development positively contributed to a favourable environment for civic engagement in Kazakhstan?

Projects directly related to the development of the rule of law in Kazakhstan are the following:

- Project 2 - *Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan*
- Project 4 - *Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan*
- Project 5 - *Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system*
- Project 8 - *Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan*

In general terms, the three interventions have constituted an useful contribution to the introduction of best practices in streamlining working processes of the judiciary. Most projects however mainly dealt with efficiency issues, which are currently a priority on the Government agenda.

This is the case of project 1, which was designed to better efficiency of courts.

Project 5 might have represented a good example of cooperation of the judiciary with the civil society; however, if we look at the activities implemented, only a very small component of the action relates to this aspect, in the form of a round table in Astana on quality of court services and co-operation with civil society.

Project 8 in theory should have also promoted inclusive approaches in the design and monitoring of UPR recommendations. The team could not interview relevant stakeholders and its findings are therefore based on the project's report, which states that in 2013 *seminars were held in various regions of Kazakhstan to discuss the implementation of UPR recommendations and implementation of the ICCPR to make recommendations. The seminars aimed at raising awareness about the*

implementation of UPR recommendations and implementation of the ICCPR Kazakhstan. More than 200 representatives of central government agencies, local municipalities, as well as international and non-governmental organizations participated in the seminar. If so, it is believed that the role of the civil society was that of a passive observer, rather than active participant, of the process.

As a conclusion, there is room for improvements in the work of the UNDP to foster civic engagement, and it is encouraged to pay increased attention to the empowerment of citizens' representatives to fulfil their role of monitors and active stakeholders in the country's reforms towards the consolidation of the rule of law.

EQ5. Has UNDP made impact to empower the poor and the disadvantaged groups to participate in the development process and have their voices heard?

In general terms, the Programme contained several elements aimed at encouraging the participation of vulnerable groups in the policy-making process. One of the most relevant interventions has surely been Project 12 - *Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups*, which represented an interesting example of an action entirely targeting the issue of participation of representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups in the reform process. The project is the only one fully directed at strengthening civil society groups. A draft Handbook was prepared and shared with the responsible state bodies, including the Administration of the President and the Ministry for Economic Development and Trade, and was posted on the website of the Institute for Parliamentary Development. Although the exercise was useful at least to determine and assess limitations of the civil society in this area, there are doubts that this has produced serious reactions from the government side which continues leading the process.

The GoK is currently revising the provision of services, including those for vulnerable, with the aim of streamlining and improving delivery. However, it seems that the civil society has limited stance on those issues; and that its role is not properly institutionalised, and citizens' representatives are not sufficiently included in the decision making processes, which strongly remain a state prerogative. Recommendations from the civil society are only occasionally considered, both at central and local level. an example of it are the results of the monitoring of the National Human Rights Action Plan, conducted by a group of highly relevant NGO; the report shows that only 22% of recommendations have been accepted by the government and included in national plans, strategies and legislation.

A missed opportunity in this sense was the already mentioned Project 8 - *Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan*, which should have included civil society activation measures in the review, but instead was limited to a top-down elaboration of the main output (reportedly prepared by UNDP experts), where the most relevant interlocutors were left aside and could only intervene in the presentation phase.

The revised Law on State Social Order might constitute a new opportunity for NGOs, which will be called for providing a series of social services. This implies i) the need for enabling CSOs to successfully fulfil their mandate through an accurate strengthening of technical capacities and skills; ii) the need for further empowering the civil society to properly carry out their dialogue with national and local authorities on service provisions standards and modalities; iii) the need for equipping the civil society in assessing citizens' rights, advocating for them and pushing authorities towards appropriate recognition of those needs and taking action to address them.

EQ6. Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance, rule of law, participatory decision-making and access to justice?

The UNDP contributions of the Programme towards knowledge and adoption of best practices in the area of public sector performance (CP Outcome 7) have perhaps been the most successful of the whole programme. In particular, a cluster of projects (Project 9 - *Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services*, and Projects 11a and 11b - *Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan*, implemented with the Ministry of Economy, the Administration of the President of Kazakhstan and the Agency of Civil Service), have provided a high value contribution to the assessment of public service delivery. The priority of the issue in the government agenda, the high quality of staff from the stakeholder organisations and the effective formulation and implementation of the projects have represented valuable factors of success. The project allowed for the introduction of modern methodologies of public administration assessment in Kazakhstan and enabled beneficiaries – in particular the Centre of Economic Research under the Ministry of Economy and the responsible staff at the Presidential Administration - to share knowledge and methods with international experts. As a result, the Government of Kazakhstan is now capable to design and monitor public bodies' performances.

With regard to access to justice, activities are still ongoing under Project 2 - *Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan*, while Project 1 - *Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan* has effectively contributed to reducing backlogs in courts and to provide valuable services to citizens in those cases where appeal to the courts not needed.

EQ7. Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to improve civic engagement?

Some of the interventions implemented under the Programme have provided useful inputs to the development of civic engagement in issues related to the implementation of rule of law. A successful example, thought based on our desk review, is the project *Transparency and access to information and justice in Kazakhstan*, funded by the UK and implemented under Outcome 5. Here the civil society seems to have had an important stance i.e. in such activities as Action 1 - *Monitoring of implementation of the existing legislation concerning the access to information* and Action 2: *Training workshops and visits to the regions*.

EQ8. To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

The UN family is paying increased attention to the issue of rights based approaches to development. As one of the main documents on this regards notes, *a human rights perspective calls for enhanced attention to the phase of assessment and analysis providing, among others, full understanding of the legal framework of a country, and the factors that create and perpetuate discrimination and social exclusion and hinder people from realising their potential. A human rights-perspective, therefore, helps us to fully understand how laws, social norms, traditional practices and institutional actions positively or negatively affect people*¹⁰. It is the team's opinion that at least in its planning phase the Programme adequately reflected the country's needs in this regard. Gender mainstreaming has not addressed through one of the projects; however, there is no evidence that measures aimed at gender

¹⁰ A Human Rights-based Approach to Development Programming in UNDP, 2002

equality and inclusion were included in the other projects. Finally, result-based management seems still on its path to improvement in the whole UN family.

4.2 Efficiency

Definition: Measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.

EQ1. Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?

Out of 11 completed projects, only eight provided financial data on their budgets (financial data were not provided for projects 2,7,8,12,10)¹¹. Financial sections of most of the project reports give only basic financial information without detailed breakdown for costs. With only a general financial information available, the evaluating team came to conclusion most of the reviewed projects achieved results at acceptable costs. Selected successful examples of efficient approaches include those that use internet resources for reaching out target population or advanced IT approaches for data collection and processing. For instance, 8 projects out of 13 created web-pages to communicate project activities to citizens and encourage citizen participation.

Among them stands the www.bagalau.kz website which has been created under the project *Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan* (project 11b) to communicate results of performance of government agencies and the database on the international obligations of Kazakhstan in the field of human rights developed and placed on the existing legal information web resource 'Adilet' (project 8). The court mediation project effectively used webinars for training mediators (project N1) and the electoral awareness project used interactive computer games and internet based mock-up election resource (project 6) to reach out youth and women. Under the project 11a the automated public agency performance assessment system was developed to collect data from all the government agencies both at the central and local levels and serve as a basis for analysis and performance evaluation of participating government institutions. This system is designed to totally transform the whole system government agencies performance evaluation to improve its efficiency, transparency and accountability. Employing internet resources, however, could be more expanded. Among reviewed projects only one is actively utilizing social networks (project 11b). Social networks may be extremely effective in reaching out the younger and socially active audience. They could be particularly efficient in case of voter education, spreading out information on rights of vulnerable groups, informing potentially interested NGO leaders about available sub-grants or making the general population aware about Kazakhstan obligations in human rights.

There are few activities whose cost efficiency could be questioned. Under the project *Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan* (project 7), aimed at supporting of the Regional Hub of Civil Service (RHPS), significant funds were used to support meetings of the RHPS Steering Committee including those organized outside of Kazakhstan. The cost of these meetings were excessive in the framework of the project itself; however, the Regional Hub partners network development and the elaboration of a platform and the

¹¹ It should be noted that all the annual work plans/Financial reports of the various projects should be kept in archive. However, these documents and relevant financial information were not shared with the team at the time of the evaluation implementation. As a consequence, the assessment was related only to the available documents.

strategy/direction of a large-scale UNDP project for the Government of RK amounting at 14 Million USD, were developed through such meetings .

EQ2. How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the civic engagement portfolio? Where are the gaps if any?

The UNDP Governance and Local Development Unit (GLD) managing the evaluated projects has sufficient personnel and resources to effectively manage project activities. GLD is overseen by the Deputy Resident Representative (DRR). GLD Program Associate (PA) serves a Program Manager for the two ongoing projects and is focal point and a custodian of information for the rest of the projects completed in previous years. Historically, some of the earlier implemented projects were directly managed by DRR or the Head of the GLD Unit. As for the current workload, a management structure looks good but in case of significant increase in number projects they may need additional personnel to employ. On average, it takes around 50% of working hours of the GLD Program Associate to manage the civic engagement portfolio. GLD staff ensured they have enough funds to travel for monitoring project activities outside of Astana. Although travel funds are sufficient, the evaluation team noted GLD staff is rarely traveling outside of the capital city. For instance, none of the activities under the reviewed 13 civic engagement programs conducted in regions of Kazakhstan (such as trainings for journalists or trainings for NGOs involved in assessment of public services) have been monitored by the UNDP staff. We however were informed GLD staff is traveling to monitor other UNDP civil society projects, not part of this evaluation, conducted in remote Kyzylorda and Mangistau regions. The evaluation team believes more frequent monitoring trips are essential both for monitoring purposes and for better orientation in civil society needs in rural areas. Some of the evaluated activities received external resource support from the UNDP units abroad. For instance, the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre (BRC) and UNDP Oslo Government Centre (OGC) provided expert advice and consulting assistance for the project "Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan".

Usually, to implement projects a special Project Unit (PU) is created. PU activities are overseen by the Project Board (PB) representing all stakeholders including representatives of UNDP, co-sponsors and PU. The PB is responsible for making management decisions for the project and providing guidance to the Project Manager in case issues arise. Project Board usually meets at least twice a year to assess the project's progress against planned outputs and give strategic directions to the implementing organization. If the the scope of activities is limited or a time-frame of the project implementation is short (as in the case of the project aimed at raising awareness of journalists about public administration reforms that lasted couple of months) PB is not established. These management arrangements look reasonable to the evaluation team.

UNDP's oversight of the project implementation is within required standards. Project units always receive timely and qualified advice and support from the UNDP office. As a rule, corresponding staff in Project Units is trained by UNDP in financial and procurement issues. In addition to the above trainings, the evaluation team recommends organizing a special management sessions covering issues of communication, report writing, developing Monitoring and Evaluation Plans and other relevant management topics. This is important for projects implemented by government agencies who often are not aware about management and reporting requirements of the international donor organizations.

EQ3. How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the civic engagement portfolio?

We did not hear complaints from the implementing partners or stakeholders on the UNDP Astana office administrative procedures or delays in processing documentation or providing project approvals and financing. Processing of new projects is conducted within acceptable time-frames. Approval cycle of new projects co-sponsored by the host government usually takes not less than 9 months (and sometimes more, up to 1,5 years). Approval of the new projects sponsored by other international organizations, such as foreign Embassies, is less lengthy and may take around 6-8 months. Approvals of new activities involves procurement and financial officers both in Astana UNDP office and in the regional UNDP office in Istanbul. UNDP is currently undergoing decentralization process aimed at empowering country offices, such as the Astana office, with more authorities to make administrative and procurement processes more efficient.

For reporting purposes, there is a suggested UNDP standard format available in Executive Snapshot. The evaluating team however noted that not all of the projects are strictly following it. Some differences in format, structure and size (some of the final reports are of 20 pages; others are of 3-6 pages and there is a progress report of one page in size (ongoing project N2) have been noted. Overall project descriptions are not always aligned with reports, even titles of the projects can differ from titles on the corresponding reports. For instance the title of the project 'Transparency and access to justice in Kazakhstan' (as it is in the project document) in the Final Report is changed to 'Access to Information and Freedom of Expression from Government to Society in Kazakhstan' (project 4). This change of title is not supported by activities conducted under project 4 more relevant to issues of "access to information" rather than to "freedom of expression". Other formats, including formats of UNDAF, British, Finland and Netherlands Embassies, seem to be used. Not all UNDP reports specify relevant UNDP sub-outcomes from the UNDP results framework; among them there are the final reports for projects 3, 2, 4, 5, and 6. The final report for the project 4 is organized for sub-outcomes which are different from those of UNDP and the report is made in the format of the British Embassy and corresponds the British Embassy's own 'program indicators' and 'county business plan objectives' rather than UNDP outcomes.

As a consequence of the above, the quality of reports is also often negatively affected. While most of reports do correspond the general reporting standards, the progress report for the ongoing project 'court monitoring system' (project 2) does not meet the reporting standards.

Not all the performance reports provide analyses of comparison of accomplishments to the goals and objectives established for the reported period, or analysis of problems encountered, reasons why established goals were not met, and / or how challenges or problems will be overcome during the next reporting period. At least three of the performance reports need improvement (projects 3, 2 and 7). Only 9 out of 13 reports have the Monitoring and Evaluation sections.

