



**Outcome Evaluation on Social Inclusion
and Quality of Life Improvement**

Table of contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations	4
Executive summary.....	5
Introduction	6
Description of the intervention	7
Evaluation methodology	14
Outcome Results.....	23
Relevance.....	23
Efficiency	25
Effectiveness.....	27
Sustainability.....	29
Findings and conclusions.....	33
Recommendations.....	34
Lessons learned.....	36
Report annexes	38
Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	38
List of documents reviewed	55

List of acronyms and abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
AWP	Annual Working Plan
BTI	Bertelmann Stiftung's Transformation Index
CCM	Country Coordinating Mechanism
CPD	Country Programme Document
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CRPD	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EKO	East Kazakhstan Oblast
GFATM	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
HACT	Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millenium Development Goals
MIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PWDs	Persons/People with Disabilities
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
TB	Tuberculosis
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Developemnt Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Developemnt Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Narions Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive summary

1. The present Outcome Evaluation is aimed at the assessment of results achieved by UNDP in the area of social inclusion and quality of life improvement and provision of recommendations that would improve further UNDP activities in the field of social development of Kazakhstan.
2. The Outcome Evaluation covers the 2010-2015 Country Programme component on economic and social well-being for all which is presented in the following projects reviewed: Support to The Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) Secretariat; Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards; Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services (using Semey as an example); Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable; Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization.
3. The UNDP Outcome activities are assessed as **highly satisfactory** under the criterion of relevance. The initiatives correspond to the national and regional priorities, help the beneficiaries from state and non-governmental sector to achieve their goals and provide the beneficiaries with the access to the global best practices.
4. The criterion of efficiency is assessed as **highly satisfactory** - activities under the Outcome are implemented within deadlines and cost estimates are met.
5. The criterion of **Effectiveness** is assessed as **highly satisfactory**. While the indicator system of effectiveness does not reflect thoroughly the results achieved by UNDP the analysis of qualitative data proved that UNDP's intended contribution to the social development and social modernization of Kazakhstan is significant and assessed by the beneficiaries as effective.
6. The criterion of **Sustainability** is assessed as **satisfactory**. Even though there are on-going projects in the project portfolio of the evaluated Outcome it is noticeable that UNDP's efforts will be sustainable due to support and ambitiousness of the national and local governments, and NGOs.

Introduction

As the end of the 2010-2015 Programming period is approaching, it is essential to assess the impact of UNDP's development assistance to Kazakhstan and its people in the field of social inclusion and quality of life improvement. This evaluation will cover activities under Outcome 1 of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP): “Vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, young and aged

The social safety net is a term used to describe a collection of services provided by the state, such as welfare, unemployment benefit, universal healthcare, homeless shelters, the minimum wage and sometimes subsidized services such as public transport, which prevent individuals from falling into poverty beyond a certain level. (UNDAF Kazakhstan 2010-2015)

people, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets”.

It is specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Outcome

Evaluation that “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 social inclusion. 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 next programming cycle”.

Specific tasks included assessing:

- progress towards the outcome
- the factors affecting the outcome
- key UNDP contributions to outcome
- the partnership strategy
- the portfolio alignment and its relevance to the UNDAF 2010-2015.

The outlined evaluation was intended not only to identify the impact that was made by UNDP’s efforts under CPAP, but also to provide valuable insights for improving its operations by highlighting best practices.

The primary audience of this evaluation was the team of UNDP Kazakhstan, which will be able to use the findings of this evaluation in their future programming. However the results of the evaluation may also be useful for the Government of Kazakhstan in learning which UNDP practices have proved to be efficient and taking them into consideration and further implementation. The evaluation may also be utilized by other UN agencies, which work in similar contexts. Wider audiences may also gain

advantage of this report in order to comprehend the general purpose of UNDP's work in Kazakhstan and particular impact in the social development area.

Description of the intervention

The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2010-2015 is based on the Country Programme Document (CPD) 2010-2015 and the United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAF) 2010-2015 for the Republic of Kazakhstan. The Country Programme is implemented jointly by the Government of Kazakhstan and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Programme was developed with the engagement of the Governmental partners, civil society, the private sector, the United Nations system and the international community. At the time of its development the Programme was designed to contribute to achievement of the Kazakhstan 2030 strategy and the Concept for Transition to Sustainable Development until 2024. This Programme is a continuation of the 2005-2009 UNDAF and the Country Programme, which had three main directions:

1. Poverty reduction and monitoring
2. Governance and participatory development
3. Environmental management and human security.

By incorporating lessons learned from the previous programme the 2010-2015 Country Programme was designed to assist Kazakhstan with its national competitiveness agenda focusing on human development for all. Three new areas relate to the 2005-2009 priority areas:

1. Economic and social well-being for all
2. Environmental sustainability
3. Effective governance

The evaluated priority area, Economic and social well-being for all, was designed to focus “on capacity development for provision of services (at the district, community and family levels for vulnerable groups, particularly in rural areas), and supporting job creation and entrepreneurship”. These goals were reflected in the Results Framework as intended outputs:

CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

CPAP Output: 2. Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas.

Therefore, the beneficiaries of the Programme include the governmental agencies (Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development, Ministry of National Economy, Oblast administrations, local government), civil society organizations (CSOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The final beneficiaries include vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, oralmans, young and aged people, people with disabilities. Moreover, it would not be exaggerated to say that the whole society would benefit from the implemented programme as more inclusive development will have a positive impact on social, economic and political development of Kazakhstan.

As a country that is striving to join the 30 most developed countries in the world Kazakhstan has set as one of its national priorities the goal of continued progress in the quality of life including in health, education, social protection and the assurance of human rights of Kazakhstan's people. This priority was translated into the 2010-2015 UNDAF as Outcome 1: "by 2015, the population of Kazakhstan, and vulnerable groups in particular, will enjoy improved social, economic and health status".

OVERVIEW OF THE OUTCOME PORTFOLIO

1. Support to the Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) Secretariat

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria is a financing institution that is aimed at reduction of the impact caused by the three diseases. The Global Fund itself does not implement any projects or activities; it only provides support to in-country programmes by employing the principles of partnership, country ownership, performance-based funding and transparency. One of the instruments utilized by the Global Fund is Country Coordination Mechanism, a multi-stakeholder body that is responsible for submitting applications for funding to the Global Fund based on priority needs at the national level, and nominating the entities accountable for administering the funding, which are known as "Principle Recipients" (PRs).

UNDP is a long-time partner of the Global Fund in supporting implementation of HIV, tuberculosis and malaria programmes in low and middle income countries, facilitating access to essential resources by countries that face constraints in directly receiving or managing such funding.

In Kazakhstan The Global Fund first started providing granting in December 2003. The Country Coordinating Mechanism has been established in 2002 in order to coordinate activities at the level of the Government and GFATM and joint decision-making. The CCM is supposed to develop and submit grant proposals to the Global Fund based on national priorities, oversee progress during implementation and ensure linkages and consistency between Global Fund grants and other national health and development programs. The decision to create a CCM Secretariat that is designed to provide CCM the necessary administrative, secretarial, communication

and logistical support was made in 2009. The CCM Secretariat started working in Kazakhstan in May 2011. UNDP Kazakhstan has been designated as the CCM Funding Recipient to receive and manage the expanded funding on behalf of the CCM.

Related CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

Total Budget (2012-2015): \$ 486 860

Status: On-going

Output 1. The CCM Secretariat is fully staffed and provides the necessary administrative, secretarial, communication and logistical support to the CCM

Activities include:

- Human Resources (2 CCM Secretariat staff – Coordinator and assistant)
- Planning and administration (oversight visits, CCM meetings, office rent and stationery)
- Meeting, Training, Workshop (round table meetings, training for CCM and its Secretariat staff)
- Communication materials (web-site review and improvement, communication strategy and announcements in mass media)
- Overheads (Transportation costs)

2. Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards

The history of cooperation between UNDP and the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Republic of Kazakhstan has started in 2000 under the programme on poverty reduction. Since August 2008 the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection (now reformed into the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan) has been implementing a joint project with UNDP, which is aimed at the preparation of comprehensive analysis of Kazakhstan's legislation and socio-economic infrastructure in the case of people with disabilities. As a result in 2009 National Report on Human Development dedicated to the problems of people with disabilities was developed where benefits for the society from the participation of people with disabilities in political, social, economic and cultural spheres were outlined.

