

United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020

Evaluation report

**Mr. Christian Privat
International Consultant**

**Mr. Rahim Saatov
National Consultant**

2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
ACRONYMS.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	7
I. Introduction.....	18
II. Country context.....	19
III. United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (2016-2020).....	22
IV. Evaluation context.....	24
V. Evaluation purpose, objectives, scope and limitations.....	25
VI. Evaluation approach and methodology.....	26
A. Evaluation criteria and questions.....	26
B. Evaluation approach.....	27
C. Evaluation methodology.....	28
1. Preparation meetings and inception report	
2. Data collection and information sources	
3. Preliminary analysis based on desk review and written sources	
4. Stakeholder analysis	
5. Mission to Azerbaijan	
6. Meetings with results groups	
7. Meetings with other groups	
8. Meetings and interviews with United Nations organizational heads and high-level government representatives	
9. Meeting with non-governmental actors and youth organizations	
10. Guidance and ethical standards	
11. Other meetings and field visits	
12. Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation	
13. Links between the UNAPF and SDGs	
14. Wrap-up meeting	
15. Methods of analysis and report drafting	
16. Quality assurance and management process	
VII. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	38
A. Relevance and strategic positioning of the UNAPF.....	38
1. Relevance with respect to internationally agreed goals and human rights conventions	
2. Relevance with respect to national priorities	
3. Relevance with respect to development issues, their underlying causes and challenges	
4. Comparative advantage of the United Nations System	
5. Design of the UNAPF	
B. Effectiveness of the UNAPF.....	45

1.	Effectiveness of the UNAPF with respect to expected outcomes	
2.	Positive factors and challenges in achieving results	
C.	Coordination and processes	55
1.	Synergies among United Nations agencies, and joint programming and programmes	
2.	Involvement of non-resident organizations	
3.	Coordination mechanisms—Steering Committee, results groups and other groups	
4.	Data collection and analysis	
5.	The challenge of measuring results	
6.	Joint Work Plans	
7.	Annual reviews, mid-term review, and progress reports	
8.	Government ownership of the UNAPF	
9.	Partnerships and strategic alliances	
10.	Effectiveness of joint communication	
11.	Effectiveness of resource mobilization	
D.	Efficiency	77
E.	Programming principles	79
1.	Leaving no one behind and human rights-based approaches	
2.	Gender equality and women’s empowerment	
F.	Sustainability	89
VII.	LESSONS LEARNED	92
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS	93
IX.	RECOMMENDATIONS	95
ANNEXES		102
	Annex 1: Terms of reference for UNAPF evaluation	
	Annex 2: List of questions and agendas for UNAPF results group meetings	
	Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings	
	Annex 4: UNAPF Evaluation Mission Programme	
	Annex 5: List of references and background documents	
	Annex 6: List of people met and interviewed	
	Annex 7: Biographies of consultants	
	Annex 8: Stakeholder analysis	
	Annex 9: Evaluation matrix	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report are grateful to all stakeholders, including Mr. Ghulam M. Isaczai, United Nations Resident Coordinator, the heads and staff of United Nations organisations, Ms. Gular Fatali, Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer, all members of results, theme and other groups, numerous governmental and non-governmental partners, as well as international development partners.

All stakeholders offered valuable inputs, data, and insights, which allowed consultants to triangulate information with documentary sources. The authors of this evaluation report hope it will be useful in the near future, particularly in the development of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework for 2021-2025.

ACRONYMS

BOS	Business Operations Strategy
CCA	Common Country Assessment/Common Country Analysis
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO	civil society organization
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GBV	gender-based violence
GDP	gross domestic product
GHG	greenhouse gases
GTG	Gender Thematic Group
HDI	Human Development Index
HRBA	human rights-based approach
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IDP	internally displaced people/person
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFI	international finance institutions
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JWP	joint work plan
LNOB	leave no one behind
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MAPS	mainstreaming, acceleration, and policy support
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTR	mid-term review
NCCSD	National Coordination Council for Sustainable Development
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OMT	Operations Management Team
PGA	participatory gender audit
QCPR	Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review
RBM	results-based management
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SMART	specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound
ToR	terms of reference
UNAPF	United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework
UNCG	United Nations Communication Group
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDCO	United Nations Development Coordination Office

UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNOPS	United Nations Operation Service
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNOHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNRCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UNSDG	United Nations Sustainable Development Group
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
UNYAC	United Nations Youth Advisory Council
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
Vision 2020	Azerbaijan 2020: The Vision of the Future, Development Concept paper
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020 (UNAPF). The UNAPF focuses on three core results areas in which the United Nations is contributing to the national development agenda of Azerbaijan. They are as follows:

- **Priority area 1:** Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work;
- **Priority area 2:** Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services; and,
- **Priority area 3:** Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters.