Financial sections are missing in five final and progress reports (projects 2,7,8,12,10). Those reports that have financial sections provide limited financial information (as in the case of project 3). Not all of them contain comparison of actual expenditures with budget estimates, including analysis and explanation of cost overruns if appropriate. While some of the projects award sub-grants to NGOs, sub- grant information is totally missing.

The evaluation team believes there clear gaps in a way how reporting on the UNDP projects is organized and a need to improve transparency of reporting to make it more pleasing to donors and stakeholders. The evaluation team recommends introducing a standard UNDP progress / final reporting format. This will facilitate project monitoring and improve management of the projects. All reports must provide analyses of comparison of accomplishments to the goals and objectives

established and they should be organized against UNDP outcomes, not a co-sponsor objectives and outcomes. UNDP project reports should have a standard M&E section with updated baselines and targets, a sustainability and a financial section.

EQ4. Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the improvement of public sector?

Most of the relevant evaluated projects successfully incorporate tasks of civic engagement and communication strategies to increase citizen participation.

For instance, within the UNDP project “Empowering civil society organizations to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups” (project 12) implemented in 2011- 2012 regional trainings of NGOs in public administration assessment techniques and methods of oversight and public opinion evaluation were organized. As a result, 205 NGO leaders representing 176 NGOs were trained in ten cities. This project inspired joint initiative of the Government of Kazakhstan and UNDP to fund a two-year small grants program providing funds to NGOs for independent assessment of the performance of state institutions. Another successful example is the project “Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration” (N11b). This project actively involved civil society representatives into developing of the draft Law on Government services. The project also produced and distributed among participating NGOs several valuable tools navigating in assessment methodology including the Handbook on assessment methodology, a Users’ guide to Civil society assessments, and other materials. Under this project several NGOs based in regions were successfully involved in pilot assessment of government services and presented their research and findings at two International Conferences and several seminars. The website www.bagalu.kz created under this activity became a powerful source of information and communication for feedback and information sharing to involve citizens and civil society groups into assessment of public services. Projects aimed at improvement of court system are much less focused on issues of citizen engagement. We also noted these issues are not in the focus of the curricula of the Academy of Civil Service supported by UNDP.

Overall, civil society involvement in this area is not well institutionalized in Kazakhstan. More support for civil society groups needed to make NGOs part of the effective and regular government institutions assessment practice. In order to increase public participation, there is a need to develop legal provisions regulating assessment of government services, provide more training to NGOs, particularly in rural areas and create stable financing mechanism for NGOs involved in assessing public services.

EQ5. Has UNDP successfully piloted access to justice for the poor and the disadvantaged?

Among the assessed projects, a cluster of four projects is aimed at promoting transparency and accountability of the judicial system. All of them are implemented by the Supreme Court of Kazakhstan. These projects include: (1) “Access to Information and Justice in Kazakhstan” implemented by the Supreme Court implemented in 2009-2011; (2) Enhancing transparency and accountability of the judicial system, 2011-2012; (3) Introduction of court mediation institute in the Republic Kazakhstan, 2012-2014; and (4) an ongoing project “Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan”.

Access to justice to vulnerable groups is not always well addressed in the above projects. Representatives of vulnerable groups are treated as part of general population rather than a specific group needing attention. For instance, despite one of two project components of the project “Access

to Information and Justice in Kazakhstan" (project 4) aims at improving the access to justice with a special emphasis on vulnerable groups, no specific activities are planned to address this issue. The results framework for this project provides no place for activities targeting vulnerable groups.

For instance, Output 2 "Improved access to justice for all, with emphasis on vulnerable groups" is measured by the rather unrelated indicator "New technologies to record court proceedings are fully operational". While the focus of this project is on development of the draft law "On Access to Information" there is no evidence NGOs representing vulnerable population were involved in the NGO working group created to assist drafting of the law or participated in the study tour to UK to learn international practices of access to information.

A more positive example of involving vulnerable groups is the related activity aimed at improvement of human rights (project 8). Within this activity conducted in cooperation with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), a research analysis of system of social and legal assistance to victims of trafficking was organized. Women-victims of trafficking were interviewed for the evidence-based analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of the system to prevent trafficking in persons involved. The final results of the study were presented in 2013 in Almaty at the national training "Irregular migration and trafficking in human beings" co-organized jointly with the UNDP "Border Management Programme in Central Asia" (BOMCA).

4.3 Effectiveness

Definition: The extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives.

The following table will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Programme:

Country programme outcomes, indicators, baselines and target	Country Programme Outputs	Output indicators, baselines and targets
Outcome 5: National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all Indicator: Implementation gap of the legal framework (Global Integrity Index) Baseline (2007): 44 points Target: Reduce implementation gap by half	The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan	Indicator: Frequency and participation in National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) monitoring Baseline (2008): NHRAP drafted Target: NHRAP is monitored at least yearly (through open public meetings) and takes into account recommendations of civil society
	The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented	Indicator: Increase in budget allocations for Gender Equality Strategy implementation Baseline (2008): TBD Target: At least 30% budget increase
	People have better access to justice through strengthened capacity of the justice system	Indicator: Availability of court records Baseline (2008): records are made using taping or typing Target: Court records are made using new technology and available for public access

Outcome 6: The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

Indicator: Conformity of national elections legislation to OSCE standards

Baseline: Non-conformation on 19 articles according to last OSCE report

Target: All national legislation conform to OSCE standards

Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration

Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services

Indicator: All political parties and other key civil society organizations participate in dialogue platforms (Y/N)

Baseline: One political club established and functions in 2008

Indicator: Number of civil society organizations that benefit from capacity development initiatives

Baseline: zero; **Target:** 300 organizations

Outcome 7: Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner

Indicator: Updated Government strategies for border management (Y/N)

Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of regional cooperation.

Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance

Indicator: Number of joint initiatives implemented using RBM and capacity development tools

Baseline: zero; **Target:** 3

Indicator: Border management strategies and plans of action produced (Y/N)

Indicator: Practices at borders reformed (Y/N)

Outcome 3 of the CPAP Results and Resources Framework – Effective Governance (Civic engagement) foresees three outcomes (5,6,7) and 13 projects, for a total amount of USD 5,748,186. Of the planned projects only two are still ongoing, whereas the other projects are completed. The following table shows the number and amount of projects by CP outcome and outputs.¹²

¹² Source: project documents.

Country programme outcomes	Country programme Outputs	Projects	Project No. ¹³	Amount USD	Source of funding	Period	Status	Stakeholders
Outcome 5 National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all	The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan	Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan	4	740,000	Regular 170,000 DGTTF Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund 150,000 British Embassy 120,000 GMS 7% In-kind 300,000	2014-2016	Ongoing	The Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan; other: Judicial bodies, local authorities, local communities and bar associations
	The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented	Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan	3	300,000	GoK 240,000 UNDP 60,000	2013-2015	Ongoing	National Commission of Women and Family Affairs under the President
	People have better access to justice through strengthened capacity of the justice system	Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR	8	487,993	GoK (tied grant) 387,993 GoK (2012 voluntary contribution) 50,000 UNDP: 50,000	2013-2014	Completed	Human Rights Commission under the President of Kazakhstan; Responsible Parties: Ombudsman, the Supreme Court, Parliament, other central and local authorities, non-

¹³ The project numbering is taken from the project ToRs in Annex 6.3

	recommendations in Kazakhstan ¹⁴						governmental organizations
	Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system	5	83,750	Dutch Embassy 43,750 GoK MFA 40,000	2011-2012	Completed	Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan
	Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan	2	240,000	GoK 190,000 UNDP 50,000	2014-2016	Ongoing	The Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan; other: Judicial bodies, local authorities, local communities and bar associations
	Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan	1	400,000	GoK 250,000 UNDP 150,000	2013-2014	Completed	Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan other: Judicial bodies, local authorities, mediators' organizations and associations, local communities
	Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of	6	252,500	UNDEF grant: 200 000 UNDP Co-financing: 52 500	2010-2012	Completed	Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan

¹⁴ This project can also relate to CP outcome 7, last CP output, since it is linked to the BOMCA project jointly funded by EU and UNDP. BOMCA contributed to the UNDP human rights project (8) through counter-trafficking capacity building for NGOs and border guards.

		the Kazakhstani society						
Total Outcome 5 (USD)				2,504,243				
Outcome 6 The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes	Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration	---						
	Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services	Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups	12	87,200	100% Finland	2011-2012	Completed	Private Institution "Institute for Parliamentary Development" Public Foundation "Pavlodar Regional School of Governance"
Total Outcome 6 (USD)				87,200				
Outcome 7 Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and	Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of	Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan	7	431,333	UNDP 100,000 GoK (tied grant) 293,333 GoK (voluntary contribution) 38,000	2013-2014	Completed	The Agency for Civil Service Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan

accountable manner	regional cooperation	Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services	9	750,000	GoK 680,000 UNDP 70,000	2012-2014	Completed	Administration of the President of Kazakhstan, Agency of Civil Service, Ministry of Transport and Communications, NGO
		Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan (2 subsequent projects)	11a, 11b	59,706 300,000	100%Japan Partnership Fund UNDP	2013	Completed	Ministry of Economy and Budget Planning; other: Administration of the President of Kazakhstan, Agency of Civil Service, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Communications and Information
	Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance ¹⁵			No data				
		Raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform of the GoK	10	20,150	Norway Embassy			Academy of Public Administration
Total Outcome 7 (USD)				1,561,189				
TOTAL AMOUNT				4,152,632				

¹⁵ See note above.

The following table shows sources of funding by amount and percentage over the total Programme budget.

Source	Amount	% over total
UNDP own resources +UN System	1,652,700	39,9%
GoK	2,169,326	52,2%
External donors	330,606	7,9%
Total	4,152,632	100%

In commenting the above tables, two are the main remarks of the team:

1. The resources spent for 'government-led' outcomes (5, 7) have been far bigger than for Outcome 6, more focused on the demand side;
2. Funding provided by the GoK has the highest incidence over the total amount allocated to the Programme.

The tables seem quite self-explanatory about the programme structure. As a comment, UNDP might have paid more attention to Outcome 6 in allocating its own resources, which instead went almost exclusively to Governmental projects. For example, providing funds to Project 3 - *Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan* - led and implemented by a body which reportedly deals uniquely with State NGOs and only partly dealing with women's issues - might be avoided. Instead, allocating additional funds to projects encouraging the civil society to take action in participating in decision-making processes would have been far preferable and better aligned with the UN values and CPAP objectives.

EQ1. How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2015?

The table below summarizes the Outputs under Outcomes 5, 6 and 7.

Country Programme Outcomes	Country Programme Outputs
Outputs under Outcome 5	The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan
	The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented
	People have better access to justice through strengthened capacity of the justice system
Outputs under Outcome 6	Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration
	Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services
Outputs under Outcome 7	Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of regional cooperation.
	Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance

The achievement of outputs related to CP Outcomes 5 has been rather satisfactory.

In particular Project 4 under Outcome 5 - *Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan*, funded by the UK, has contributed to widen the debate among the GoK and the civil society. The Draft law on Access to Information was developed by a Working Group which comprised the representatives of state authorities and non-governmental organisations. The law is however not approved yet. The projects implemented at the Supreme Court have also been rather effective in achieving their goals of enhanced provision of services to citizens.

Outcome 7 – as already noted under Relevance – has also been successfully treated, in particular through a cluster of three projects addressing the issue of performance assessment and monitoring of state bodies. The fourth project under Outcome 7 was about the strengthening of the Agency of Civil Service Affairs (ACSA) of the Republic of Kazakhstan to establish a regional hub, through building institutional networks for exchange of knowledge and experience on best practices in the civil service among the countries of the region. The project managed to extend the foreseen partnership to other non-neighbouring countries (Mongolia, Thailand, Macedonia), and the Agency with its Academy are currently conducting training courses for staff from a number of countries and organising events aimed at knowledge sharing.

Initiatives under Outcome 6, as observed previously, have been limited in numbers and budget and do not fully achieve the planned outputs. It is therefore recommended that more attention be paid to the demand side of governance¹⁶ in the future CPAP programming.

As a World Bank report notes, demand-side governance (DSG in this report) *provides many benefits. These include (1) better development outcomes, such as improved service delivery, improved program effectiveness and public expenditure efficiency, reduced corruption, and improved governance; (2) more effective institutions, processes, and systems through user feedback mechanisms, community monitoring, and stronger linkages between local governments and CSOs; and (3) better projects through increased community participation, inclusion, and improved targeting. DSG has many costs. It takes time, money, and manpower. [...] DSG has risks as well. Because it is political by nature, it can create tensions between citizens and authorities and trigger government reprisals against citizens.[...] Despite the upfront costs (and risks), DSG is often cost-effective over the long run because it assists the projects in achieving sustainable development outcomes*¹⁷.

Outputs for Outcome 7 have been partially achieved.