In 2012 a three-year project called "Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards" started. Its goal was assistance to the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan in implementation

of social policies aimed at the development of social services system with special attention to people with disabilities and facilitation of poverty reduction. There were four primary directions of the project:

1. Practical implementation of the 2012-2018 National Action Plan to Ensure the Rights and Improve the Quality of Life of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Kazakhstan
2. Putting a system of special social service standards in place
3. Implementation and improvement of the deinstitutionalization of medical and social institutions
4. Optimization of the state social benefit system

Related CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

Total budget: \$ 690 300

Status: Complete

Output 1. Approval and successful implementation of the 2012-2018 Action Plan to secure the rights and improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Outcome 1. The Action Plan to Implement the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is successfully implemented

Outcome 2. The system of special service standards is in place

Outcome 3. Medical and social institution deinstitutionalization mechanism is improved

Outcome 4. Recommendations on streamlining social benefits are made

Outcome 5. Effective Project Management

3. Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services (using Semey as an example)

The regional programme is aimed at reduction of inequalities and disparities in social well-being for the vulnerable populations, increase of employment, improving key health indicators as well as at enhancement of the capacities of local government to plan for diversified and balanced local economic growth and expansion of income generation opportunities and local self-governance development. The programme is implemented by three UN agencies – UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF – and UNV, and the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Akimat of East

Kazakhstan Region. UNDP's involvement occurs in various areas: capacity-building of local authorities and NGOs, implementation of the local self-government initiatives, use of energy-efficient technologies, entrepreneurial skills development and social development. At the same time, UNDP acts as the Administrative Agent of the pass-through funded portion of the Joint Programme.

Related CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

Related CPAP Output: 2. Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas.

UNDP budget: \$ 6 720 267

Status: On-going

Objective 3: Vulnerable groups in Semey, Kurchatov, Ust-Kamenogorsk and the districts affected by nuclear testing in EKO have improved access to social and economic services

Output 3.4 Piloting of innovative system of providing special social services to the elderly at home, development of a network of day centres for elderly, centres for social adaptation for the homeless.

Output 3.5 More than 22,000 oralmans in the territory of EKO receive adaptation services in the Centre for Adaptation and Social Integration in Semey city

Output 3.6 Over 500 micro and macro enterprises (with more than 3000 people) benefit from the development of entrepreneurial skills and knowledge on climate change adaptation in 17 districts of EKO

4. Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable

The regional programme is aimed at improving the wellbeing and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, particularly for the most vulnerable. The programme is implemented by six UN agencies – UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN Women and WHO – and the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Akimat of Kyzylorda Oblast. UNDP's involvement occurs in various areas: capacity-building of local government for planning diversified and sustainable economic growth, implementation of local self-governance initiatives,

inclusive and innovative business development, green economy initiatives implementation, poverty reduction and social development.

Related CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

Related CPAP Output: 2. Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas.

UNDP budget: \$ 4 500 000

Status: On-going

Objective 2. Disparities in social well-being and health are reduced, employment opportunities are increased, access to quality health, justice, education and social services for the vulnerable families, their children and vulnerable population groups is improved

Output 2.3 Innovative approaches to providing special social services to families, children and youth are introduced in rural areas

Output 2.4 Support in formulation of policies for promoting productive employment and poverty reduction

5. Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization

The regional programme is aimed at supporting the Government of Kazakhstan in addressing priorities for social-economic modernization in the oil rich region, which is exposed to severe climatic conditions. The programme is implemented by seven UN agencies – UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UN Women, and WHO – and the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Akimat of Mangystau Region. UNDP's involvement occurs in various areas: socio-economic development of the region, employment increase, and capacity building of the local government, green economy initiatives implementation.

Related CPAP Output: 1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.

Related CPAP Output: 2. Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas.

UNDP budget: \$ 3 700 000

Status: On-going

Objective 1. By the end of 2016, inequities and disparities in social well-being for the vulnerable populations are reduced, employment is increased, key health indicators are improved

Output 1.1 Support to formulation of policies stimulating productive employment

Output 1.2 Innovative approaches to providing health and special social services to women, children, youth, elderly, PWDs, repatriates, etc. are piloted in rural area

Table 1. Results and resource framework for Kazakhstan, 2010-2015 (CPD)

Economic and social well-being for all					
National priority: Continued progress in the quality of life, health, education and welfare of Kazakhstan people (“Health, Education and Well Being of Kazakhstan Citizens” of the Strategy Kazakhstan-2030)					
UNDAF outcome: By 2015 population of Kazakhstan and vulnerable groups in particular will enjoy improved social, economic and health status.					
Program component	Country programme outcomes, indicators, baselines and target	Country programme outputs	Output indicators, baselines and targets	Partners	Indicative resources
	Vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, young and aged people, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets. Indicator: % of unemployed population (age 15-24) covered by inclusive and life-skills-based education programmes Baseline: 7.3 % (National report on status of education, 2008); Target: 50%	Social sector stakeholders are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups	Indicator: Number of regions that replicate model services for oralmans Baseline: Centres for oralmans’ adaptation and integration starting in Karaganda, Shymkent, Aktau Target: By end of 2015 at least four other regions replicate model centre in East Kazakhstan Oblast	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, oblast administrations, civil society organizations (CSOs), private companies.	600,000 (Regular resources) 1,500,000 (Other resources, incl. Gov’t)
		Economically at-risk population benefit from improved job creation and sustainable productive employment	Indicator: Number of jobs created in target areas, including for target groups Baseline: TBD; Target: TBD	Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT), local gov’t, private sector, and non-governmental orgs (NGOs)	800,000 (Reg.) 4,000,000 (Other, incl. Government)

Evaluation methodology

Table 2. Evaluation scope

National Priority. Continued progress in the quality of life including in health, education, social protection and the assurance of human rights of Kazakhstan's people.	
UNDAF Outcome 1. By 2015 population of Kazakhstan and vulnerable groups in particular will enjoy improved social, economic and health status	
UNDAF Agency Outcome 1. Vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, young and aged people, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and quality social safety nets	
CPAP Outcome 1. Vulnerable groups, especially women, young and aged people, oralmans, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets	
CPAP Outcome Indicators (Baseline and CPAP Outputs Targets):	
1. Reduction of transaction cost of registering, operating business and interaction with state bodies (Baseline: Data od "Doing Business" 2009 report (WB); Target: By 2015, reduce the transaction cost by 70%)	1. Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.
2. % of unemployed population (age 15-24) covered by inclusive and life-skills-based education programs (Baseline: 7,3% (National report on status of education, 2008); Target: 50%)	2. Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas.

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

Table 3. Projects implemented

under the UNDAF Outcome 1:

Economic and Social Well-Being for All

#	Title	Period
1	Support to the Country Coordination Mechanism	2010-2015
2	Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards	2012-2014

3	Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services/Semey Joint Program – Component 3: Improved access to social and economic services for vulnerable groups in Semey, Kurchatov, Ust-Kamenogorsk and the most affected areas of East-Kazakhstan region	2011-2015
4	Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable/Kyzylorda Joint Program – Component 2: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being)	2014-2016
5	Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization/Mangystau Joint Program – Component 1: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being for the vulnerable populations, increase of employment)	2014-2016

Table 4. The results framework for the Outcome Evaluation

	Results	Indicators	Baseline (where applicable)	Target (where applicable)	Risks & Assumptions
Impact	Vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, young and aged people, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and quality social safety nets	Percentage of the population aged 60 and above who report to have good access to medical and social services	60%	75%	Risks: reforms are not consistently implemented and there is not enough political will or financial commitment. There is no data available on inclusive life skills based education programs. A lack of interdepartmental coordination in migration issues. The negative perception of migrants and refugees in the society impedes promotion of local integration proposals. Assumptions: Government is
		Conformity of status of disabled persons to standards and rules on equalizing of opportunities for persons with disabilities (United Nations General Assembly Resolution	Not conformed	In line with requirements of Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	