As such, the evaluation is considered a stepping stone and will serve as an analytical tool in preparation for the next United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), which will be developed according to the new United Nations Development Group (UNDG) guidelines. This evaluation suggests ways the next UNSDCF can be more pragmatic in achieving certain targets under the SDGs in an integrated manner and within national development priorities and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The evaluation covers the period 2016 – June 2019 and assesses the UNAPF according to: a) relevance, strategic positioning and design; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability; e) five programming principles, and f) coordination.

The evaluation provides UN partners and organizations an opportunity to reflect collectively on the contribution of the United Nations to development change on the basis of expected UNAPF outcomes, and identifying specific UN interventions that may have contributed to observable results and/or changes.

The evaluation was commissioned by the United Nations Resident Coordinator Office (UNRCO), with the support of United Nations organizations, Government of Azerbaijan counterpart (Ministry of Economy), and conducted by an evaluation team composed of international and national consultants.

The purpose of the present UNAPF evaluation is to gather critical findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle and improve United Nations coordination in Azerbaijan, and also support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in-country.

UNAPF evaluation objectives are:

- To assess the contribution of the UN system to national development priorities through UNAPF outcomes, and making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability);
- To identify factors that have affected United Nations Country Team (UNCT) contributions, answering questions related to the “whys” of performance, and explaining enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning); and,
- To draw lessons from past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNSDCF cycle.

The methodology included:

- Preparatory meetings with the Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer, in the United Nations Resident Coordinator Office.
- Desk review of primary documents.
- Preparation of a detailed inception report, with an evaluation matrix.
- Stakeholder analysis.
- Evaluation mission of the International Consultant in Baku, and with the National Consultant between 9 to 17 July 2019.
- Briefing with the United Nations Resident Coordinator.
- Meeting with three UNAPF results groups.
- Interviews with key ministries and national institutions.
- Interviews with Heads of UN organizations, including non-resident ones.
- Meetings with non-governmental actors and youth organizations.
- Meeting with development partners.
- Meetings with the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Group, Communication Group, and Operations Management Team.
- Joint meeting with the three thematic groups (gender, human rights, SDGs).
- Wrap-up with the Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer in the United Nations Resident Coordinator Office at the end of the mission.

All sources of information allowed for a good triangulation of information for evaluation criteria and questions.

FINDINGS

Relevance

In terms of relevance, the evaluators found the UNAPF reflected the aspirations of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and accompanying Sustainable Development Goals. The UNAPF is relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms and standards.

The UNAPF is very relevant with respect to national priorities, including the “Azerbaijan - 2020: The Vision of the Future” and new public investments and efforts on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Several other strategies were mentioned in the UNAPF and are expected to feed into the implementation of “The Vision of the Future” development concept (hereafter referred to as Vision 2020). Other national strategies, policies, programs and laws were issued during the UNAPF, which are consistent with the UNAPF.

The evaluation confirms the relevance of the UNAPF to address Azerbaijan’s development issues, their underlying causes and challenges. The UNAPF gave particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups and improvement of living standards for all, which is also in line with the SDG imperative of *leaving no one behind* (LNOB). At the same time, the UNAPF intended to move upstream with approaches and assist policymakers in charting the course of new development goals in Azerbaijan, and to ensure that the next generation of national goals has a greater emphasis on equity, quality and sustainability. In addition to

baseline assessments and other types of studies conducted, there was a Country Analysis during UNAPF development, which helped fully address development issues.

Comparative advantages

The comparative advantages and added value of the United Nations, including some non-resident UN organisations, has been used in a variety of ways by national partners under the UNAPF.