Under Output 1 the team noted successful projects, especially the above mentioned cluster of three projects: Project 9 - *Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services* and Projects 11a and 11b *Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan* (2 subsequent projects). The three interventions, implemented with the Ministry of Economics (MoE), the President Administration and the Centre for Economic Research under the MoE have created synergies and have established a base for further improvement of the system of assessment, modernization of state administration and improvement of public service sector. Beneficiaries highly appreciate the UNDP contribution, which has allowed introducing modern methodologies of evaluation of state agencies' performances; in particular, Kazakhstan has opted for a Canadian methodology known as MAF (Management Accountability Framework). The project has also contributed to introduce performance standards and best practices in civil service, notably in the management of personnel, including observance of office hours (previously subject to arbitrary decision of managers). Based on these results, the Centre will continue work on more complex

¹⁶ Demand Side Governance approaches refer to *the ability of citizens, service users, project beneficiaries, communities, and civil society organizations (CSOs) to demand greater accountability and responsiveness from public officials and service providers. These citizen-driven accountability measures complement and reinforce conventional supply-side mechanisms that improve governance (such as political checks and balances, auditing systems, administrative rules, legal oversight, and civil service reform) and strengthen public financial management and public accountability institutions. Integrating DSG approaches into projects involves setting up systems to ensure that beneficiaries have a greater voice in planning and implementation and that the project is downwardly accountable and responsive to their needs.* (source: How, When, and Why to Use Demand-Side Governance Approaches in Projects, the World Bank, 2012)

¹⁷ See above.

issues, such as the introduction of monitoring mechanisms of the soon established result oriented budget; the execution of citizens' surveys on state services; etc.

Output 2 is focusing on improvement of capacities of border and customs authorities. Within this output a national training on migration and trafficking in human beings was co-organized jointly by the project 8 and other project financed by EU and implemented by UNDP titled the "Border Management Programme in Central Asia" (BOMCA).

Ongoing Projects

Under Outcome 5, two projects are still ongoing (2 and 3). We will analyse these projects with particular attention.

Project 2 - Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan.

According to the progress report made available to the team (dating back to January 2014), the following activities were completed:

Component 1: enhancing the capacity of local judicial authorities to carry out effective assessment of the quality of judicial services and user surveys of court services

An international expert conducted an analysis of the methodological recommendations for monitoring the activities of local and other courts, developed organizational-analytical division of the Department for supporting activities of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan (RoK), and provided an overview of the most effective examples of international practices for judicial monitoring.

Held a contest to attract the national organization for the preparation and conduct of a national survey of users of the courts in 2015 g. Training of interviewers in the field will begin this year and will continue in early 2015.

Component 2: judges and judicial leaders on the ground have been trained the basic international principles of an independent judiciary. State requirements and assessment system of Kazakhstan's international obligations within the framework of universal treaties

A training seminar for judges on the issues of Justice and quality evaluation of the delivery of court services was delivered by an international consultant. A seminar with the participation of the chairpersons of the regional courts was held in January 2015. Also, ad hoc discussions were held, including the application of international conventions. The Supreme Court seems quite satisfied about the results of the project. An important achievement – though indirect and not deliberate - was the introduction of a questionnaire on court services; on request of the Supreme Court it was developed by a leading NGO in the sector, which was able to introduce a standard questionnaire used in international courts and developed with the help of a European consultant. In this way, the format was of very high quality and responses were relevant to the intended uses. A briefing was then held, where the Court presented the result of its work to the President Administration. Results of the project seem promising: there seems to be general recognition of the need for streamlining the work of courts, and the GoK is determined to maximise the level of services of the court system and to further analyse citizens' expectations.

An indirect support to the improvement of the judicial is the introduction of the Mediator profession, through another UNDP project implemented in 2013-2014 (*Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan*, project 1). Although this profession found some opponents among lawyers and even judges, mediators can really contribute to reduce courts' workload by providing cheaper services than lawyers and by reducing timing of conflict resolutions by 3 or 4 times. In addition to

that, mediators coming from the educational sector –i.e. from law Faculties – have the ability, knowledge, skills and sensitivity to treat issues in a less ‘mechanic’ ways. The team was told about cases when mediators did solve complex issues: i.e. street children perpetrators of small crimes such as theft and being helped by mediators in building a network of human and relational support, through which children could successfully overcome difficulties and succeed in integrating with the society.

Project 3 - *Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan*. The project involves training initiatives, a set of measures to strengthen the family institution, the promotion of economic and political empowerment of women, access to vocational training and employment, promotion of gender equality. Project tools are seminars, conferences and other training events, research and expert support of other specialized women's institutions in order to increase the representation of women in decision-making and promote gender-mainstreaming and gender policy in Kazakhstan.

Work was conducted on the following issues:

- completing a pilot program on keeping the family business and various types of households for population of Kyzylorda oblast
- Building the capacity of the National Commission on women and socio-demographic policy under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan-regional seminar on gender equality in Bratislava, June 2011 year
- Panel discussion "women leaders" with the participation of the UNDP Administrator, Mrs. H. Clark May 19, 2011
- Finalization of the national mechanism for the implementation of the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "on State guarantees of equal rights and equal opportunities for men and women"
- Assistance in the preparation of the report on the implementation of the Convention by the Republic of Kazakhstan to the UN on the Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women
- A series of workshops in four regions of the country for the promotion of family values, "the family is the basis of society"
- Training for journalists and the formation of national journalistic network to highlight gender issues
- Monitoring compliance with the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "on the prevention of domestic violence"
- The convening of an International Conference on "improving the mechanisms for the prevention of domestic violence in the Republic of Kazakhstan: problems and prospects"
- Small grants programme to promote women's political leadership
- Support the official Web portal of the National Commission (www.ncgp.kz), which is one of the tools in achieving gender equality in Kazakhstan.

The project is implemented by the National Commission on Women and Family Affairs under the President Administration (PA). Based to the limited evidence the team had at disposal, the somehow ‘official’ character of the implementing body can pose questions on the effectiveness of the action. It is quite well known that official sources tend to have optimistic views on the situation of women in the country, and that there is a sort of denial of practices such as VAW, domestic violence and gender inequality in the country. Moreover, the lack of relevant, non-government driven CSOs

among the project stakeholders is an issue, in a country where GO-NGOs are widely spread out and relevant civil society organisations- at least the ones dealing with specific citizens' rights - are increasingly marginalised (see also below questions 5 and 6 under Effectiveness).

EQ2. What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2015?

It is worth noticing that the Programme, through its projects, which have proposed and implemented activities of knowledge sharing, joint debates and cooperation between the state and its citizens - have provided for an important basis for changes and have introduced new models aimed at enhancing the state dialogue with the civil society in advocating their rights. However, the real change which should have been stimulated at a more general level – a change of perspectives and approaches from the state in dealing with the civil society - has in reality not happened. The most recent developments indicate that the GoK is tightening its approaches and limiting modalities of participation of the civil society, at least in its participation in the legislative process. The decision to amend/launch 56 new laws by the end of this year is a clear indicator of this position and does not leave proper room to the civil society to properly debate or analyse planned changes. Such developments should be carefully monitored and debated among UN Agencies, and appropriate actions should be devised and initiated.

EQ3. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?

The following table recapitulates expected outcomes of the programme:

UNDAF outcome: By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups.

Outcome 5 National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all

Outcome 6 The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

Outcome 7 Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner.

The UNDAF outcome and relative sub-outcomes have been partially achieved.

Several factors contributed to success and limitations of the programming, as follows.

Enhancing factors:

1. There is decisive determination of the Government to improve service delivery in the country. This has been reflected in several presidential speeches and addresses, as well as in the Strategy 20150 and in the recent document '100 Concrete Steps – a Modern State for All'.
2. The above willingness has favoured ownership and motivation among state organisations, in particular in the implementation of those projects which are focused on state service delivery and improving accountability and efficiency of the state administration.
3. This is also reflected in the source of funding of single projects, where it is clear that the GoK has expressed a remarkable clarity of ideas in indicating its priorities.

Challenging factors:

1. The phrasing of the UNDAF Outcome is not totally reflected in the three (sub) outcomes 5,6 and 7. Outcome 3 of UNDAF is clear on the necessity to involve the civil society as one of the two main stakeholders, whereas the three outcomes do not properly articulate this need and are rather oriented to the government side, except for Outcome 6.
2. This is reflected in the structure of the Programme, which foresees only limited resources for the implementation of initiatives aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of the civil society in monitoring of, and decision on, policy directions. Yet the need for improving citizens' participation in Government policies and strategies is high in the country, as we will see below. This is particularly relevant in this period, when the GoK is amending a set of existing laws and preparing new laws which, as most sources say, will significantly affect citizens' freedoms and rights. Among those laws the GoK will introduce important changes to the State Social Contracting Law, and a new Law on Government Support to NGOs, the Labour Code, the Law on Access to Information. For the moment, only few active NGOs are monitoring the current legislative process¹⁸, with limited support from the international donor community, which was very active in supporting civil society development initiatives until some years ago and is now slowly withdrawing from consistent support to the country.
3. The prevalence of GoK funds in the financing of the programme has perhaps contributed to this picture. It is not a case that the only projects successfully and actively involving civil society stakeholders were funded by external donors and in particular EU countries (Finland, the Netherlands, UK). The fact that Kazakhstan has received the status of middle income country and is itself since recent times provider of external aid (KazAid) represents an additional source of demotivation and loss of interest among the international donor community. Nevertheless, the issue of how UNDP funds its activities is of paramount importance for the credibility, effectiveness and intellectual autonomy of the organisation.
4. Also, the existing platforms created by the GoK to promote dialogue among the government and civil society seem to be at risk. An example is the Advisory Consultative Council created under the MFA, which is a quite unique model of institutionalised dialogue. The Council has monitored the implementation of the previous National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP), but the dialogue seems to have been suspended due to considerable divergences on the quantity of recommendations of the previous AP actually implemented by the GoK (according to the civil society only 22% has been implemented, whereas the GoK claims to have implemented 70%). Currently the preparation of NHRAP is suspended from the Government side and only the civil society is working on the next plan.
5. Some of the projects implemented under the programme do not seem to have produced significant results. The explanation of this would require a more accurate analysis of processes and factors at project level, which is not within the scope and timing of this evaluation; we have examined some of them in the previous pages. Another project where results are under question is Project 6 - *Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of the Kazakhstani society* - aimed at increasing youth and women voter participation and enhancing capacity of local election commission members. Despite the positive results achieved with increase of youth and women voter and candidates participation, the overall impact of improvement of capacity of election commission members

¹⁸ They include Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Adyl Soz and a group of NGOs supported by ICNL/USAID involved in reforming legislation regulating civil society.

is limited. The election commissions in Kazakhstan are subject of strict government control and are instruments of ensuring results favourable for the government. None of the elections organized in Kazakhstan since it gained independence in 1991 have been recognized free and fair by OSCE, including the latest early Presidential elections of this year. The OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report on April 2015 presidential elections critically assessed activities of the election commissions noting their work is raising concern about impartiality of the election administration and, overall, whether they meet international standards for elections¹⁹.

EQ4. Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?

Of the 13 projects under the programme, the following are aimed at the above objectives:

1. *Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan*
2. *Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan*
4. *Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan*
5. *Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system*
6. *Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of the Kazakhstani society*
7. *Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan*
8. *Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan*
9. *Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services*
11. *Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan*
12. *Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups.*

In terms of resources dedicated, the large majority of the projects have contributed to achieve the expected objectives. Results are uneven. For instance, projects 1, 2, 7 have been really useful for the introduction of new techniques of monitoring state performances, especially in services delivery. Project 4, funded by the UK, has been considerably successful in the joint drafting of the Law on Access to Information (which, as stated above, is however now being revised and amended). Project 8 - *Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan* has raised the capacity of the executive and legislative bodies of Kazakhstan in monitoring and evaluation of human rights protection system and implementation of international obligations, through workshop on human rights indicators, which introduced state officials and civil society representatives to human rights based approach and global human rights indexes and indicators. According to the final project report, *the findings of the research promoted the rights of vulnerable groups by conducting needs assessments and research, and elaborated practical recommendations and solution for better protection mechanisms*. On the other side, there is widespread conviction among the civil society that the UPR report does not reflect the real situation of rights in the country and that the report is a government 'creature', trying to provide a better picture and thus only relatively credible. The team cannot assess the veracity of such statement, but in any

¹⁹ <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/kazakhstan/174811?download=true>

case it is recommended to conduct such reviews in an as much as possible independent environment to ensure objectivity of its conclusions.

EQ5. Has UNDP contributed to governmental institutions be more likely to solicit public opinions relating to issues of rights and access to justice and to public services?

Project 12 *Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups* was quite interesting in providing training to 176 regional NGOs on evaluation of public administration and public services. However, the applicability of the training and the degree of involvement of trained NGOs in the assessment of public services is not known to the team.

An interesting remark is the degree of sensitivity and response of the GoK to the issue of more participatory approaches in their work of reform of service delivery. Although – as above noted – some steps have been taken towards a more structured and articulated dialogue with the civil society on those themes, it is perhaps premature to draw conclusions. The official GoK strategy, expressed to the team in several official meetings, is about consolidating statehood first, then developing other stakeholders' capacities. Considering the latest developments, however, there are widespread concerns that these statements will not result into concrete actions, and that the country will continue being ruled according to paternalistic methods, thus leaving very limited room for active contributions from the civil society in designing and monitoring state policies. The current geo-political circumstances and the fear of the GoK of another 'Ukrainian case' are also playing an important role. Within this framework, it would be advisable that UNDP continue advocating rights and participatory policies as a fundamental element if the path towards the consolidation of an effectively functioning Kazakh state.

EQ6. To what extent has the rights-based approach been integrated in CO development programming and implementation activities?

The rights-based approaches aim at strengthening the capacity of duty bearers and empower the rights holders.