		48/96 of 20 Dec. 1993)			adherent to declared social sector reforms. Sufficient public financing is available for improving and scaling up of quality services.
Outcome	Vulnerable groups, especially women, young and aged people, oralmsans, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets	Reduction of transaction cost of registering, operating business and interaction with state bodies	Data od “Doing Business” 2009 report (WB)	By 2015, reduce the transaction cost by 70%	Assumptions made from outputs to outcome. Risks that outcome will not be achieved.
Outputs	Social sector stakeholders (in the public sector and civil society) are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups	Availability of strategy and action plan to improve the situation of People with Disabilities (PWD) in light of the Convention on rights of PWD	No strategy and action plan exists	By 2011, strategy, action plan and recommendations developed, discussed and presented to policy makers and civil society	Assumptions made from activities to outputs. Risks that outputs may not be produced.
	Improved business and employment opportunities are created for vulnerable groups in selected areas	Number of jobs created in target areas, including for target groups	TBD	TBD in 2010	
		Number of regions that replicate model services for oralmsans	Centers for oralmsans’ adaptation and integration starting in Karaganda, Shymkent, Aktau	By end of 2015 at least four other regions replicate model center in East Kazakhstan Oblast	
Activities	Support to Country Coordination Mechanism			Based on project’s plan	

	Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards	Based on project's plan	Based on project's plan		Preconditions for implementation of activities.
	<p>Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services/Semey Joint Program – Component 3: Improved access to social and economic services for vulnerable groups in Semey, Kurchatov, Ust-Kamenogorsk and the most affected areas of East-Kazakhstan region</p>				
	<p>Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable/Kyzylorda Joint Program – Component 2: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being)</p>				
	<p>Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization/Mangystau Joint Program – Component 1: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social</p>				



well-being for the vulnerable populations, increase of employment)				
--	--	--	--	--

The Outcome Evaluation employed the following methods of data collection:

- **Desk Review:** reviewing and identifying relevant sources of information and conceptual frameworks that exist and are available:
 1. Examination of contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2030, Address of the President – Kazakhstan 2050, 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.
 2. Validation of information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources such as the CPAP, and project evaluation reports.
 3. 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.
 4. 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, program/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, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents will be reviewed.
- **Interviews:** semi-structured in-depth interviews 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 and others associated with the country program. Interviews with key informants including gathering the information on what partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used. Informants of the interviews will include:

- UN agencies;
 - Government partners;
 - NGO representatives.
- **Field visits to selected sites:** visits for briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government as well as with donors and partners where appropriate.

Table 5. Evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance	To what extent are the Outcome activities suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Did the Outcome 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 inclusive development positively contributed to creation of barrier-free environment in Kazakhstan? ● Has UNDP made impact to empower the disadvantaged groups to participate in the development process and have their voices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDAF CPAP Project/program documents MDG reports Relevant governmental documents Interviews with: ● UN Agencies ● Government partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk reviews Interviews Field visits Information systems Case study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance of Program/Projects with UNDAF, MDG and Country Objectives Level of the objectives' consistency and relevance throughout the implementation phase Level of contribution to creation of barrier-free environment Extent of empowerment of the disadvantage groups to participate in the development process and have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Logical analysis

	Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, and conceptual frameworks relevant to achieve the planned Outcome?	heard? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of social inclusion and special services provision? • Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area to improve civic engagement? • To what degree are approaches such as human rights based approach, rule of law, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion? 	• NGOs		their voices heard Level of the UNDP's involvement in introducing the Government to the best global practices of social inclusion and special services provision Level of civic engagement improvement by the UNDP Compliance with human rights based approach, rule of law and results-based management	
Efficiency	Have activities connected with the Outcome been implemented within deadline and cost estimates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • What are the roles, engagement and coordination among the stakeholders? • Has UNDP contributed to public awareness of the issues of inclusive development and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users? 	UNDAF CPAP Project/program documents MDG reports Relevant governmental documents Interviews with: • UN Agencies	Desk reviews Interviews Field visits Information systems Case study	Level of cost-efficiency Extent of public awareness on the proposed issues	Document review Logical analysis

	Was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives and partner initiatives that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a synergy and leveraging with other programs in Kazakhstan? What is the extent of synergies among UNCT programming and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government partners NGOs 		Extent of synergies among UNCT programming and implementation	
Effectiveness	<p>Did the initiatives connected with the Outcome contribute towards the stated outcome?</p> <p>To what extent do the Outcome activities attain its objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? To what extent UNDP produced results aligned with CPAP? Has UNDP contributed to the capacity building, advocacy on inclusive development? 	<p>UNDAF</p> <p>CPAP</p> <p>Project/program documents</p> <p>MDG reports</p> <p>Relevant governmental documents</p> <p>Interviews with:</p>	<p>Desk reviews</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Field visits</p> <p>Information systems</p> <p>Case study</p>	<p>Number of outputs that are on track by 2015</p> <p>Progress indicators for projects, CPAP and UNDAF</p> <p>Extent of alignment of UNDP-produced results with CPAP</p> <p>Level of UNDP's contribution to the capacity building advocacy on inclusive development</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Logical analysis</p>
	<p>Who are the main beneficiaries?</p> <p>To what extent do the poor, indigenous groups, women and other disadvantaged groups benefit?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of beneficiaries 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, youth and women? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN Agencies Government partners NGOs 	Extent of the benefits of the poor, indigenous groups, women and other disadvantaged groups		

<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>What are the benefits of the Program related activities that are likely to continue after the Program fund has been exhausted?</p> <p>Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?</p> <p>Did they include an exit strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions? • Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy? • Did UNDP managed to establish mechanisms ensuring sustainability of the policymaking interventions? • What is the extent of the viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcomes? • Is there an effective use of Governance portfolio to support appropriate central authorities, local communities and civil society in inclusive social development related agenda in a long-term perspective? • Did possible areas of partnerships with other national institutions, NGOs, UN Agencies, private sector and development partners have been used in a way to sustain the results? 	<p>UNDAF</p> <p>CPAP</p> <p>Project/program documents</p> <p>MDG reports</p> <p>Relevant governmental documents</p> <p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN Agencies • Government partners • NGOs 	<p>Desk reviews</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Field visits</p> <p>Information systems</p> <p>Case study</p>	<p>Level of UNDP's contribution to human and institutional capacity building of partners</p> <p>Existence of exit strategy</p> <p>Existence of sustainability ensuring mechanisms</p> <p>Extent of viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Logical analysis</p>
-----------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--

Outcome Results

Relevance

Support of laborious process of the state development and reform implementation from foreign countries and donors offers us additional opportunities. A significant number of countries have less luck than we do. This factor especially in the initial phases of transition period is extremely important because we need financial resource and knowledge from the outside. (Nursultan Nazarbayev, *Kazakhstan 2030*, 1997)

Social development is one of the primary goals of the Republic of Kazakhstan. In 1997 when Nursultan Nazarbayev, the first President of Kazakhstan, first announced the Kazakhstan 2030 strategy among the long-term priorities there were health, education and well-being of the citizens of Kazakhstan. He acknowledged the problems of poverty and unemployment and stated that a lack of efficient reformation programmes in agricultural and social areas (healthcare, education, science, etc.) and the reduction of state funding had led to the deterioration and stagnation of these vital fields. In this first strategic document President Nazarbayev has formulated probably the key idea of future UNDP's involvement: Most vulnerable groups should be provided with aid, but it is also important to increase the number of those who can cope with difficulties on their own.

In 2007 President Nazarbayev declared the termination of the transition period and named 30 most important directions of Kazakhstan's internal and foreign affairs. One of the main goals named was modern social policy which would focus on both needs of the public and job creation.

The most efficient social policy has always been and remains performance motivation and job creation. First off we need to create real drivers for coming around to work for those who have lost their jobs for some reason, give them opportunities to obtain a new profession. (Nursultan Nazarbayev, *the Kazakhstan 2030 strategy at the new development stage of Kazakhstan*, 2007)

These national priorities of the Kazakh government formulated as “continued progress in the quality of life including in health, education, social protection and the assurance of human rights of Kazakhstan's people” had found their way into the UN Programming as 2010-2015 UNDAF and 2010-2015 UNDP Country Programme Outcomes. All problems mentioned at some point by authorities like HIV/AIDS, the gap between the urban and rural development levels, youth employment, problems of vulnerable groups such as elderly, persons with disabilities, women, children, repatriates, have been reflected in UNDP's initiatives.