Design

In terms of design, the UNAPF is important for capturing a shared vision mission between the United Nations and government, and is an enabling and broad enough framework. However, there are limitations in focus and design, in particular because of the insufficiency in the “SMARTness” of the results matrix. Some indicators are formulated in a way that does not allow for the effective monitoring and evaluation of results. Several indicators are high and too ambitious for the UN to make significant contributions. An additional challenge is related to the difficulty of monitoring and evaluating results, especially advocacy and policy development related targets.

Effectiveness with respect to expected outcomes

With regard to the effectiveness of the UNAPF some progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of national priorities, including strengthening national capacities and institutions, policy formulation and implementation, data collection and analysis (in all three UNAPF priority areas). Those subject to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention. Progress was also achieved in supporting the government in cross-cutting areas, advancing towards SDG achievement, empowering youth and women, and in the area of human rights. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the majority of planned interventions under outcomes seems to have been implemented during 2016-2018 or will be implemented between 2019-2020.

Some of the factors that contributed to progress towards UNAPF outcomes have been a stable political environment and good relationships between the government and United Nations. In terms of challenges, limited coordination amongst government entities has been a constraint to UNAPF implementation.

Synergies among United Nations agencies and joint programming and programmes

With respect to coordination and processes, the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among United Nations joint programming through the regular sharing of information, and resulted in a few joint programmes. The UNAPF also increased inter-agency collaboration and invited UN organizations to participate or co-chair a Results Groups and develop and monitor joint work plans together. There is also good collaboration within the UNCT, where organizations support each other when possible; however, synergies could be enhanced. Challenges in creating and implementing joint programmes include operational and practical implications with examples being ‘double charging’, different organizational work strategies, and increased competition for funding. Solutions can be found at UNCT and headquarters levels.

Involvement of non-resident organizations

The UNRCO has been supportive in linking non-resident UN organizations to others and relevant government authorities based on the UNAPF, and with the aim to conduct joint programming for Azerbaijan. A number of non-resident organization projects have contributed to UNAPF outcomes and the achievement of national priorities. Nevertheless, there is a need for the UNAPF and UNCT to be more inclusive of the expertise of different organizations and to allow the government to take full advantage of their unique areas of expertise.

Coordination mechanisms

Existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee, results groups, theme groups (human rights, gender, SDGs) and others (communication, M&E, Operations Management Team) helped ensure a joint alignment of results, and supported effectiveness and efficiency in delivering results, monitoring, reporting and planning in the five outcomes and cross-cutting areas. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement to address certain operational challenges and allow some actors such as civil society organizations, academia, and the private sector, where feasible, to participate.

Data collection and analysis

There is a rich collaboration between different United Nations organizations, the State Statistics Committee, and other ministries, all of which strengthened national capacities for data collection and analysis. Nevertheless, sometimes the UN does not know to what extent data is fully reliable, or a limited analysis of the data is conducted, or there are discrepancies between the statistical data produced by different sources. This can create obstacles to understanding the current situation and deprivations, as well as challenges in properly designing interventions, effectively measuring results, and using evidence for policy development and decision-making.

Measuring results

With regard to measuring results, several UNAPF outcome indicators are too high to be easily measurable. For these, it is difficult or impossible to determine contribution of the United Nations. Often, these are indicators where the United Nations hardly has any direct and significant influence, especially in a higher middle-income country like Azerbaijan. At best, it is possible to attribute some results to the UN through the achievements of outputs.

In addition, it is not easy to understand from the results matrix how outputs can contribute to the outcomes given that the matrix was completed only at the outcome level and does not include outputs. Furthermore, the UNAPF was developed without an action plan, which could have specified outputs. There are 47 outputs in the current joint work plans, which is a lot. Having a few outputs per outcome would make it easier to monitor and evaluate achievements at the highest level in the hierarchy of results and would make the UNAPF a much more strategic document and process.

Joint work plans

The UNAPF Result Groups developed three annual and bi-annual joint work plans (JWP), one per strategic priority area, which encapsulated outputs, specific actions, and resources required to achieve broad

UNAPF strategic outcomes for the year. For assessing progress, United Nations organisations reported against output indicators set in the JWPs by providing a current status of indicators and showing progress using color coding, which is important and laudable work. The UN and partners managed to use joint work plan opportunities to better align their outputs for more effective and efficient results delivery. However, planning for, monitoring, and tracking 47 outputs proved to be a challenge, which could be reflected on in the next UNSDCF.