This approach is well integrated in most of the projects such as project 12 (which aims at empowering civil society organizations to perform public oversight of governing institutions), 1 (project focused on improving human protection mechanism), 4 (project focused on development of the draft law On Access to Information that conducted with active participation of NGOs), 6 (project focused on enhancement of electoral awareness), 8 (aimed at empowering civil society organizations to perform public oversight of governing institutions), 10 (project aimed at raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform).

The above projects' provide for capacity building for civil society institutions (trainings, handbooks and information dissemination) to enhance its ability to exercise public control over government agencies, promote human rights issues and electoral rights. These also includes capacity building for government offices to improve their understanding of a need to provide access to information to citizens, and inform them about citizens' rights. Through such activities as training for NGOs in methodology and techniques of assessing performance of public services (12), civil society groups come and try to exercise their rights and help government institutions better fulfill their roles and duties to their people.

This approach can also be traced in the projects aimed at improving of the system of evaluation of performance of government institutions (11b) as they facilitates access for citizens to information about performance of public agencies through public web resources and other means.

This is also true for the projects focused on improvement of court system in Kazakhstan (NN2 and 5) as they are focused on improving capacity of court administration to make it more transparent, opened to citizens and efficient in serving public needs.

Although the rights-based approach is well integrated in a number of projects, not all of the activities do include it (for instance project 7 is missing this target). Overall, activities aimed at capacity building of government institutions need be re-focused to make duty bearers better accountable for respecting, protecting, and fulfilling human rights and involving citizens into decision making process. We also noted number of projects with a human rights focus is very small in the reviewed portfolio.

EQ7. Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?

The alignment of the UNDP projects formulated under this task with GoK priorities and the willingness of the Kazakh Government to improve state performances, monitoring systems and service delivery theoretically favour good achievements. In particular, Project 5 - *Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system* seems to be the most promising; its main stakeholder, the Supreme Court, is mandated to streamline efficiency and a certain degree of transparency in improving the quality of services. The same can be said about Project 2 – *Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan*.

Transparency and accountability also enter in the scope of the civil service reform; however, initiatives conducted with the Agency of Civil Service Affairs (ACSA), which is the main country's stakeholder in this field, under Project 7 - *Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan*, did not directly address these issues. Cases of maladministration, corruption and favouritism are widespread in the country. OECD for instance notes that, although important steps have been made by adopting an anti-corruption strategy for 2011-2015 and by improving business regulations in order to reduce opportunities for corruption, there is large room for further improvement, i.e. declaring the fight against corruption as a top priority and ratifying the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC).

This said, the issues of transparency and integrity, although they appear to be among the pillars of good governance principles, are only indirectly or partially addressed through the UNDP Programme. Kazakhstan is still finding its own path to the achievement of better transparency and accountability, and it is the team's opinion that the fight against corruption and for increased transparency and integrity of the GoK should be state-driven in order to produce durable results.

EQ8. Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights in the legal and administrative systems?

A good number of projects launched by UNDP in this field are aimed at enhancing citizens' rights in legal and administrative issues, namely:

1. *Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan*
2. *Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan*
3. *Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan*
4. *Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system*

1. *Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan*
11. *Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups*

Some of them – such as projects 1,2,11 – have achieved interesting results. Project 1 has provided for a valid alternative to traditional judicial procedures in civil or family disputes and is contributing to more efficient services in this sector, affected by serious backlogs and delays. Project 2 is also streamlining the efficiency of the judiciary, thus contributing to improving the quality of services.

Project 3 was implemented in a satisfactory way, but its main output – the law on Access to Information – is experiencing delays in its approval and a new revision is expected soon.

Project 11 has achieved good results in training the civil society on many issues. The final project report states that *NGOs can register at the website www.blog.ipd.kz and share relevant information, findings and evaluation reports among themselves and state bodies*; however, the site is not available now. The report also states that *NGOs are welcome to initiate discussions on assessment issues and ask questions from the state counterparts as well as from relevant NGOs*. It is not clear whether these mechanisms are currently working.

Finally, as above commented, the UPR review under project 8 is a quite unbalanced document lacking a comprehensive analysis of both positive and negative trends, as influenced by the project. Moreover, the monitoring of detention and correctional centres is implemented with very limited human resources. Meanwhile renown international organizations monitoring human rights note deterioration with human rights in Kazakhstan²⁰. The factsheet prepared by the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights to peaceful assembly and of association Maina Kiai who visited Kazakhstan in January this year provides for mostly negative account of the situation with human rights in this area²¹. Among other issues, UN Special Rapporteur notes potential deterioration of the situation on association's ability to access resources. She refers to the recent draft of the new Law on Government Support to NGOs that establishes state oversight over the allocation of all funds to While the government UPR Report presents changes in the Criminal and Administrative Codes made in 2014 as fully positive, Kazakh NGO community, on the contrary, is against many of the regulations concerning civil society. The new Criminal Code instead of "decriminalizing offenses" as it was promised, imposed criminal liability on public associations for minor violations that do not constitute significant public danger. The new Administrative Code also contains provisions that provide severe administrative punishments for leaders or members of a public association that carried out activities outside of the goals and tasks defined by its charter²². The government Report also ignores deterioration with media and religious rights. In 2012, major media outlets were shuttered. Contrary to what report says about improvement with religious rights, in 2011 government amended legislation on religion, leaving up to a third of previously legal organizations outside the law and criminalized believers who continued to meet without registration²³.

As a conclusion, much remains to be done to enable right-holders to claim their rights. An important issue is the insufficient awareness of citizens about their rights, and of how to approach the right

²⁰ Freedom House supported 'Nations in Transit' reports for last three years give Kazakhstan a downward trend arrow due to deterioration of the human rights situation, political, media, civic and religious rights: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/kazakhstan>.

²¹ <http://freeassembly.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Kazakhstan-factsheet-final1.pdf>

²² NGO Law Monitor: <http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/kazakhstan.html>

²³ Ibid.,

institutions. Adequate awareness campaigns should be launched to inform citizens and duty-bearers of their respective rights, duties, and responsibilities.

EQ9. How UNDP has used and promoted the rule of law system to improve the well-being of disadvantaged people such as persons with disabilities, oralmans (Kazakh repatriates), youth and women?

The previous CPAP, at the request of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, focused on two target groups - people with disabilities and the *oralmans* (repatriants), carrying out studies and analysis for the preparation of the ratification by the Republic of Kazakhstan of the UN Convention on People with Disabilities and also to inform new migration policies and helping local authorities in Semey city to establish an adaptation and rehabilitation centre for oralmans. The government UPR review for 2010 - 2013 prepared under the project 8 is focusing the section 'Right to freedom of movement and free choice of residence; rights of migrants, refugees and repatriated Kazakhs (the oralman)' on observing implementation of the state program of repatriating ethnic Kazakhs. None of other evaluated projects directly targets oralmans. Overall, in assessed projects oralmans are treated as part of the vulnerable population and are not singled out as a group with special needs.

4.4 Sustainability

Definition: The benefits of the Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted

EQ1. How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?

It is worth noticing that these projects – through their activities of knowledge sharing, training and workshops - have proposed some specific changes and have introduced new models aimed at enhancing a better dialogue with the civil society in advocating their rights; however, the real change which should have been stimulated at a more general level should have been the government change of perspectives and approaches in dealing with the civil society. This has in reality not happened.

EQ2. Are there national plans reforms to promote the civic engagement legal – or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years?

The evaluation team had several meetings with government officials, MPs and civil society leaders to discuss current trends in the national policy towards civil society and NGO initiatives²⁴. Through these meetings the evaluation team was exposed to different opinions about the legislative trends in civil society area. Currently the government is considering several major legislative initiatives including the *amendments to the Law on State Social Contracting and related to them draft Law on Government Support of CSOs, proposals on foreign funding*, a draft Anti-Corruption law, and a *Draft*

²⁴ These meetings included deputies of Parliament N. Abdirrov and Yelena I. Tarassenko representing the ruling Nur Otan Party and Meruert Kazbekova from the Ak Zhol Party, Ilyas S. Ispanov, Chief of the Administrative Office of the Supreme Court and Ambassador-at-Large, MFA, Eren Suleymen coordinating activities of the Government - NGOs, Consultative Advisory Council at the MFA developing the National Human Rights Action Plan. We also discussed this issue with NGO leaders including Zauresh Battalova, Chairwoman of the Foundation for Support of Development of Parliamentarism, Eugenyi Zhovtis Chairperson of the Kazakh International Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law who is co-chairing the Government - NGOs, Consultative Advisory Council at the MFA, and others.

Law on Social Control (it may be merged with initiatives to establish public councils and renamed a draft Law of Public Councils).

From the government perspective, latest legislative initiatives are going to open new opportunities for civic engagement. Interviewed leaders of independent NGOs, however, have more mixed perception of the above initiatives -- while supporting those aimed increasing citizen participation, they oppose potential restrictive provisions for civil society. First of all, NGO leaders noted the recent revisions in the Criminal and Administrative Offenses Codes made in 2014 have significantly restricted freedom of association by defining previously legitimate activities of public associations as offenses and introducing severe penalties for minor violations by public associations. Another concern of civil society leaders is related to the latest initiatives by Civic Alliance of Kazakhstan (CAK), an NGO closely affiliated with the government, proposing a package of amendments to the Law on State Social Contracting²⁵. These amendments have both positive and negative provisions. While they are introducing new forms of financial support for NGOs (such as grants and awards), they also promote the idea of establishing of a single 'operator' of grant funds provided by government agencies for distribution among NGOs. Interviewed civil society leaders are afraid this initiative may be extended to include donations / funds from internal private and even foreign sources. Unfortunately, these initiatives do not specify implementing mechanism to ensure transparency and effectiveness of the proposed new grant making process. The absence of provisions clarifying the functions of the discussed 'new institution' may result in the decision to vest an existing organization -- and the Civic Alliance is one of the most probable candidates for it -- with the exclusive right for civil society grant making in this country.

Another controversial ideas coming from CAK aim at imposing burdensome reporting obligations on NGOs receiving foreign funding. If implemented, they may significantly restrict opportunities for free donor support of civil society organizations, financing of human rights and advocacy groups and result in overall tightening of government control over civil society. Kazakh NGOs are actively opposing such plans as they view them threatening independence of civil society. For this purpose, in 2014 they created an Initiative Group (IG) to advocate for improvements in civil society legislation and are working with the Ministry of Culture and Sport (MCS) responsible for reforming social contracting mechanism. These initiatives are interrelated with the current work on the new Law on Government Support of NGOs²⁶ drafted by the MCS which is also in the focus of the NGOs IG. At this moment, it is difficult to say to what extent the CAK's initiatives are supported by government and how the amended law on State Social Contracting or the draft Law on Government Support of NGOs may look like.

Among the positive initiatives noted by NGO leaders, are the draft Law on Social Control intending to increase citizen participation in decision-making and increase the transparency of activities of government bodies and the Law on Access to Justice and the Anti-Corruption draft laws. While the likelihood for approval of the latter three draft laws by the end of this year is high (as we were assured at the Parliament), the work on the draft laws / amendments on the laws regulating social contracting is much more slow due to the structure reorganizations and change of leadership of the MCS in 2014. There is no doubt however, the social contracting mechanism is in the focus of government. The Five Institutional Reforms laid out by the incumbent President Nazarbayev in 2014 in order to

²⁵ This package of amendments also relates to the draft Law on Government Support of NGOs under development in the Ministry of Culture and Sport.

²⁶ At this stage, it is not clear whether a new law on government support to NGOs mean replacing the Law on State Social Contracting or it will be an additional law regulating civil society.

strengthen the Kazakh statehood amid today's global challenges include three areas where observed UNDP projects contributed with their activities: (a) creation of a modern and professional civil service; (b) ensuring the rule of law; and (c) promotion of transparency and accountability of the state.

EQ3. Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

Most of the observed activities provide for strong far-sighted approach to the sustainability of project activities. The evaluation team came to conclusion that out of 11 completed projects all projects demonstrate commendable results in achieving sustainability after the life of the project. These results are observed in more details in the Table: "Sustainability plans / assessment of sustainability achieved after the life of the project", to be found below.

Sustainability approaches included adoption of progressive laws and regulation, strong partnerships with government institutions, institutionalization of the new methodologies or practices, capacity building of cadre of government officers, and capacity building of civil society actors. Most of the assessed projects have been supported by follow on government or UNDP activities. The hardest task to plan for sustainability is for activities where enabling political environment for project sustainability is not adequate, as it is in the case of promotion of human rights or free and fair elections (projects 8 and 6); and where there are not enough efforts by the government to promote civic participation, as it is in the case of empowering civil society organizations to perform public oversight of government institutions (Project 12). Sustainability of the human rights project is supported by the UNDP determination to conduct follow on activities (UNDP is currently writing a proposal for follow-on activities).

While there is a clear success with achieving most of the sustainability goals, sustainability is not part of the reporting format.

Although sustainability is not directly dealt with in this report, it is worthwhile to add some comments on this aspect. Out of 13 projects, only three projects discuss issues of sustainability in their Progress / Final Reports. 10 out of 13 projects do not have sustainability sections as part of their reporting format. Only one project "Access to Information and Freedom of Expression from Government to Society in Kazakhstan" (Project 4) has a clearly spelled out exit plan and the well written sustainability section in its Final Report. UNDP reporting format does not require this issue should be addressed. Sustainability section of the progress report of the project "Cultural and Moral Revival of the Society as a Prerequisite for Social - Economic Modernization of the Country" is weak and needs assistance by the UNDP team (project N3). On a positive side, issues of the follow up support after the end of project activities are discussed at least in eight final reports and the follow up support is provided either by cooperating government agency or UNDP.