In the end of 2008 adoption of law on special social services marked a new stage in the field of provision of special social services to the public and specifically to the people with disabilities. The goal of this law was the improvement of efficiency and quality of the provision of special social services through creation of a comprehensive social care system and conditions for the development of competitive market in this area. This initiative was reflected in the Country Programme as one of the outputs (CPD Outcome 1).

In December 2008 the Republic of Kazakhstan signed the UN Convention on the

Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD) and Optional Protocol. This proclaims Kazakhstan's agreement with the keystones on which modern state policy concerning people with disabilities is based; readiness to abide by international standards of political, economic, social, judicial and other vital rights of people with disabilities. UNDP's expert participated in the task group for the creation of conditions for ratification and implementation of CRPD in Kazakhstan, which created Action Plan to Ensure the Rights and Improve the Quality of Life of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Kazakhstan. As UNDP is one of key partners of the Republic of Kazakhstan in creation of equal chances for PWDs' participation in social life UNDP's activities are highly relevant to Kazakhstan's priorities.

In 2014 in his Presidential Address to the Nation President Nazarbayev presented a

We will involve them in active life, they won't just receive social benefits, but they will see themselves as the members of society, effective employees. (*Nursultan Nazarbayev, the Kazakhstan 2050, 2014*)

new strategy – Kazakhstan 2050 – which is aimed at ranking of Kazakhstan among 30 most developed countries in the world. For UNDP's activities this speech had particular significance due to the fact the President put special emphasis on the problems of people

with disabilities and pointed out that Kazakhstan has to become a barrier-free environment. He also suggested an introduction of special quota in order to assist PWDs in employment. This announcement may not be the direct result of UNDP's work, but interviewed experts suggest that UNDP's efforts have great impact on setting this problem as one of the issues for the country-level agenda.

UNDP's Outcome activities are also in line with the regional issues. In East-Kazakhstan Oblast (EKO) one of the strategic directions is the development of social sphere and human potential, quality of life improvement, provision of all kinds of top quality social services. Among the goals of EKO development there is targeted support for the vulnerable groups.

In Kyzylorda Oblast UNDP's Outcome activities relate to the following targets: well-being and quality of life improvement of the population of Kyzylorda oblast; assistance in poverty reduction; assistance in rehabilitation of PWDs and provision of equal opportunities for multifaceted integration to the society, ensuring of efficiency in provision of special social services in state medical and social institutions. UNDP's activities are instrumental for the Kyzylorda Akimat in completion of the following tasks: assistance and ensuring of sustainable employment; increase of the population's income; provision of social support for PWDs; assistance in sustainable development of NGOs of PWDs and veterans and increase of their involvement in social programmes implementation; enhancement of gender equality in the region; satisfaction of PWDs' need in receiving information.

In Mangystau Oblast UNDP's Outcome activities relate to the following targets: well-being and quality of life improvement of the population of Mangystau oblast; creation

of the basis of sustainable development of rural areas, provision of higher level of essential services for rural area dwellers. UNDP's activities are instrumental for the Mangystau Akimat in completion of the following tasks: achievement of efficient employment; enhancement of targeted support for the vulnerable groups and its effectiveness; development of social services; improvement of the quality of the social services provided to the rural population.

As for the support of barrier-free environment creation one of the biggest achievements of UNDP is the development and piloting of the passportization of existing buildings and venues for the purpose of adherence to barrier-free environment. During the 2012-2014 stage of the project this method was piloted on 86 building and venues in Karagandinskiy region. The results of the study were taken into consideration during the development of recommendations on the conduct of passportization of social infrastructure venues in all regions of the country.

UNDP's ability to provide introduce the best global practices of social inclusion, special services provision and other areas was highlighted by both state partners and NGOs. The assistance with the access to the best practices may also include the technical provision of international documents, studies of international experience in

“Things that we can do on our own we accomplish using our own resources; when we need international law or international evaluation or some kind of expertise or experience we try to implement it with UNDP because they have significant experience” (State partner)

the related areas, participation of international experts and field trips to learn the best practices of other countries. For instance, the study of the experience of the Baltic countries became the basis for the law on special social services. At the same time the best practices are transmitted through workshops and seminars where

international experience is discussed or international experts share their knowledge with the local target audience.

Efficiency

The issue of efficiency is a rather challenging one in general. Based on the fact that in its operations UNDP employs the “best value for money” principle, or acquiring the best quality service for the most optimal amount of funds, and that this principle underpins the Annual Working Plans where various types of activities (procurement, travel, grant money, etc.) are included UNDP's Outcome activities are assessed as cost-efficient. The members of UNDP staff say that their assessment of available alternatives is based on the market situation and that a thorough analysis is utilized. Along with best value for money principle UNDP always chooses only those partners and contractors that prove to be the most efficient. Resting on those key principles the efficiency of UNDP's conduct of business is assessed positively.

Another measure to ensure the cost-efficiency of UNDP's Outcome-related activities is the conduct of all exercise including procurement and other tasks on competitive basis when both technical and financial components are considered. But it is essential to highlight that the Outcome activities are considered to be cost-efficient,

Other important aspect to be considered in the process of efficiency evaluation is UNDP's grant programmes, which are implemented very actively. Grant provision is also made on a competitive basis. Grant money is provided to NGOs who work with the targeted vulnerable groups (e.g. PWDs). One of the key factors having a positive impact on efficiency is the adherence to specific standards for the project proposals. It is also essential to point out the high level of consistency with these standards throughout different programs and their stages. Besides when UNDP team evaluates a grant proposal it assesses whether the suggested costs are on the market level. If they are higher than the market UNDP does not drop the project if it has potential. Such proposals with potential impact are sent back for the follow-up revision. This approach proves to be productive as it ensures efficiency without having to eliminate impactful projects.

The same goes for the implementation of the Outcome activities within the set deadlines. As reported by the UNDP staff all activities are in line with the outlined working plans, therefore, Outcome implementation is performed in a timely manner.

The discussion of the activities and resource allocation during the steering committees is also a contributing factor to the improvement of efficiency.

Another efficiency conducive factor is internal and external research. It could be exemplified by the study of the regional NGOs conducted by an independent consultant on the assessment of the possible export of NGOs' goods and its future implementation. Best practices from other countries are also researched and taken into account, but their execution is only considered when it is appropriate within specific context, which is also a sign of efficiency.

The public-awareness component is also assessed as contributing to the overall efficiency due to the fact that awareness-raising activities are included in all Annual Working Plans for all projects in the Outcome Portfolio. The engagement of final beneficiaries was assessed by the expert interviewed as increased which is partially achieved due to the coverage of awareness-raising activities of UNDP. Modern awareness-raising methods like TEDx are promoted among the regional beneficiaries. Some respondents indicate that such awareness-raising instrument as brochures prove to be very efficient in distributing information especially in rural areas. The efficiency is assured by the fact

"They [UNDP staff] are very open, always on the line. They are full of ideas and it is a different matter that we sometimes do not have time for all proposals. They are the partners with whom it is always amazing to work" (NGO)

that such brochures show the examples of real people.

Aspects of UNDP's work that were named by the beneficiaries and contribute to UNDP's efficiency are its responsiveness, flexibility and availability. Another positive aspect is UNDP's "full involvement in the process" (NGO). Other respondents point out UNDP's orientation towards solving acute and relevant problems which are sometimes recognized and approached by the local authorities, but are not solved effectively. UNDP manages to find efficient ways for the resolution of such problems.

A further example that highlights the flexibility of UNDP is the fact that throughout numerous governmental restructurations UNDP has managed to minimize the effect

"Ministries are constantly either renamed or restructured. It does not cause any problems, but still there could be delays, at first it was not clear who should we contact. But when these issues are eliminated we cooperate actively, they come to our events. It is clear that they are engaged and want the continuation of the collaboration" (UNDP staff)

of such activities on its work and adapted to the change rapidly, which not only secured the efficiency of the process but also contributed to the overall efficiency level of UNDP.

Some aspects that the beneficiaries interviewed named, as things that should be improved in order to enhance efficiency were the length of various processes within UNDP and paperwork. For instance, NGOs suggested that options of sending the necessary documentation electronically would have positive impact on the process.

UNDP manages to achieve synergies within various components of one project or even between different projects. Moreover, as UNDP helps NGOs' interaction as they can find each other, cooperate and complete each other especially when those NGOs work in different fields. This collaboration allows achieving synergy even between grant projects and using the allocated funds more efficiently. Such successful joint project was implemented in Mangystau Oblast when two NGOs joined forces in order to provide touristic services for children with disabilities.

Effectiveness

The general assessment of UNDP's effectiveness by the beneficiaries is positive. One of the facts that prove this is that the intended outputs found its way into Kazakhstan's legislation.

Rather efficient work allows UNDP to attain the Outcome objectives as it was intended. Even in case with Mangystau and Kyzylorda joint programmes it is possible to see that based on the effective completion of interim objectives these programmes have contributed to the achievement of the 2010-2015 Outcome results a great deal.

Table 6. Indicators achieved in the 2010-2015 Programming period

Indicators	Baseline (where applicable)	Target (where applicable)	Results (2014)
Percentage of the population aged 60 and above who report to have good access to medical and social services	60%	75%	No national survey has been conducted
Conformity of status of disabled persons to standards and rules on equalizing of opportunities for persons with disabilities (United Nations General Assembly Resolution 48/96 of 20 Dec. 1993)	Not conformed	In line with requirements of Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Conformed
Availability of strategy and action plan to improve the situation of People with Disabilities (PWD) in light of the Convention on rights of PWD	No strategy and action plan exists	By 2011, strategy, action plan and recommendations developed, discussed and presented to policy makers and civil society	Strategy and action plan were created and implemented
Number of jobs created in target areas, including for target groups	TBD	TBD in 2010	n/a
Number of regions that replicate model services for oralms	Centers for oralms' adaptation and integration starting in Karaganda, Shymkent, Aktau	By end of 2015 at least four other regions replicate model center in East Kazakhstan Oblast	3

"The fact that UNDP has come to the region had positive impact on the regional NGOs. Most of them used to depend heavily on state social procurement that was conducted by the Akimat, now NGOs started to participate in grant programmes and implement small projects with the support of UNDP. They learn to write proposals, fill out forms required by international organizations, which is very important for self-development and capacity building of NGOs. The fact that rural organizations get a chance to receive independent funding not Akimat's and implement projects in their settlements is great. And, of course, the opportunity for small NGOs to build relations with authorities is essential for further sustainable cooperation". (NGO)

Indicators outlined in UNDAF and CPD as well as Programme indicators prove the effectiveness of the Outcome, however, even quantitative indicators do not reflect the real results achieved by UNDP as the qualitative data collection and analysis shows that UNDP's efforts contributed a lot to the advancement of

social development. State partners acknowledge the capacity-building efforts of

UNDP, their international expertise that improves the governmental agencies' abilities to implement social modernization. NGOs also assess UNDP's activities in the social development aspect as effective due to the fact that they receive real and tangible assistance from an international organization which does not only account for monetary funds but also their capacity building and providing them with the sense of confidence that encourages them to apply for further UNDP grants or other donors' assistance.

One of the factors contributing to achieving the intended Outcomes is the support and willingness to cooperate

“One of our priorities is to establish relations with Akims. It might be the effect of the Soviet time that the change has to start from the top. Firstly we have to communicate the intended benefits for the regions to them” (UNDP staff)

from Akims and Akimats. However, such level of assistance and desire to collaborate is also the result of UNDP's hard work in the field of establishing contacts, expounding the goals and objectives of UNDP activities in the region, showing real, tangible results and proving to be effective and efficient. While many Akims are eager to make the change happen in the regions and dedicated to their work still it is crucial to substantiate proposed activities.

“Our goal is to change their [beneficiaries'] mindset rather than to provide financial assistance” (UNDP staff)

The best evidence for the effectiveness of UNDP activities would be the drive of the beneficiaries to continue UNDP's programmes which was expressed almost in every

single interview.

Sustainability

Sustainability criterion assessment is highly dependent on the fact that the projects that comprise the Outcome portfolio are still on-going (even though the “Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards” technically over, the cooperation between UNDP and the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development is continuing under the consecutive three-year project).

Nevertheless one of the most sustainable results were achieved in the project dedicated to the improvement of the social protection system as it had resulted in numerous legislation acts which would impact the lives of Kazakhstan's citizens for a continuous period of time unless there would be some drastic changes in the

"The real change is seen even in the grant proposals. When we first started working in the region people thought, "Oh, we will be given money!" But during many years of work we have been trying to explain that we are not the organization that just gives money, we have specific goals, for instance, that water and lighting in every rural settlement. And when they see results, economy and cost-efficiency, effectiveness they start to write completely different proposals. They write proposals not just to us, but also to other organizations like World Bank, British Embassy" (UNDP staff)

legislation (which seems highly unlikely at the moment). One of the most vivid examples are the certification initiative, which is not just a methodology for the documentation, but also "the basis for the reconstruction of public building" across the country; and the law on special services, which triggered the development of special needs assessment methodology. 150 social workers were trained under the framework of this methodology and will apply it in their conduct of business. Moreover, some of the initiatives of this project although have not been

implemented yet, but have already been approved by the Government and are to be executed in 2017-2018, which is definitely a sign of sustainable efforts.

Joint Programmes are quite sustainable. Especially with some activities like teaching the employees of Public Service Centers sign language - as this skillset would remain with these people even if they stop working at the Public Service Center. The same goes for the librarians who participated in the capacity building seminars on information support to the rural entrepreneurship. The developed knowledge of the needs of the rural business, prospective partners and business consultants, the stages of setting up a business and other necessary information will also be used even after the termination of the Programme.

Online centres are also one of the examples of UNDP's sustainable efforts. UNDP

"Librarians themselves experienced that they can virtually have an impact on the lives of their fellow villagers, on the society. At the same time people started to realize that the library can provide real help, they did not even know that such potential existed in libraries. Rural librarians felt self-respect; they do not feel as a budgetary burden anymore. They became more socially sensitive" (NGO)

provided technical support, equipment, and telecommunication infrastructure. Such online centres are targeted at various tasks: developing computer literacy, development of people with disabilities and assistance for rural entrepreneurs. UNDP's business consultants along with specialists from the Chamber of Entrepreneurs

take an active part in these projects. Some online centres even go further and introduce new services, which demonstrates the sustainability of achieved results as

well: the Pushkin Library being one of the online centres and also a coordinator and resource centre for other online centres has decided to introduce free online legal counseling, which is performed by their own lawyer who usually works on the library's legal issues.

Another demonstration of sustainability is the inculcation of efficiency culture on the regional level. According to UNDP staff the way grantees and Akimats plan their activities has completely changed since UNDP has started its work in the regions. It is evident that UNDP's promotion of efficient culture has paid off as grantees more often use cost-efficient approaches, which in some cases even allows them to save some money and re-allocate it towards more activities. Such culture is definitely instrumental in sustaining the achieved results and outcomes.

Furthermore, there are exit strategies for the designed initiative, which is also a contributing factor to sustainability. The EKO Programme, which is to end in December 2015, can exemplify this statement: the methodology of oralman centres has been taken on board by the Oblast Akimat and is executed through the establishment of a regional center. The work in this direction will definitely be continued after UNDP finishes its activities in the region. The high level of sustainability is achieved by the consideration of the issues and possible exit strategies at the beginning of all projects even the small ones within the small grant projects. One of the ways to ensure the sustainability of such projects is carrying as assets by local authorities and public institutions the goods received within the project. This approach also ensures the security and constant access by the vulnerable groups. In some cases exit strategies include the arrangement of rent-free facilities. For instance, there is a pottery shop at the Semey Educational College where people with disabilities work and train young people. According to the conditions of the project they do not need to pay for rent or utilities. According to the UNDP staff such clear exit strategy may be used in essential projects in Kyzylorda and Mangystau Programmes.

Keeping the issue of inclusive development on the agenda also produces the sustainability. It is obtained by the institute of advisors to Akims on the issues of people with disabilities, which was introduced due to UNDP's assistance. Advisors on the issues of the disabilities ensure the sustainability of the received results and contribute to further progress in the field of social development.

Capacity building is one of the key factors contributing to sustainability as well.