UNDP's role and responsibilities in ensuring sustainability should be strengthened. Assistance should be provided to those government partners who have difficulties with sustainability sections of their progress reports. Sustainability section should be added to the project design and discussion over project sustainability strategy must be part of the required format for project documentation and reporting.

Table: Sustainability plans / assessment of sustainability achieved after the life of the project.

#	Project	Sustainability plan/ exit strategy	Sustainability after the end of the project
---	---------	---------------------------------------	--

10	Raising Awareness of Mass Media on Public Administration Reform	No sustainability plan in the project documentation.	Partial sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity of a group of regional journalists in 3 sites enhanced; training manuals and materials disseminated; - this was a limited and stand along effort; no follow on activities; - UNDP did not track whether journalists started using training methodology/skills and published articles on the related topics.
12	Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups (2011-2012)	No formal sustainability plan in project documents.	Sustainability is questionable. <p>Although the Final Report for this project argues "there is a political will in the Government to make the NGO part of assessment more practical and meaningful," the evaluation team has found this practice is not institutionalized yet; there is a need in creating a stable financing mechanism of NGOs' involvement in assessing of public services (state social contracting would be the most appropriate mechanism we think); unfortunately, a principal partner and the expected custodian of the project products -- the Institute for Parliamentary Development - does not exist anymore.</p> <p><i>On a positive side:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacities in public oversight of governing institutions of 205 representatives of 176 regional NGOs in 10 regions improved; - handbook for NGOs developed /distributed; - a special website www.blog.ipd.kz to promote dialogue over this issue developed; - training seminars proceedings and results available on UNDP website and at www.bagalau.kz; - Government and UNDP announced a plan for a two-year small grants programme for NGOs to conduct independent assessment of government agencies and their activities. (we however don't know whether it has been implemented)
#1	Introduction of court mediation institute	No formal sustainability plan in project documents.	Sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cadre of mediators trained nationwide; - institute of mediation created; - government continues supporting it.
11a	Strengthening responsive governance for MDG	Although there is no formal sustainability plan in the project documents,	Sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - modern ICT developed /institutionalized; - concept of a computerized management system for the delivery, monitoring and

	acceleration in Kazakhstan (2013)	sustainability of the project results is well thought through and implemented.	assessment of public services developed/practiced; -software for the unified information system is developed and piloted in a test mode. -web portal tested --government is using transferred know-how and tools.
11b	Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan (2011-2012)	Although there is no formal sustainability plan in the project documents, sustainability of the project results is well thought through and implemented.	Sustainability achieved; -draft law on "Public Services" developed / amended with participation of NGOs /adopted in 2012; -methodology of public administration assessment (PAA) created and based on the international expertise (Canadian MAF) /transferred to government/adopted and is functioning; - website www.bagalau.kz created and became a source of information and a communication tool to involve citizens and NGOs into assessments of public services; -follow up support through a new project provided by UNDP.
3	Cultural and Moral Revival of the Society as a Prerequisite for Social - Economic Modernization of the Country	Sustainability is discussed in progress report. Approach to sustainability needs improvement since too often outputs confused with outcomes.	Ongoing project -recommendations how to improve national gender strategy made; -Web site developed: www.ncgp.kz .
2	Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan	No Sustainability Plan	Ongoing project -there are good chances sustainability of the project activities will be achieved: this issues are in the focus of the "Kazakhstan-2050" strategy and the "100 steps"; -nation-wide opinion surveys conducted / helped to develop a plan of court training and to improve regional courts efficiency; Issues to improve to enhance sustainability: civil society component is not well integrated yet.
4	Access to Information and Freedom of Expression from Government to Society in Kazakhstan	Discussion on sustainability is part of the Final Report. Project is well thought through for the sustainability of results.	Sustainability achieved: -although the draft Law on Access to Information has not been adopted to the date of the evaluation, the draft law is currently under consideration in Parliament with good chances to be adopted soon; -issue of access to information included into the curricula of the Academy on Public Administration;

			-web-portal 'Teamworks' launched by the Project to allow follow-on discussions of the WG members to continue
5	Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system	No formal sustainability plan in project documentation.	Partial sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --independent evaluation of efficiency of court services conducted / results assessed/ improvements made by Supreme Court; -a follow on UNDP project on monitoring court services launched/ongoing; --no evidence a distant learning course module on access to information was developed/adopted into the curricula of the Academy of Civil Service.
9	Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services(2013-2014)	Although there is no formal sustainability plan in the project documents, sustainability of the project results is well thought through and is part of the project design.	Sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this activity is in line with the government plans for improving civil services; part of the '100 steps' strategy; -government services in 5 regions reviewed /practical recommendations regarding improving performance assessment system developed; --implementation standards (IS) developed for the storage, collection, processing and visualization of data collected under assessments; -Register of public services developed /transferred to government for further use; - local executive bodies trained in assessment methodology. <p><i>Problematic areas identified in the Final Report:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - regulatory acts related to public services need improvement; - lack of coordinated strategy between agencies regarding developping of public services and assesing performance of gov agencies.
7	Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Regional Hub of Public Service)	No sustainability plan in the project documents.	Sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Regional Hub of Public Service (RHPS) created; - implementing partner, Agency for Civil Service Affairs and Corruption Prevention, continues providing follow on support for the RHPS; -the web-portal created www.regionalhub.com
6	Enhancement of Electoral Awareness and Inclusive Democratic Development of the Kazakhstan Society	No sustainability plan.	Partial sustainability achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity of the local election commission members increased;

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in youth and women candidates for local elections; Final Report: "While in 2007 only 7.5% of candidates for deputies of local Maslikhats were young people under 30 years, in 2012 they come up to 12%, and in oblast and city Maslikhats - 13%"; - although relevance of the data above to the project activities could be questioned as these are the national data while the project was conducted in few regions only, the evaluation team however agrees the project activities influenced increase in youth and women voting (this influence is just not properly measured); - overall, none of the elections in Kazakhstan since independence have been qualified as free and fair by OSCE; election commissions are in the centre of results rigging.
8	Improving human rights protection mechanisms and facilitating effective implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations in Kazakhstan	Sustainability of the project discussed in the final report.	<p>Limited sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - project identified several serious limitations for sustainability: non-willingness to cooperate by some government agencies; gaps in national legislation; lack of consistency in application of existing laws; lack of awareness and information on HR issues among government officials at the local level; corruption remains a major source of concern and a real challenge; - human rights situation in Kazakhstan was criticized by UN Rapporteur Maina Kiai who visited country in January 2015. Maina Kiai noted that the Kazakh government had developed a tendency to focus on restrictions rather than human rights themselves, adding that this had resulted in a situation where rights were treated as privileges to be granted at the discretion of State authorities -on a positive side: capacity of government officials improved: they know more about HRs and better understand Kazakh government HRs obligations; -non-state participation in the development of national HR policy, monitoring/reporting on HR enhanced; -UNDP prepared follow on project proposals aimed at implementing the recommendations of the second cycle of the UPR (2016-2018).

5 Conclusions, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

5.1 Main Findings

The table below provides a concise recapitulation of the answers to evaluation questions.

	Low				High
Relevance					
Effectiveness					
Efficiency					
Sustainability					

5.1.1 Relevance

The Programme is highly relevant to UNDP policies and priorities, and is aligned with the overall strategies indicated in the UNDAF Framework and in the Programme document. The initiative is also relevant to Kazakhstan policies, in particular with regard to the priorities spelt out in national strategies, addresses and speeches about efficiency and effectiveness of state bodies. The programme formulation is the good result of a compromise between UNDP values, aimed at the development of society-driven changes, and the priorities set out by the GoK of efficiency and better functioning of state mechanisms for service delivery.

The articulation of the UNDAF Outcome 3 – based on three country programme outputs – is rather well structured. On the other side, the lion share of the Programme goes to Outputs 5 and 7, mainly concerning ‘supply-side’ governance aspects, whereas Output 6, which deals with empowerment of the demand side (citizens, civil society) has received less attention. Also, the differentiation among sources of funding (GoK, UNDP or bilateral donors) has contributed to a certain degree of fragmentation.

The programme structure is adequately addressing the needs of vulnerable people, although in practice this aspect was relatively neglected vis-à-vis the real demand for improved services for this target segment.

5.1.2 Effectiveness

The expected objectives were partially achieved. Continuous dialogue with partners and quality of expertise were undoubtedly appreciated by beneficiaries. Limited efforts were made to achieve objectives related to Outcome 6.

In many cases, the Programme has enhanced cooperation among relevant stakeholders and has introduced new tools which – when properly adapted and divulged – might effectively contribute to the achievement of CPAP Outcome 3. Actions addressing very specific issues – such as the cluster of three projects aimed at improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services, implemented with the MoE and the Presidential Administration – showed a high degree of success and fully achieved the expected results. Actions whose contents were more general and were not

addressing specific issues – such as the project on *Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan* – were limited in results.

In general terms, the scattered character of the projects – which only in few cases were designed along longer term strategies and presented coherent linkages among themselves over time - has hindered the achievement of more durable and tangible results.

In general, there is still a strong need to further capacitate not only state stakeholders, but also the civil society, to monitor and influence the delivery of services. In the case of civil society stakeholders, there should be continuous commitment from the UNDP to empower them in participating to the dialogue with the GoK on citizens' rights, and in contributing to policy making. This aspect should be strengthened in the next programming phase

5.1.3 Efficiency

The UNDP Governance and Local Development Unit responsible for implementation of the Sub-Outcomes 5,6, and 7 of the “CPAP results and resources framework” has enough personnel and resources to effectively manage programme activities in the above areas. Administering ongoing projects and processing new ones is conducted within acceptable time-frames.

Limited data were available on efficiency in the use of financial resources. Reporting should be regular, unified –following standard templates - and structured around result-based principles. Finally, it would be advisable that a Programme management structure be included to oversee the achievement of strategic goals, ensure coordination and encourage reflections on its aims.

5.1.4 Sustainability

This issue has not sufficiently been considered in the project design phase. Projects under the three CP outcomes project did not include an exit strategy, which would be recommended, among others, to test Governments' willingness to further sustain and fund some project results which are considered particular relevant for the country. Ownership was relatively good, thanks to the continuous dialogue of UNDP with constituents and to the alignment of the projects with national priorities and areas of cooperation. It would be advisable to narrow down the project themes and agree on one-two priorities to be dealt within each CP Outcome in the next Programme period, in order to achieve a long-term strategic focus and developing actions aimed at more durable results.

5.2 Conclusions

1. The Programme could to a certain extent stimulate and improve policy dialogue.
2. Projects funded by external donors (bilateral aid) have in general been more attentive to the demand-side of governance and have been more efficiently and effectively implemented. UNDP funding was in many cases weak on the governance demand side.
3. On the other hand, some clusters of projects implemented with well performing state entities, such as the Supreme Court and the Presidential Administration, well responded to needs due to the clarity of intentions of the stakeholders and longer-term strategic focus.
4. The intervention presents a wide range of themes, issues, interventions, thus sometimes decreasing depth and impact.
5. Projects lack an appropriate exit strategy.

6. Reporting arrangements should be better structured, present a unified template and be based on result- based principles.

7. The demand side of governance has not been sufficiently dealt with; the prevalence of projects targeted the state level and did not involve the civil society in a satisfactory way.

5.3 Lessons Learnt

1. The needs of the civil society should be more emphasized in the next programming phase.

As outlined in the previous chapters, there is a strong need to empower the civil society to actively take part in the debate on state policies, especially concerning citizens' rights and delivery of public services. This aspect is of utmost importance for the establishment of an inclusive society in Kazakhstan.

2. Continuity is required in order to take advantage of results and outputs developed under the Programme.

The Programme has brought about several positive contributions: the development of some important pieces of legislation, an increased accountability of state services (i.e. the work carried out with the Supreme Court and with the President's Administration) some models for civil society participation. These achievements need to be consolidated through further cooperation.

3. The projects were more successful where they were executed in synchrony with sector reforms and legislative developments in the sector.

A clear example of this is the above mentioned cluster of projects aimed at enhanced performances of state bodies. This certainly improved ownership and commitment of stakeholders both at national and provincial level. In general, all projects designed to support recently launched strategies or policies have a demonstrated higher impact and enjoy more favourable conditions for sustainability and durability.