“This is one of the most important tasks we set for ourselves and most of our activities and projects we support are created with this in mind. It is evident now that both Central Government and local government servants as well as NGOs are much better capacitated in comparison with what was there before UNDP intervention” (UNDP staff)

Institutional capacity building is executed through numerous workshops and seminars, assistance with proposal writing, developing business skills among rural entrepreneurs, help for NGOs in establishing contacts with the authorities and in continuing this

cooperation. In addition, UNDP introduces best practices to the authorities and promotes modern approaches (e.g. green economy, barrier-free environment, etc.) on the local and national level. Human capacity building is executed by the beneficiaries for the most part. One of the most vivid examples is the Pushkin Library where people with disabilities get an opportunity to learn various skills: computer literacy, English language, arts, and financial literacy.

Nevertheless, further capacity building is required in order to ensure that beneficiaries would further cope with the task of sustaining the outcomes. Beneficiaries expressed strong interest in the continuation of workshops and seminars, which not only

“It seems that due to the nature of their business they are limited in the activities allowed by their governing documents and that they are to focus more on cooperation with the Government. But it would be very useful if they had more chances to conduct workshops for NGOs on Oblast and regional levels which is needed due to the size of our country” (NGO)

allow to learn new skills or information, but also to network with representatives of authorities or NGOs. Some NGOs suggested more training in proposal writing even though such assistance is provided at the moment. Another suggestion was to focus on the awareness-raising seminars on the barrier-free environment among NGOs, especially on Oblast, district and municipal levels. It also seems that capacity-building activities should be based on the introduction of the international best practices as it was stated in several interviews that one of the most valued aspects of UNDP’s work is the ability to tap into the international expertise and provide this information to the beneficiaries. Besides development of guidance manuals for NGOs and the local regional population was suggested, for example, in the area of local governance.

Findings and conclusions

The criterion of **Relevance** is assessed as “**highly satisfactory**”. Based on the evidence that UNDP Outcome activities are in line with Kazakhstan’s needs and goals stated in official documents and plans as well as on the suggestions of NGOs that UNDP’s activities are relevant to their own goals the relevance of the Outcome receives the highest mark. This mark is also supported by the fact that while there were several government reshuffle UNDP managed to cope with these changes and its activities stayed relevant in new conditions.

The criterion of **Efficiency** is assessed as “**highly satisfactory**”. The intended outcome was achieved at an acceptable cost and within the set deadline. High levels of flexibility, principles of choosing the most efficient approaches, strict adherence to the UNDP standards, active engagement of the beneficiaries and thorough system of awareness-raising activities are the factors that show the high level of UNDP’s efficiency.

The criterion of **Effectiveness** is assessed as “**highly satisfactory**”. While the indicator system of effectiveness does not reflect thoroughly the results achieved by UNDP the analysis of qualitative data proved that UNDP’s intended contribution to the social development and social modernization of Kazakhstan is significant and assessed by the beneficiaries as effective.

The criterion of **Sustainability** is assessed as “**satisfactory**”. The result was achieved due to the implementation of strategy that sets sustainability as one of the top priorities. Some initiatives have proved to be extremely sustainable, as they have found their way into legislation. Other initiatives are backed either by the local authorities or by NGOs. Regional grant programmes are specially tailored to build the capacity of NGOs and CSOs. Within these programmes activities are assessed based on the identified indicators and baseline and targets set. Such approach does not only improve efficiency but also acts as an instrument of achieving, monitoring and sustaining the results. The active involvement of NGOs in grant search and participation not only in UNDP programmes but also in the programmes of other international organizations is again the achievement of UNDP and the illustration of the sustainability of its efforts. Various methods of effective individual and organizational capacity building are the contributing factors as well.

Recommendations

1. An experimental approach may be utilized in future programming. Experimental research consists of three main components such as manipulation, control and randomization. For UNDP manipulation would be their interventions. Control is an essential element of experimental approach. The subject in the control and experimental groups are similar in number and characteristics, but the subject in the control group receives no treatment, i.e. is not affected by the intervention. For UNDP's context it could be different districts of the same Oblast. Randomization means that there is an equal chance to be chosen for the study for every subject. For UNDP random assignment could mean that they draw a random sample of schools in the district, but then they assign particular schools that would get innovative greenhouses.

Another possible example could be online centres. Their establishment in the local libraries is an intervention. Out of all libraries in the district a random sample could be drawn. In this sample UNDP could randomly assign those libraries that would also operate as online centres. These libraries become a treatment group; the rest of the libraries would be a control group. A baseline study would be conducted in the beginning and then monitoring and follow-up studies would be conducted to measure the changes occurring. Measuring outcomes in this comparison group is a way of measuring how participants (individuals, communities, etc.) would have been otherwise. The difference between the results in control and treatment groups is the impact produced by the UNDP's efforts. This is a great way to measure and show the real impact that would not have happened had it not have been for UNDP. Such scientific approach, which is to be implemented in the projects during the initial stage would have positive effect on the programmes and especially on the reporting and evaluation.

The ability to measure impact based on treatment and control groups would enable UNDP to have a vivid illustration of their outputs. If it is not feasible for the whole programme or project experimental research may be implemented in the most impactful activities.

2. A greater involvement of private sector is suggested. UNDP should involve more private companies in their projects as it would decrease the burden on the country's budget, provide new point of view and expertise and enhance capacity building. UNDP may attract private companies with the idea of reputation improvement, as it would be assessed as active involvement in corporate social responsibility. The brand of UNDP may also have positive impact in attracting private companies.

3. Requests for transfer of some documentation and processes connected with it from paper to electronic format were expressed from both UNDP staff and

beneficiaries. Based on interviewees' responses it is suggested that grant application process and internal reporting could be practiced in the electronic format if it does not contradict UNDP Kazakhstan policies.

4. Due to economic crisis in Kazakhstan and general UNDP approach of limiting granting aid in upper-middle income countries, as the UNDP staff stated it, the functions that UNDP may focus more on are consultative, advisory and educational functions. It is also stipulated by the fact that UNDP's international expertise is highly valued by partners and beneficiaries and such consultative assistance which will be based on profound international experience will definitely be seen positively.

Lessons learned

Lesson learned 1. The Golden Mean

While UNDP is supposed to provide its beneficiaries and final beneficiaries with innovative solutions still it is essential to take into consideration the context UNDP works in. An example that would illustrate this case is one grant competition when the committee had to choose between an innovative project with 3D technologies and a bakery (applicants found out that in their area there were no bakeries and three settlements did not have opportunity to buy bread without significant efforts). The committee liked both projects but in the end they chose bakery as it was more fit for the needs of the region. This is an extreme example, but the general idea is that in some contexts “bakeries” are more important than innovations, however, by choosing solely “bakeries” it would not be possible to enhance social development of the country. Therefore, a balanced approach should be executed. As it was stated in the concept of Kazakhstan’s social modernization “Twenty steps towards the Society of Universal Labor”, “there should not be any flash-forwards. All changes of the social sphere should correspond with the development level and capacities of Kazakhstan’s economy”.

Lesson learned 2. Component synergy

A way to improve effectiveness and sustainability of the programme is to achieve synergy between implemented components, which at first glance are aimed at different outputs but in reality interlinked. For example, UNDP's micro-financing initiative is targeted at the assistance to SMEs, but by encouraging applicants to design projects that would have positive effect on the vulnerable groups they also contribute to the attainment of Outcome on social development. Implementation of drop irrigation, pyrolysis furnaces and other innovative technologies at schools may not have direct intended effect on vulnerable groups but it is obvious that such vulnerable group as children who are involved in, for instance, working in new greenhouses provided to their schools benefit from this initiative in multiple ways.

Lesson learned 3. Piloting projects for national programmes through regional programme components

In order to improve cost-efficiency and make the necessary adjustments prior to national implementation initiative can be efficiently piloted in the regions. As UNDP works with both national and local state beneficiaries it can provide a platform for social development initiatives piloting regionally and at the same time offer the projects that prove to be the most efficient to be implemented on the national level. For instance, when the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development wanted to pilot home-like institutions UNDP offered the results of the implementation of such

projects in one of their programme components as they had already been working on the capacity development of such homes..