5.4 Linking Conclusions with Recommendations

Conclusions	Recommendations	To whom?
1. The Programme could to a certain extent stimulate and improve policy dialogue.	1. Ensure further and continuous support to all partners for an enhanced dialogue, to improve their capacities to carry out effectively the required tasks.	UNDP CO
2. Projects funded by external donors (bilateral aid) have in general been more attentive to the demand-side of governance and have been more efficiently and effectively implemented. UNDP funding was in many cases weak on the governance demand side.	2. UNDP own financial resources to be preferably allocated to initiatives aimed at building capacities of the demand side of governance.	UNDP programming office and COs
3. Some clusters of projects implemented with well performing state entities, such as the Supreme Court and the Presidential Administration, well responded to needs due to the clarity of intentions of the	3. Further include long-term strategic goals in the programming of activities. ,i.e. clusters of projects articulated around LT strategic goals	Planning/programming departments at UNDP CO

Conclusions	Recommendations	To whom?
stakeholders and longer-term strategic focus.		
4. The intervention presents a wide range of themes, issues, interventions, thus sometimes decreasing depth and impact.	4. Improve projects' design with focus on results, impact and sustainability. Improve indicators, making them objective and SMART. Focus on specific projects directly contributing to the CP outcomes, and with LT goals.	Planning/programming departments at UNDP CO
5. Projects lack an appropriate exit strategy.	5. Develop exit strategies and focus on sustainability issues at the project design stage.	UNDP CO, donors, implementing agencies, beneficiaries
6. Reporting arrangements should be better structured, present an unified template and be based on result- based principles.	6. Reporting should be standardised, and should enshrine result based principles. The relevant formats, even when available, should be effectively shared with and adopted by all involved actors.	UNDP CO, donors
7. The demand side of governance has not been sufficiently dealt with; the prevalence of projects targeted the state level and, despite involving the civil society to a certain degree, did not foster the actual empowerment of the civil society in a satisfactory way.	7. Emphasize this aspect in the next programming phase.	UNDP CO, country's civil society

6 Report annexes

6.1 List of meetings with stakeholders

#	Date	Stakeholder	Persons interviewed	Issues discussed
1	31/08/2015	UNDP Office in Astana	(a) Meeting with Murat Narkulov, Programme Associate, Governance and Local Development Unit (b) meeting with Ms. TuyaAltangerel, Deputy Resident Representative, and Murat Narkulov	Schedule of upcoming meetings; methodology of the assessment UNDP activities overview; Schedule of upcoming meetings; methodology and general approach of the assessment
2	01/09/2015	Foundation for Support of Development of Parliamentarism, HR NGO /Astana	ZaureshBattalova, Chairwoman (former Senator of Parliament of RK)	Human rights situation; gov provision of public services; mediation; implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations; UNDP activities in related areas
3	01/09/2015	Supreme Court of RoK	(a) IlyasS. Ispanov, Chief of the Department for provision of courts' activities under the Supreme Court of the RoK(Chief of the Administrative Office); (b) Laura Kurmantaeva, Director of Planning and Analysis Department	Court mediation; training for judges assisted by UNDP; court monitoring and access to information
4	02/09/2015	Economic Research Institute, Center for Performance Assessment of Government Agencies, under the Ministry of National Economy of the RoK	Sabina Sadiyeva, Director; Oleg and Ildar -- leading specialists of the Center	System of provision and evaluation of public services; civil service reforms
5	02/09/2015	Academy of Civil Service under the President of Kazakhstan	Ms.SholpanEsimova, Vice-Rector	civil service reforms and training; system of provision and evaluation of public services; methodology of performance evaluation of civil servants;
6	03/09/2015	National Commission for Women, Family, and	(a) Lyazzat Suleiman, Deputy Chairperson NCW&DP	Gender issues;

		Demographic Policy (NCW&DP)	(b) Yelena I. Tarassenko, Deputy of Majilis (Lower House of the Parliament of RK; NurOtan party); (c) Kamal A. Alpeisova, Member of NCW&DP	
7	03/09/2015	The Union of Women Entrepreneurs of Kazakhstan/ NGO	MeruertKazbekova, Chairperson; Deputy of Majilis (represents Parliament Party 'AkZhol')	Gender issues
8	03/09/2015	Majilis (Lower House of the Parliament of RK)	Deputy Nurlan M. Abdirov, represents ruling NurOtan party, promoter of civil society draft laws	Draft laws: on access to information; on public council; anti-corruption
9	04/09/2015	MFA	Ambassador-at-Large ErenSuleymen	National Human Rights Action Plan, cooperation Government- NGOs, Consultative Advisory Council at MFA
10	04/09/2015	Nazarbayev University /Astana	Dr. Fatima Zhakypova, Executive Director, Graduate School of Public Policy	MOU with Academy of Civil Service (ACS); cooperation with ACS
11	04/09/2015	Presidential Administration, Sector of Strategic Research and Analysis	(a) Ms. AjanaManasova, Director of the Center of Strategic Research and Analysis (b) Ryskul, key specialist of the Sector of Strategic Research and Analysis	civil service reforms; system of provision and evaluation of public services; methodology of performance evaluation of civil servants; UNDP activities in Kazakhstan
12	07/09/2015	Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law (KIBHR), NGO /Almaty	Rosa Akylbekova, Director of KIBHR	Human rights; implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations; UNDP activities in related areas
13	07/09/2015	Kazakh International Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law, NGO /Almaty	Eugeniy Zhovtis, Chairperson of the KIBHR, a leading HR activist in Kazakhstan; co-chairperson of the government - NGO Consultative-Advisory Body: Platform for dialogue on human dimension	Human rights; implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations; UNDP activities in related areas
14	07/09/2015	Union of Crises Centers/NGO /Almaty	ZulfyaBaisakova, Director	Gender issues; UNDP assistance in related areas

15	11/09/2015	Namys, leading NGO advocating for rights of disabled people/ Almaty	Kairat Imanaliev	Vulnerable groups
16	11/09/2015	International Center for non-for-Profit Law /Almaty	Gulmira Kuzhukeeva, civil society legislation expert; participant of the study tour to UK on the UNDP project aimed at drafting Access to Information Law	Legislation affecting civil society organizations

6.2 List of documents reviewed

- Raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform of the Government of Kazakhstan. Initiation plan.
- STANDARD PROGRESS REPORT: PROJECT # 00076891 Raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform of the Government of Kazakhstan, Reporting period: JANUARY-APRIL 2011.
- Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services. Project Document.
- ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT [#2]: №85588 « Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services», Reporting period: [2014].
- Introduction of court mediation institute in the republic of Kazakhstan.
- ОТЧЕТ ПО ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ПРОЕКТА ЗА 2012 ГОД: Проект: 79730 «Внедрение института медиации в Казахстане», Период: МАРТ – АПРЕЛЬ 2012.
- ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT: No. and title: 79730, Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan, Reporting period: 1 January 2013 – 31 December 2013.
- ОТЧЕТ ПО ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ПРОЕКТА ЗА 2014 ГОД: Проект: 79730 «Внедрение института медиации в Казахстане», Период: январь-декабрь 2014.
- Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan. Project document.
- Annual Project Report (APR), Project number (Atlas): 00077763, Project name: Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan, DGTTF edition (year): 2011 - 2012, Implementation period: 04/2011 – 12/2012.
- Final Report: # 85338, Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan, March - December 2013.
- Духовно-нравственное возрождение общества как предпосылка для социально-экономической модернизации страны.
- Отчет о результатах реализации совместного проекта между Программой развития ООН в Казахстане и Национальной комиссией по делам женщин и семейно-демографической политике при Президенте Республики Казахстан: «Поддержка Национальной комиссии по совершенствованию мер обеспечения гендерного равенства в Республике Казахстан», Отчетный период: январь – декабрь 2011 г.
- Отчет о результатах реализации совместного проекта между Программой развития ООН в Казахстане и Национальной комиссией по делам женщин и семейно-демографической политике при Президенте Республики Казахстан: «Поддержка Национальной комиссии по

совершенствованию мер обеспечения гендерного равенства в Республике Казахстан»,
Отчетный период: январь – декабрь 2014 г.

- Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan. Project document.
- ОТЧЕТ О ПРОЕКТНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ: Проект: «Совершенствование системы судебного мониторинга в Казахстане», Отчетный период: Январь-декабрь 2014 г.
- Transparency and access to information and justice in Kazakhstan, Award ID: 00056899, Project ID: 00070020.
- Project Completion Report Access to Information and Freedom of Expression from Government to Society in Kazakhstan, April 2009 - 31 March 2011.
- Initiation Plan, Project Title: Enhancing transparency and accountability of the judicial system.
- FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT: Project ID and Title Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system, Reporting Period: October 2011 – July 2012.
- Empowering civil society organizations to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups. Project document.
- Project Final Report for the Embassy of Finland: №80274 “Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups”, November 2011- October 2012.
- STANDARD PROGRESS REPORT: Number and title: #00085567 Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Reporting period: January 2013 – December 2014.
- PROJECT LESSONS-LEARNED REPORT: Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Reporting period.
- Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Project document.
- Enhancement of Electoral Awareness and Inclusive Democratic Development of the Kazakhstani Society. Project document.
- Final Progress Narrative report: Enhancement of Electoral Awareness and Inclusive Democratic Development of the Kazakhstani Society, Aug 2010 - July 2012.
- Improving human rights protection mechanisms and facilitating effective implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations in Kazakhstan”. Project document.
- ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT: No. and title: #00085584 “Improving human rights protection mechanisms and facilitating effective implementation of the UN Universal Periodic Review recommendations in Kazakhstan”, Reporting period: January 2013 – December 2014.
- Border management in Central Asia. Phase 8. Final Report.
- Country programme document for the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2010-2015. (UNDP)
- Country programme action plan between UNDP and the government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2010-2015. (UNDP).
- 100 CONCRETE STEPS: "Modern state for all". 2015.
- ELECTION OBSERVATION MISSION Republic of Kazakhstan - Early Presidential Election, 26 April 2015. Final report.
- National report submitted in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21; 2010-2013. Kazakhstan.

6.3 Terms of Reference

TOR for OUTCOME Evaluation in CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Duty station:	Home-based with mission to Astana
Duration:	35 days
Type of contract:	Professional Services Contracted
Language required:	English, Russian

Background

According to the evaluation plan of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Kazakhstan for 2010-2015, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted²⁷ to assess the impact of programme component of the UNDP's development assistance:

Outcome 5 National institutions have better capacity for protection and promotion of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all

Outcome 6 The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and CSOs enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes

Outcome 7 Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner

UNDP in Kazakhstan would like to evaluate its contribution during 2010-2015 to the achievement of the *Outcome on Civic Engagement* and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learnt. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in Kazakhstan's context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development. Outcome evaluation also should be able to answer whether UNDP supported the Government of Kazakhstan in meeting the National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2050 and the Millennium Development Goals.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2015 with a view to contributing to the preparation of the new UNDP country programme starting from 2016.

BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

Kazakhstan has been successful in managing its transition since 1991, with GDP per capita up from US\$1,500 in 1998 to nearly US\$13,000 in 2013. Government investment has improved infrastructure and social services, and the country has made significant progress in human development. Trust in country leadership remains relatively strong, though institutional and governance performance is weak by international standards. In accordance with Worldwide Governance Indicators, Kazakhstan ranks highly for political stability, government effectiveness and regulatory quality, but low for accountability, control of corruption, and rule of law.

In December 2012, President Nazarbayev's provided further national guidance in "the Kazakhstan-2050 Strategy", stressing the need to improve public institutions' efficiency by promoting fair competition, justice and the rule of law, and strengthening interaction with NGOs and the business sector. Kazakhstan was elected to the UN Human Rights Council for the period of 2013-2015 and

²⁷ Please see Annex I: The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015.

has pledged to use its membership to strengthen human rights at home and globally²⁸. In 2013, Kazakhstan announced its intention to bid for a non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council for 2017-2018. Kazakhstan has ratified the majority of the core UN human rights treaties²⁹.

The Government of Kazakhstan has demonstrated commendable commitment to the public administration reform and improvement of public services and has sufficient institutional and financial capacities and political will to carry on with the reforms. The Government is not satisfied with the existing level of progress achieved and is eager to learn and improve the quality of public services and accountability for citizens. The existing state policies aimed at professionalization of public service and strengthening professional knowledge and skills of civil servants represent a major advantage for a knowledge oriented organization like UNDP, to further support the development of national capacities and promotion of democratic governance in the country.

In the period of last years, the government has also adopted several relevant policy documents and action plans, including the National Human Rights Action Plan for 2009-2012, the Legal Policy Concept Paper for 2010-2020, the Gender Equality Strategy 2006-2016 and state programmes on such issues as fighting corruption, and developing civil society. However, gaps remain in access to justice and inclusive access to social services for the most vulnerable groups through the prism of human rights, culture, age, gender and diversity mainstreaming. Addressing identified gaps and based on UN comparative advantage, the UNDAF 2010-2015 has been developed to contribute to national efforts in the national priority areas of improving public sector effectiveness and efficiency.

Kazakhstan adopted a new Law "On Public Services", which introduced regulations to enhance public accountability and expanded citizens' rights to quality services. The law offers to introduce the institute of appeal in case of violation of rights and legitimate interests of consumers of the services when getting public service. Also, requirements to the standard and rules of public service were improved, every citizen can be involved into discussion of draft standards of public services and in informing on quality and procedure of public services. Besides, the Law makes it possible to monitor public service rendering that enhances the role of non-governmental organizations and citizens in making managerial decisions. The Government tend to achieve all-inclusive public participation and provide greater access to the information about public services and standards of public services 80% by 2018 year (31.1% in 2013).