Lesson learned 4. Improving relevance by determining the mandate

When UNDP started working with the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan they signed an agreement where the directions of UNDP activities were specified. Governmental entities can choose the related spheres from UNDP's wider mandate. For instance, department of social services of the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development has chosen two directions: social inclusion and improvement of special social services system. The Ministry has expertise in understanding the related problems, they have their own framework, at the same time as they know the mandate of UNDP they can plan specific activities that are included in the working plan. Therefore, such initial agreements help to ensure that both UNDP and the governmental institution know each other's priorities, come up with relevant activities and involve each other in relevant projects.

Lesson learned 5. Information distribution in a more comprehensive form

UNDP's goals and intended outcomes, which are eloquently formulated in programme documents like one-pagers, etc. may not be comprehensible for all partners and beneficiaries, and population in general. Yet in order to achieve intended results in the most efficient way understanding and engagement from the targeted groups is required. In furtherance of its activities UNDP used a creative way of distributing the necessary information among the target audience in the regions. They involved their existing beneficiaries in a theatre staging where these beneficiaries explained how they had started working with UNDP, what they had learned, what the best practices were, etc. These improvised theatre visited several regions and introduced UNDP's activities in their own words that were clear to others.

Report annexes

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

TOR FOR

OUTCOME EVALUATION IN SOCIAL INCLUSION AND QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENT

Duty station:	Home-based with mission to Astana
Duration:	33 days
Type of contract:	Professional Services Contracted
Language required:	English, Russian

1. 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 conducted¹ to assess the impact of programme component of the UNDP's development assistance:

- *Outcome 11* Vulnerable groups, specially women, young and aged people, oralmans, people with disabilities, have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets.

UNDP in Kazakhstan would like to evaluate its contribution during 2010-2015 to the achievement of the above mentioned *Outcome* and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learnt. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why the 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 implementation of the new UNDP country programme starting from 2016.

2. BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

Kazakhstan has been successful in managing its transition since 1991, with GDP per capita raising from U\$1,500 in 1998 to nearly U\$13,000 in 2013. It has gained the status of an upper-middle-income country. At the same time Kazakhstan's real GDP

¹ Please see Annex I: The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Kazakhstan for 2010-2015.

growth slowed from 6 percent in 2013 to 3.9 percent during the first half of 2014, resulting from less favourable terms of oil and gas trade. The sharp devaluation of the Kazakhstan tenge in February 2014 led to a strong drop in now more costly imports of goods, and increase of domestic inflation by over 7,5% during the year.

While enjoying high growth of 6-7% of GDP during several consecutive years, Government 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. The country is also ranked 83 out of 133 countries in the Social Progress Index, measuring through three dimensions – Basic Human Needs, Foundations of Wellbeing, and Opportunity².

Country's income growth positively influenced poverty indicators on a broad scale. The share of the population living in poverty dropped from 47 percent in 2001 to 2.9 in 2013 (measured by the national poverty line³).

Kazakhstan's performance in the World Bank's indicator of shared prosperity also shows progress, of about 5-6% starting from 2006.. Yet, a large share of population faces unstable employment and disadvantages in housing, safe drinking water, sanitation and social services. Most rural communities rely on the natural resource base to meet daily needs, and the resulting environmental degradation threatens livelihoods, particularly affecting the poor and women-headed households. Many health problems result from low access to safe drinking water and sanitation – only 67% of country's population has access to quality drinking water and only 47% to the sewerage system, despite of certain improvements. People lack awareness of sound environmental practices, which must be addressed as they improve their economic conditions.

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 has pledged to use its membership to strengthen human rights at home and globally⁴. 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 treaties⁵.

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_Social_Progress_Index

³ National poverty line for 3rd quarter of 2015 is KZT 7218, about US\$39

⁴ www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/67/122

⁵ 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).

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.

In his latest address “Nurly Zhol” President Nazarbayev, has task the Government to put efforts in social infrastructure development. Though the funds allocated for this are for the physical infrastructure, this implies better services and conditions for most vulnerable part of the population. Later in 2015, 5 institutional reforms have been identified with “100 steps” of implementation. Step 76 is aiming at the improvement of human capital based on OECD standards, and step 84 is about making social assistance more targeted.

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.

Kazakhstan adopted a new Law "On Public Services" in spring 2013, 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. In addition, 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;
- 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 Social Inclusion and Quality of Life Improvement*, the UNDP has focused on enhancing capacities for integrated management of national and regional level government agencies, private sector, NGOs/CBOs etc.

3. 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 social inclusion. 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 next programming cycle.

4. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will cover UNDP Outcomes 11 (Table 1) 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 1: CPAP results and resources framework – Economic and social well-being for all

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING FOR ALL		
<p>National priority: Continued progress in the quality of life, health, education and welfare of Kazakhstan people (“Health, Education and Well Being of Kazakhstan Citizens” of the Strategy Kazakhstan-2030).</p>		
<p>UNDAF outcome: By 2015 population of Kazakhstan and vulnerable groups in particular will enjoy improved social, economic and health status..</p>		
Country programme outcomes, indicators, baselines and target	Country Programme Outputs	Output indicators, baselines and targets
<p><i>Vulnerable groups, especially women, children, migrants, refugees, young and aged people, people with disabilities have improved access to markets, goods, services and social safety nets.</i></p> <p>Indicator: % of unemployed population (age 15-24) covered by inclusive and life-skills-based education programmes</p> <p>Baseline 7.3 % (National report on status of education, 2008)</p> <p>Target: 50%</p>	<p>The Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman have enhanced capacity to implement and monitor the Human Rights Action Plan Social sector stakeholders are able to better plan, implement and monitor quality of social services, with special emphasis on target vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>Indicator: Number of regions that replicate model services for oralmans</p> <p>Baseline: Centres for oralmans’ adaptation and integration starting in Karaganda, Shymkent, Aktau</p> <p>Target: By end of 2015 at least four other regions replicate model centre in East Kazakhstan Oblast</p>
	<p>Economically at-risk population benefit from improved job creation and sustainable productive employment</p>	<p>Indicator: Number of jobs created in target areas, including for target groups</p> <p>Baseline: TBD;</p> <p>Target: TBD</p>

Following projects (See Table 2) 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 2: Projects implemented during the period 2010 – 2015: Economic and social well-being for all

#	Title	Period
1	Support to the Country Coordination Mechanism	2010-2015

2	Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards	2012-2014
3	Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services (using Semey as an example)/Semey Joint Programme - Component 3: Improved access to social and economic services for vulnerable groups in Semey, Kurchatov, Ust-Kamenogorsk and the most affected areas of East-Kazakhstan region	2011-2015
	Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable/Kyzylorda Joint Programme – Component 2: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase – (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being)	2014-2016
4	Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization/ Mangystau Jpint Programme – Component 1: Social-economic Development of the Region and Employment Increase (Reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being for the vulnerable populations, increase of employment)	2014-2016

Outcome status: Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcomes 11 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 social and inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a reliable partner. UNDP's position will be analyzed in terms of communication, i.e. how UNDP articulates the need for its presence in the country, how UNDP meets partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, how UNDP mobilizes resources for the benefit of the partners. A specific attention should be given to the UNDP's comparative advantages over other development organizations in Kazakhstan.

Partnership strategy: Ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. Specific attention should be given to how new partnerships were formed, level of stakeholders' participation and efficiency of the partnerships. Examine the partnership among the UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field. The Evaluation will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the Outcome to the country needs, hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in social development.

Lessons learnt: Identify lessons learnt, best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in relation to the management and implementation of activities.

Lessons learnt is the critical aspect of the Outcome Evaluation as it will be use to design a better implementation strategy for the programmatic 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 inclusive development positively contributed to creation of barrier-free environment in Kazakhstan?
- Has UNDP made impact to empower 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 social inclusion and special services provision?
- Has UNDP unified stakeholders and contributed to a legal system in the related area to improve civic engagement?
- To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach, rule of law, 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?
- What are the roles, engagement and coordination among the stakeholders?
- Is there a synergy and leveraging with other programmes in Kazakhstan? What is the extent of synergies among UNCT programming and implementation?
- Has UNDP contributed to public awareness of the issue of inclusive development and increased the engagement of the beneficiaries and end-users?

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?
- To what extent UNDP produced results aligned with CPAP?