The lessons learned from the last UNDAF cycle for 2005-2009 call for greater UN cohesion in selecting joint strategic priorities and resource allocation thus addressing priority developmental challenges and strengthen the impact of interventions. These key strategies required giving rise to: Civic engagement, focused on both strengthening civil society capacities and expanding and protecting spaces for citizen participation in political and public life;

Increasing empowerment of all actors in Kazakhstan, including non-governmental and civil society organizations, women and youth, to lead the process;

Increasing commitment to social inclusion, particularly for women, young people and children, the elderly, people with disabilities, refugees and other disadvantaged populations;

Effective and equitable delivery of service to citizens, especially for local communities;

Enhancing the Government-NGO partnership in increasing the quality of public services;

Effective long-term forecasting and management of changes in society, planning and programming strategic goals results based management of the Government.

increasing opportunities for people to participate in decision-making policy regarding the quality of public services shall be of primary concern;

²⁸ www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/67/122

²⁹ Kazakhstan is not party to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (OP-ICESCR) (signature only, 2010), the 2nd Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR-OP 2), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (signature only, 2008) or the Optional Protocol to the CRPD (OP-CRPD (signature only, 2008).

to provide the country with a strong platform for fostering democratic processes, enhancing collaboration between the state and its constituencies and strengthening institutional capacities for stronger civil service and public sector;

The UNDP Country Office will be conducting an outcome evaluations in 2015, which should provide a more evidence-based information on UNDP's contribution to the development results during the 2010-2015 country programme cycle. To achieve the *Outcome on Civic Engagement*, the UNDP has focused on enhancing capacities for integrated management of national and regional level government agencies, private sector, NGOs/CBOs etc.

Evaluation PURPOSE

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP's programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of effective governance and civic engagement. The purpose of the proposed evaluation is to measure UNDP's contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to fine-tune the current UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the rest of the CPAP 2010-2015 as well as informing the next programming cycle.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover UNDP Outcomes 5, 6 and 7 (Table 2) under current CPAP and UNDAF period 2010-2015. This outcome evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. The evaluation will also assess the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UNDAF 2010-2015.

Table 2: CPAP results and resources framework – Effective Governance (Civic engagement)

EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE National priority: Establish an effective and up-to-date corps of civil servants and state-owned formations of Kazakhstan loyal to the cause they serve to and capable of acting as representatives of the people in achieving our priorities.		
UNDAF outcome: By 2015, state actors at all levels and civil society are more capable and accountable of ensuring the rights and needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups.		
Country programme outcomes, indicators, baselines and target	Country Programme Outputs	Output indicators, baselines and targets
<i>National institutions have better capacity for protection of human rights and ensuring access to justice for all</i> Indicator: Implementation gap of the legal framework (Global Integrity Index) Baseline (2007): 44 points Target: Reduce implementation gap by half	The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan	Indicator: Frequency and participation in National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) monitoring Baseline (2008): NHRAP drafted Target: NHRAP is monitored at least yearly (through open public meetings) and takes into account recommendations of civil society
	The Action Plan of the Gender Equality Strategy reaches a greater number of beneficiaries and is more fully implemented	Indicator: Increase in budget allocations for Gender Equality Strategy implementation Baseline (2008): TBD Target: At least 30% budget increase

	People have better access to justice through strengthened capacity of the justice system	Indicator: Availability of court records Baseline (2008): records are made using taping or typing Target: Court records are made using new technology and available for public access
<i>The Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations enjoy effective dialogue and collaboration in policy-making, elective and legislative processes</i>	Parliament, sub-national legislative bodies and civil society organizations have strengthened capacity and use analysis and information for dialogue and collaboration	Indicator: All political parties and other key civil society organizations participate in dialogue platforms (Y/N) Baseline: One political club established and functions in 2008
Indicator: Conformity of national elections legislation to OSCE standards Baseline: Non-conformation on 19 articles according to last OSCE report Target: All national legislation conform to OSCE standards	Civil society organizations in targeted areas actively engage in community mobilization and provision of services	Indicator: Number of civil society organizations that benefit from capacity development initiatives Baseline: zero; Target: 300 organizations
<i>Central and local governments operate in a more effective, transparent and accountable manner</i>	Central Government bodies enhance their capacity, including for promotion of regional cooperation.	Indicator: Number of joint initiatives implemented using RBM and capacity development tools Baseline: zero; Target: 3
Indicator: Updated Government strategies for border management (Y/N)	Border and customs authorities exercise enhanced capacities for improved control and surveillance	Indicator: Border management strategies and plans of action produced (Y/N) Indicator: Practices at borders reformed (Y/N)

Following projects (See Table 3) have been implemented in the period between late 2009 and early 2015 within the Effective governance (Civic engagement) outcome by UNDP CO in Kazakhstan.

Table 3: Projects implemented during the period 2010 – 2015: Effective Governance (Civic engagement)

#	Title	Period
1	Launch of Mediation Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan	2013-2014
2	Improvement of the court monitoring system in Kazakhstan	2014-2016
3	Cultural and moral revival of society as a prerequisite for social and economic modernization of Kazakhstan	2013-2015
4	Access to information and freedom of expression from government to society in Kazakhstan	2009-2011
5	Improving transparency and accountability of the judicial system	2011-2012
6	Enhancement of electoral awareness and inclusive democratic development of the Kazakhstani society	2010-2012
7	Expert support for implementation of the Concept of a new model of public service of the Republic of Kazakhstan	2013-2014
8	Improving human rights protection mechanisms and effective implementation of the UPR recommendations in Kazakhstan	2013-2014

9	Assistance in improving the system of provision and evaluation of public services	2012-2014
10	Raising awareness of mass media on public administration reform of the Government of Kazakhstan	2011
11	Strengthening responsive governance for MDG acceleration in Kazakhstan	2013
12	Empowering civil society to perform public oversight of governing institutions and promote interest of vulnerable groups	2011-2012

Outcome status: Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcomes 5, 6 and 7 achievement, and also identify the challenges to attainment of the outcomes. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcomes.

Underlying factors: Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP's control that influenced the outcomes. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners' involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

Strategic Positioning of UNDP: Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP's inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner. The Country Office (CO) position will be analyzed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating value by responding to partners' needs, mobilizing resources for the benefit of the country, not for UNDP, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP services and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in the rule of law result area.

Partnership strategy: Ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders' participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the outcome to the country's needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in development.

Lessons learnt: Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in incubation, and in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve related outcomes. This will support learning lessons about UNDP's contribution to the outcomes over the UNDAF cycle so as to design a better assistance strategy for the programming cycle.

Outcome evaluation design should clearly spell out the key questions according to the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated. The questions when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. The questions cover the following key areas of evaluation criteria:

a) Relevance: the extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation:

Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?

Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Kazakhstan?

How has UNDP's support for the rule of law development positively contributed to a favorable environment for civic engagement in Kazakhstan?

Has UNDP made impact to empower the poor and the disadvantaged groups to participate in the development process and have their voices heard?

Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance, rule of law, participatory decision-making and access to justice?

Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area in the work to improve civic engagement?

To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

b) Efficiency: measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.

Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?

How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the civic engagement portfolio? Where are the gaps if any?

How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the civic engagement portfolio?

Has UNDP contributed to public awareness and communication strategy and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users in the improvement of public sector?

Has UNDP successfully piloted access to justice for the poor and the disadvantaged?

c) Effectiveness: the extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives.

How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2015?

What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2015?

What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?

Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?

Has UNDP contributed to governmental institutions be more likely to solicit public opinions relating to issues of rights and access to justice and to public services?

To what extent has the rights-based approach been integrated in CO development programming and implementation activities?

Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?

Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights in the legal and administrative systems?

How UNDP has used and promoted the rule of law system to improve the well-being of disadvantaged people such as persons with disabilities, oralmans (Kazakh repatriates), youth and women?

d) Sustainability: the benefits of the Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted

How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?

Are there national plans reforms to promote the civic engagement legal – or likely to be developed, approved and implemented in the next few years?

Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

Apart from the criteria above, there are additional commonly applied evaluation criteria such as impact, coverage, connectedness, value-for-money, client satisfaction and protection used in the evaluation, although, not all criteria are applicable to every evaluation. Within the Outcome evaluation there can be additional evaluation questions specified for each the criteria, however all they must be agreed with the UNDP in Kazakhstan. Based on the above analysis, Contractor (herein referred to as evaluation team) must provide recommendations on how UNDP in Kazakhstan should

adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the outcome change is achieved by the end of the UNDAF period and beyond.

methodology

This section suggests an overall approaches and methods for conducting the evaluation, as well as data sources and tools that will likely yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions. However, the final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation team and UNDP about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

The evaluation team is encouraged to review the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) that specifies the outputs, targets and indicators for each component. Based on the objectives and scope mentioned above, the evaluation team will elaborate a methodology and plan, which will be approved by UNDP and validate information stemmed from contextual sources such as work plans or monitoring reports.

Outcome evaluation will use available data to the greatest extent possible. This will encompass administrative data as well as various studies and surveys, including those conducted by the UN agencies. This approach will help address the possible shortage of data and reveal gaps that should be corrected as the result of the evaluation.

The reliability of disaggregated data at the rayon (district) level should be taken into account as the capacity for data collection at the local level is still quite low and it is relatively expensive to conduct comprehensive surveys at sub-regional level. In this regard, it is necessary to use objective and subjective data available from the official sources (national and local statistics offices, administrative data), additionally verified by independent sources such as surveys and studies conducted by local and international research companies, civil society organizations and UN agencies. The relevant sources and access to data will be provided by UNDP and national stakeholders respectively.

The main issues associated with evaluability of some Programme components within Outcome Evaluation might be caused by too general outcome indicators set in the beginning, or their absence. Nonetheless, due to clearly stated overall Country Programme intervention goals and envisaged impact with corresponding indicators there is a certain capacity for data collection, management and analysis in the given Outcome Evaluation. Thus, it is very important to ensure that the Country Programme is evaluable and has an evaluability model that is clearly structured. That, within the model, the goals and objectives are measurable so that the degree to which they have been achieved can be assessed (*i.e. answer the question: what data can be collected that will provide clear evidence that the goals and objectives have been met?*). In general the indicators allow the evaluator to ensure that the Country Programme is serving those people it intended to reach, that the relevant data is collected in an organized and consistent fashion.³⁰

The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UNDP, the governmental institutions, CSOs as well as members of donor community, private sector representatives, multilateral and bilateral donors, and beneficiaries. Field visits to selected project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, as well as with donors and

³⁰ Please see more on Evaluability: *The Justice Research and Statistics Association. Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation.* Source: <http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf>

partners are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible.

Based on the objectives mentioned above, the evaluation team will propose a methodology and plan for this assignment, which will be approved by UNDP senior management. An approach relating objectives and/or outcomes to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives. However, it's recommended that the methodology should take into account the following:

The Outcome Evaluation may include, but is not limited to, the following methods of data collection:

Desk review – review and identify relevant sources of information and conceptual frameworks that exist and are available (please, see Annex II). Note that two relevant evaluations exist (UNDP evaluation of 4 components of their part of the programme and evaluation of UNICEF child protection work in EKO):

Examination of contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2030, UNDAF, CPAP and other sources. These documents speak to the outcome itself, as opposed to what UNDP is doing about it, and how it was envisaged at certain points in time preceding UNDP's interventions.

Validation of information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources such as the CPAP, and project evaluation reports. To do this, consultant(s) may use interviews or questionnaires during the evaluation that seek key respondents' perceptions on a number of issues, including their perception of whether an outcome has changed.

The current status of and degree of change in the outcomes shall be assessed against the Country Analysis and the baselines for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used in relation to UNDAF, CPAP, relevant project/program documents, progress and monitoring reports of projects/programs, contextual information from partners.

Documents and relevant background material on the development context in Kazakhstan materials, relevant support documents, evaluations, assessments, and a variety of temporal and focused reports. In particular, programme/project reports, the annual reports and the consultant's technical assessment reports, respective project documents, project reports, Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR). In addition, the evaluation team could review project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluation team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

Undertake a constructive critique of the outcome formulation itself (and the associated indicators). This is integral to the scope of outcome evaluation. The consultants should make recommendations on how the outcome statement can be improved in terms of conceptual clarity, credibility of association with UNDP operations and prospects for gathering of evidence.

Critical analysis of available data (its validity and reliability) with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UNDP inputs to the Government of Kazakhstan.

Interviews – structured, semi-structured, in-depth, key informant, focus group etc. to capture the perspectives of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, participating ministries, departments and agencies, relevant personnel from UNDP and local authorities, donors, other relevant stakeholders (including trainees, community members and community leaders) and others associated with the Country Programme. Interviews with key informants including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used.

Case studies - in-depth review of one or a small number of selected cases, using framework of analysis and a range of data collection methods. Several case studies can be quite sophisticated in research design, however simpler and structured approaches to case study can still be of great value.

Information systems – analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to a service or process, used for monitoring.

Field visits to selected sites for briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with donors and partners, where appropriate visits to project sites and partner institutions³¹;

deliverables of the evaluation

The evaluation team will prepare reports which triangulate findings to address the questions of the Outcome evaluation, highlight key significant changes in regard to the key thematic policy documents, draw out lessons learned, present findings and recommendations, reflecting comments and feedback received from selected staff. It is important to receive the report on a timely basis, as reports will be wasted if they arrive too late to inform decisions.

The structure of the reports should be used to guide the reader to the main areas (please, see Annex III for the evaluation report template). It is expected that the reports should include analysis of the outcome pertaining to women and men throughout the report and that gender analysis is not confined to a separate chapter. The reports should be clear, present well-documented and supported findings, and provide concrete and implementable recommendations. UNDP should be able to share it readily with partners and it should generate consensus around the finding and recommendations. The language of the reports should be simple, free from jargon and with specialist terms explained.

Here are the principal evaluation products the evaluation team is accountable for following activities and deliverables:

Evaluation inception report (submitted with expression of interest and prepared before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise and consist of *5-10 pages excluding annexes*) – to clarify the evaluation team's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures (to be presented in an evaluation matrix discussed below). The evaluation inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The evaluation inception report provides with an opportunity to verify that all share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

Evaluation matrix (*suggested as a deliverable to be included in the evaluation inception report*) is a tool that evaluation team creates as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. (Please, see Table 4 below)

Table 4. Evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

³¹ The list of main stakeholders is provided in Annex IV; nonetheless, the list of the partners could be expanded upon the request of the evaluation team if deemed necessary.

Draft evaluation report (*consist of 50-60 pages excluding annexes*) – for revision by UNDP Kazakhstan at the end of data collection. The draft evaluation report should contain all the sections outlined in the *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex III) and be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation.

Final evaluation report. The final task of the evaluation team is to prepare a comprehensive and well-presented copy of the final evaluation report, covering all section of *Evaluation Report Template* (please, see Annex III) and containing 50-60 pages³². Evaluation brief and summary are required. When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluation team is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Implementation arrangements

Evaluation plan

The evaluation team may not begin data collection until the inception report has been reviewed and cleared. The evaluation team must develop an *Evaluation plan* and pilot-test the evaluation instruments. The Evaluation plan is a written document that specifies the evaluation design and details its procedures (what needs to be evaluated, with whom, by whom, when, how).

Once approved by UNDP, the Evaluation plan becomes the key management document for the evaluation, guiding delivery in accordance with expectations of UNDP throughout the performance of the contract. The Evaluation plan can have, but is not limited to, the following sections:

- Roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders
- Evaluation framework
- Evaluation calendar
- Evaluation criteria
- Types of information needed
- Sampling and selection of sources of information
- Data collection procedures and methods
- Methods for analyzing collected information

In preparing *Evaluation plan*, the evaluation team is expected to identify what is feasible taking into consideration both the financial resources required and non-financial or indirect costs of the evaluation, including the time and effort that people involved must contribute. It is very crucial that evaluation team already at the application stage effectively designs a composition of the evaluation team for each stage of the *Outcome Evaluation* with required skills and experience (e.g. to ensure overcoming language barrier during field mission, data collection and interpreting documents for desk review available only in local languages, some companies may need to involve local consultants or indicate availability of team members with corresponding skills and experience).

Supervision and stakeholders' involvement

³² Evaluation team may need to use 'Times New Roman' font at a size of 12 points, with Normal margin and line spacing 1.15.

In general, the evaluation team has independence from organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation. However, UNDP along with Government institutions will have overall responsibility for organizing the *Outcome Evaluation* and will appoint a focal person/s for coordination in Astana. These focal points, with the assistance of UNDP, will backstop and manage the steps involved in planning, implementing and following up the evaluation exercise. On a daily basis, the evaluation team will work with UNDP and de-brief about the progress of the *Outcome Evaluation* as needed.

Duty station and logistical modalities

The assignment is home-based with a mission to Kazakhstan to conduct fieldwork. UNDP will interact with the chosen evaluation team by communicating through e-mail correspondence while outside of Kazakhstan, as well as support the evaluation team in country. There will be an office space, supplies, equipment and materials provided in premises of UNDP.

Evaluation timeframe

The time required will vary depending on the questions the evaluation is attempting to answer, the human and financial resources available, and other external factors. It is important to think through timing issues to ensure that a proposed evaluation is feasible and will provide accurate, reliable, and useful information. It is envisaged that evaluation will take place through April - June 2015 and will involve 35 working days in total (please see the Table 5):

Table 5. Evaluation timeframe

	Working days
Conducting a desk review	5
Preparing the detailed evaluation inception report (to finalize evaluation design and methods)	4
In-country evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) and 2 days of in country analysis with preliminary feedback to country stakeholders.	10
Preparing the draft report	8
Finalizing the evaluation report (incorporate comments provided)	6
Follow up support to UNDP in knowledge sharing and dissemination	2

(e.g. 35 working days in total over a period of two months)

Evaluation team composition and required competencies

Evaluation team of selected consultancy service organization must comprise of at least two members: an international consultant (team leader) with relevant experience in assessing the development of civic engagement and participatory decision making procedures
a national consultant who is well-familiar with the development challenges of Kazakhstan in the area of rule of law, public sector performance, judiciary and civic engagement, who will assist the team leader with the review of the documents in local language, field missions, data collection and interpreting and other activities as required.

Eligibility and requirements for the evaluation teams:

An organization (public, private, or nonprofit), academic/research institution;

Work experience in conducting independent evaluations,

Experience in M&E, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science at least 5 years;

Experience in cooperation with international experts / organizations is an advantage;
Ability to travel in the regions.

Required functional competencies for evaluation team members:

Possess strong analytical skills and the ability to conceptualize, articulate and debate about local governance and human rights issues with a positive and forward-looking attitude;
Understand human rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming in programming;
Understand results-based management principles, logic modeling/logical framework analysis;
Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with various partners including government, civil society, private sector, UN Agencies and other development donors;
Excellent organizational and time management skills;
Strong analytical skills and experience in undertaking of similar assignments;
Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work with people from different backgrounds to deliver quality products within a short timeframe;
Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills;
Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands;
Be client oriented and open to feedback.

Required corporate competencies for evaluation team members:

Sound knowledge of the UN programming principles and procedures; the UN system and common country programming processes; the UN evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights based approach (HRBA);
Demonstrate integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards;
Promote the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
Fulfill all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

Education of evaluation team members:

MA or PhD in economics, business administration, political science, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science.

Experience of evaluation team members:

5 or more years of relevant professional experience is required, including previous substantive research experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management (preferably in local development and governance, social protection, welfare, and population reproduction);
Experience with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches;
Prior monitoring and evaluation experience in Kazakhstan or CIS region (especially Central Asian countries) is an asset.
Knowledge of the social and political situation and regional development trends in CIS countries is an advantage;

Language Requirements for evaluation team members:

Proficiency in English language and proven report writing skills, knowledge of Russian and Kazakh is an asset.

It is demanded by UNDP that evaluation team is independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation³³.

Evaluation team Ethics

³³ For this reason, staff members of UNDP based in other country offices, the regional centers and Headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation team.

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'³⁴ and should describe critical issues evaluation team must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people, as well as some categories of vulnerable population; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluation team is also requested to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System'³⁵

Table 6. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing (to cover cost related with initiation of the evaluation, i.e. travel, communication etc.)
40%	Following submission and approval of the draft evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval by UNDP of the final evaluation report

³⁴ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

³⁵ Please see, Annex V

Annexes

Annex II: A list of key documents, among others, to be consulted and analyzed:

Country Programme Document
 Country Programme Action Plan
 Programme Board meetings
 Project Documents
 Annual Progress Reports Variety of temporal and focused reports
 Relevant legislation and policy documents
 UNDAF for 2010-2015
 National Human Rights Action Plan for 2009-2012
 Human Development report 2011. Government of RK, UNDP
 MDGR 2010
 Project Annual Reports
 Strategic Plan of MHSD, MNE etc.

Annex III: Evaluation Report Template

This template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'³⁶.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

Title and opening pages — should provide the following basic information:

Name of the evaluation intervention
 Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
 Countries of the evaluation intervention
 Names and organizations of evaluation teams
 Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
 Acknowledgements

Table of contents — should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary — A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.

Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.

Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.

Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

³⁶ UNEG, 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System', 2005, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/unevaluationstandards> and UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008, available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

Introduction — should:

Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.

Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation, why and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.

Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.

Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention — provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address. Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.

Link the intervention to national priorities, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.

Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.

Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.

Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.

Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.

Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.

Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives — the report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

Evaluation scope — the report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.

Evaluation objectives — the report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.

Evaluation criteria — the report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.

Evaluation questions — Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods — the evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the

findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

Data sources — the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.

Sample and sampling frame — If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.

Data collection procedures and instruments — Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.

Performance standards — the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales). A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.

Stakeholder engagement — Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

Ethical considerations — the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information)³⁷.

Background information on evaluation teams — The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.

Major limitations of the methodology — Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis — the report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Outcome Results — Overall results (attainment of objectives), Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency, Country ownership, Sustainability, Impact.

Findings and conclusions — the report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

Findings — should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.

Conclusions — should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide

³⁷ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the outcome

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Recommendations — the report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned — as appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes — suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

ToR for the evaluation

Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate

List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited

List of supporting documents reviewed

Project or programme results map or results framework

Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators

Short biographies of the evaluation teams and justification of team composition

Code of conduct signed by evaluation teams

Itinerary

The Evaluation Report will be submitted to the GEFOS Quality Assessment System to ensure the appropriate quality of the evaluation and to make it available for knowledge sharing purposes.

Annex IV: Key stakeholders and partners³⁸

Organization	Name and Position of the focal point	Contact information
Government partners		
Ministry of Foreign Affairs		mfa.gov.kz
Ministry of National Economy		
Ministry of Health and Social development		
Civil Society Organizations		
PF “KAMEDA”, Almaty	Makhabbat Yespenova, Projects Coordinator	8 701 726 52 32
PA «Association of Business Women of Kazakhstan»	Ainur Argynbekova	87019180080 http://www.businesswomen.kz/
Association of Social Workers and Volunteers (ASRiV)	Kulchariya Kokkozeva, Chairman	87772996528
RPA “IRIS”	Gulmira Beketova	87772106010
Social corporate fund “ZUBR”	Vitaliy Kulik, Director	87775555008 zubr.24net.kz
PF «Development of Youth Entrepreneurship»	Yersin Kudiyarov, Co-founder	87774244001 www.rmp.kz
	Aleksandra Koshkina, Director	8 7222 520508 www.rmp.kz
YPF “Kazakhstan Youth Support”	Botabek Tokishkadyrov	8 775 433 43 38
PA “Otansyngysh Oralmandar”	Ainur Shariv	87014414191
PF “Academy of Legal awareness”	Mukhtar Baimagulov	87077797936
PA “East Kazakhstan Oblast Voluntary Society of the People with Disabilities”	Magiza Mirzavetdinova	8 7232 221516
PF “Pavlodar Regional Governance School”	Almira Batayeva	87779347063
Academia		
Nazarbayev University		www.nu.edu.kz
University “Kainar”		8 (7222) 566 041, 522 914, 566 027 www.kainar-semey.kz
Academy of Public administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan	Bolatbek Abdrasilov, Rector	8 7172 753268 pa-academy.kz/
Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Law	Chris Nguyen, Consultant	8727 2 704475 www.kimep.kz
Assessment and Monitoring Center of Public Agencies Efficiency	Asel Kenesova	87751880411 http://www.bagalau.kz/
UN Agencies		
UNV		
UNDP		www.undp.kz
UNISEF		www.unicef.kz
UNFPA		
Donors and International Organization		
Kazakhstan Government		www.government.kz/
Corporate and Private Sector		

³⁸ NB: This list outlines the main groups of stakeholders. The extended list of stakeholders will be provided before the evaluation.

Entrepreneurship Development Fund 'DAMU'	Angela Maslova Representative in Semey	87222 520159 http://www.damu.kz/9647
National Commercial Board "Atameken"	Ardak Adilzhanov	87752983688 http://palata.kz
JSC "Fund of Financial Support of Agriculture"	Maksat Kenzhebayev	87752999866 http://www.fad.kz
"Kazbusinessconsulting" LTD	Ramiz Alakhverdiyev	8701 779 35 35 kbc.24net.kz
"Center of Business researches "BISAM – Central Asia" LTD	Leonid Gurevich	87273 780523 http://www.bisam.kz
Entrepreneurs Service Center		8/7222/ 52-14-98 http://www.fund-damu.kz/14137
Media		
Correspondent office of JSC Agency "Khabar"		www.khabar.kz
JSC RTRC "Kazakhstan"		8 kaztrk.kz/rus/
"Arna Press" newspaper, radio 7	Asan Myrzakhanov, Journalist	87771165001 http://arnapress.kz
"Liter" newspaper	Yekaterina Gulyaeva, Journalist	87771741068 www.liter.kz
Tendrinews	Ruslan Shakabayev, Journalist	87013536763 http://tengrinews.kz
Khabar Agency	Saruar Kabdullayev, Journalist	87755856472 www.khabar.kz
KTK	Olzhas Nurekenov, Journalist	87055005843, www.ktk.kz
Kazakh TV		+7 7172 553-700; +7 7172 553-451 Fax: +77172 553-701 http://kazakh-tv.kz
The print press		
Kazakhstanskaya Pravda	Aigul Bidanova, Journalist	87771536472 http://www.kazpravda.kz

Annex V: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation team:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁹

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

³⁹ For more information on Code of Conduct please visit: www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

6.4 Code of conducts signed by the evaluation team

Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation team:

- ✓ Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- ✓ Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- ✓ Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- ✓ Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- ✓ Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- ✓ Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- ✓ Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Donata Maria MACCELLI

Name of Consultancy Organization: LATTANZIO ADVISORY SpA

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

Signed at *Rome* 13/04/2014

Signature: 

Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation team:

- ✓ Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- ✓ Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- ✓ Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluation team must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation team is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- ✓ Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation team should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- ✓ Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation team must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation team should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- ✓ Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- ✓ Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

Name of Consultant: Ivan APANASSEVICH

Name of Consultancy Organization: LATTANZIO ADVISORY SpA

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

Signed at *Rome* 14/04/2014

Signature: _____