- Has UNDP contributed to the capacity building, advocacy on inclusive development?
- Has UNDP contributed to the capacity of beneficiaries 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?
- Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?
- Did UNDP managed to establish mechanisms ensuring sustainability of the policymaking interventions?
- What is the extent of the viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcomes?
- Is there an effective use of Governance porfolio to support appropriate central authorities, local communities and civil society in inclusive social development related agenda in a long term perspective?
- Did possible areas of partnerships with other national institutions, NGOs, UN Agencies, private sector and development partners have been used in a way to sustain the results?

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. There can be additional evaluation questions specified for each criteria, however 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.

5. METHOTOLOGY

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 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 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 (Independent mid-term evaluation of Semey Joint Programme conducted in the fall 2014 and evaluation of UNICEF child protection work in EKO):
 - a) Examination of contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, National Strategy of Kazakhstan 2030, Address of the President – Kazakhstan 20150, 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.
 - b) 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.

- c) 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.
- d) 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 is needed.

- **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 institutions⁶;

6. DELIVERABLES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team will prepare report 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.

⁶ 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.

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:

6.1. Evaluation inception report (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 3 below)

Table 3. Evaluation matrix

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

6.2. 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.

6.3. 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 pages⁷. 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.

7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

7.1. 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:

- 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).

7.2. Supervision and stakeholders' involvement

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.

7.3. Duty station and logistical modalities

⁷ Evaluation team may need to use 'Times New Roman' font at a size of 12 points, with Normal margin and line spacing 1.15.

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.

7.4. 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 4):

Table 4. 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	7
Finalizing the evaluation report (incorporate comments provided)	5
Follow up support to UNDP in knowledge sharing and dissemination	2

(e.g. 33 working days in total over a period of two months)

7.5. 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, social development, public sector performance, 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 social inclusion, governance, social protection, welfare);
- 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 evaluation⁸.

7.6. Evaluation team Ethics

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'⁹ 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'¹⁰.

Table 5. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing (to cover cost related with initiation of the evaluation, i.e. travel, communication etc.)
30%	Following submission and approval of the draft evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval by UNDP of the final evaluation report

⁸ 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.

⁹ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited

Government of Kazakhstan

Aygul Tabergenova	Deputy Director of the Social Services Department, Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development
Nariman Tasmuratuly Bagdatov	Head of the Administration of Regional Cooperation, Ministry of National Economy
Aliya Barieva	Head of the Department of the Administration on Employment and Social Programmes Coordination in EKO, Akimat of East Kazakhstan Oblast
Altyn Eskarayeva	Deputy Head of the Administration of Social Protection and Employment Coordination, Akimat of Kyzylorda Oblast
Raushan Demesinova	Specialist at the Department of Social tasks and communications, Administration of Economy and Budgetary Planning, Akimat of Kyzylorda Oblast
Zhansaya Ismagulova	Deputy Head of the Internal Affairs Administration, Akimat of Mangystau Oblast

NGOs

Alexander Ivkin	Chairperson, “Laykty Omir” rehabilitation center for the people with disabilities
Ali Amanbaev	Chairperson, People with Disabilities Organizations Union of Kazakhstan
Magiza Mirzaveddinova	Chairperson, Voluntary Society of People with Disabilities in EKO
Bibigul Shagiyeva	Deputy Director, Pushkin Library
Nurali Amanzholov	President, the Kazakh Union for people living with HIV
Aldabergen Isayev	Chairperson, Kamystybas
Sadyk Aliyev	Chairperson, Zhalagash regional veteran organization
Kirill Osin	Director, EcoMangystau

UN Partners

Umit Kazhgaliyeva	Area-based Programme Officer, UNICEF
Zhanar Sagimbayeva	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, UNICEF
Gaziza Moldakulova	National Programme Officer on Population and Development, UNFPA

UNDP

Olga Yugay	Project expert
Malika Koyanbayeva	Programme Analyst/Portfolio Manager
Murat Narkulov	Programme Associate
Dina Teltayeva	Communications Associate
Ryssaldy Demeuova	Coordinator of the CCM Secretariat
Aygul Takhitaliyeva	Regional Manager, Mangystau Oblast
Bayan Yegizbayeva	Regional Manager, Kyzylorda Oblast
Rauan Kaliyev	Regional Manager, EKO
Assima Sultanova	Regional Manager, EKO
Zhanetta Babasheva	Resources Monitoring Associate
Botagoz Yussupova	Administrative Specialist

Summary of Field VisitsAstana, UNDP Office

Interviews and briefings with the UNDP team, phone interviews with stakeholders

Astana, UNICEF Office

Interview with the UNICEF team

List of documents reviewed

General reference

- Abisheva, T.D., Tursunova, S.T. 2009-2012 Human Rights Action Plan of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2009
- Akimat of EKO, Development Programme for EKO 2011-2015, 2010
- Akimat of Kyzylorda Oblast, Development Programme for Kyzylorda Oblast 2011-2015, 2010
- Akimat of Mangystau Oblast, Development Programme for Mangystau Oblast 2011-2015, 2010
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, BTI 2014: Kazakhstan Country Report, 2014
- Chudoba, J., Khassenova, D. UN Country Situation Analysis, 2014
- Government of Kazakhstan, Approval of the first stage of the 2012-2018 National Action Plan to Ensure the Rights and Improve the Quality of Life of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Kazakhstan, January 2012
- Government of Kazakhstan, Approval of the second stage of the 2012-2018 National Action Plan to Ensure the Rights and Improve the Quality of Life of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Kazakhstan, March 2014
- Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2014-2018 Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Healthcare and Social Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, December 2014
- Nazarbayev, N. Kazakhstan 2030 strategy, 1997
- Nazarbayev, N. Kazakhstan 2030 strategy at the new development stage of Kazakhstan: 30 most important directions of our international and foreign affairs, 2007
- Nazarbayev, N. Kazakhstan 2050 strategy, 2014
- Nazarbayev, N. Social Modernization of Kazakhstan: 20 steps towards the society of unified labor, July 2012
- Nyussupova, G., Rodionova, I. Demographic Situation and the Level of Human Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Regional Aspects, Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series #16/2011
- Pomfret, R. Kazakhstan's 2030 Strategy: Goals, Instruments and Performance, December 2013
- UNDG, Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) Framework, February 2014
- UNDP, Audit of UNDP Country Office in Kazakhstan, December 2013
- UNDP, Country Programme Action Plan 2010-2015
- UNDP, Country Programme Document, March 2009
- UNDP, Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience (Human Development Report 2014)
- UNDP, The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World (Human Development Report 2013)
- United Nations, Post 2015: The Future We Want, May 2013

United Nations, United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Kazakhstan 2010-2015, March 2009

Support to The Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) Secretariat

Annual Working Plan 2013
Annual Working Plan 2015
CCM Performance Assessment
Description of the Project 2014-2015
Lessons Learned Report 2015
Project Document 2014-2015
Standard Progress Report 2011
Standard Progress Report 2012
Standard Progress Report 2013
Standard Progress Report 2014
Standard Progress Report 2015

Improvement of the social protection system in line with International Standards

Annual Working Plan 2010-2011
Annual Working Plan 2012
Annual Working Plan 2013
Annual Working Plan 2014
Annual Project Review 2013
Cover Letter for Financial Report November-December 2013
Financial Report 2012
Financial Report Comment May-October 2012
Minutes of Meeting December 2011
Minutes of Meeting May 2013
Minutes of Meeting July 2013
Minutes of Meeting July 2014
Project Document 2010-2011
Project Report 2012-2014
Standard Progress Report 2010-2012

Raising Competitiveness of the Region through Innovative Approaches to Regional Planning and Social Services (using Semey as an example)

Annual Program Narrative Progress Report 2014
Annual Working Plan 2011
Annual Working Plan 2012
Annual Working Plan 2013
Annual Working Plan 2014
Annual Working Plan 2015
Consolidated Annual Financial Report 2014

Mid-Term Evaluation Report 2014
Minutes of Meeting October 2013

Improving the welfare and quality of life in the Kyzylorda region through innovative approaches to delivering economic, social and environmental services to the local population, including those most vulnerable

Annual Program Narrative Progress Report 2014
Annual Working Plan 2014
Annual Working Plan 2015
Consolidated Annual Financial Report 2014
Minutes of Meeting 2015

Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization

Annual Program Narrative Progress Report 2014
Annual Working Plan 2014
Annual Working Plan 2015
Consolidated Annual Financial Report 2014
Minutes of Meeting 2015