Annual review, mid-term review and progress reports

The preparation of joint annual review meeting reports, the two UNAPF annual progress reports, and the Resident Coordinator annual reports are commendable efforts from the UNCT and have been useful sources for this evaluation. The user-friendly format of the 2018 progress report allowed the UNCT to use reporting information for wider communication purposes. The evaluation also found that a useful and timely mid-term review was also conducted, which allowed the UNCT to reflect on the alignment of the UNAPF to global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets and improve the indicators and future measurement of them.

Government ownership

The participation of numerous ministries in the results groups and the M&E Group (as co-chairs) demonstrates some joint ownership of the framework. Nonetheless, there has not been significant ownership of this framework document by the government, which does not necessarily see the work it is doing with the UN as part of the broader framework of the UNAPF. Issues the UNAPF deals with go beyond one ministry as a key counterpart. Moreover, the absence of a unified national development plan, which covers not only the economic sector but the social sector and human rights, limits government capacity to guide the identification of priority areas (of United Nations support) on a more regular basis.

Partnerships and strategic alliances

The UNAPF helped promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas even if many partnerships happened at the organizational level. New partnerships with different stakeholders were formed and older partnerships were consolidated to support UNCT work in sustainable development. Nevertheless, the UN is called to strengthen its partnerships and strategic alliances with non-governmental actors and to address the difficulties in financial management with non-governmental organizations (NGO)/CSO partners, which limits direct support to community level interventions and sometimes reduces the effectiveness of interventions. NGOs appreciate the support provided by the UN and ask for more active and wider support.

Joint communication

The Communication Group helps the UNCT to 'Communicate as One', by supporting events and organizing joint activities. It prepared a three-year communications strategy aligned with the UNAPF, and is guided by an annual workplan that includes specific events and activities throughout the year. The Group increasingly focuses on events, involving wider public participation. It also publishes monthly newsletters and tries to involve influencers like celebrities and bloggers in order to reach broader audiences through them.

Resource mobilization

The resource envelope for UNAPF implementation was estimated at \$71,840,500 US dollars; however, some UN organizations may have been overambitious while formulating the current UNAPF results matrix despite a downward trend in the state budget over the two years prior to the launch of the current UNAPF. There is a need for the UNCT to explore opportunities in moving away from an individual approach to resource mobilization, where possible—toward a more coordinated approach in order to add value by joining forces.

Efficiency

It is hard to determine if UNAPF results have been achieved at a reasonably low cost, with reduced transaction costs for the government and each United Nations organization, or with improved collaboration to avoid duplication. The Operations Management Team (OMT) developed a Business Operations Strategy (BOS), in alignment with the rest of the UNAPF cycle (2018-2020), which allowed the programming side of the framework to be fully supported by the operations side. The UNCT decided to focus on business operations harmonization management, common procurement, common human resources, common finance, and common information and communication technology. The OMT currently focuses on organizing office premises. The use of different platforms by organizations creates challenges in streamlining human resources, finance, administrative tools and operations—some of which are beyond the control of the UNCT.

Programming principles

Regarding programming principles: Leaving no one behind, human rights, and gender equality are all fundamental principles for the UNAPF and United Nations joint support to the government in achieving national development priorities and meeting international commitments. There is, however, limited information in the framework document about how these principles were going to be “cross-cutting.” A human rights-based approach (HRBA) was reflected in some outcomes of the results matrix, in particular the reference to treaty bodies. UNAPF results and strategies were also driven or at least informed by the standards and principles of Azerbaijan’s ratified human rights treaties. However, human rights-based approaches have not been reflected in a systematic, sustained and purposive way in the UNAPF implementation, through the use of the HRBA steps: (1) causality analysis, (2) role-pattern analysis, and (3) capacity gap analysis. There was not enough analysis to identify who the vulnerable are, where they are, their needs, and to elaborate on how the United Nations can contribute.

Furthermore, the capacity of government counterparts to address the needs of vulnerable groups and importance of disaggregated data were not continuously developed. Technical support was provided through the UNAPF Human Rights Theme Group and Gender Theme Group on reporting to the human rights committees; however, the dialogue between the UN and government (on human rights) could be strengthened with joint interventions focusing on vulnerable groups.

Gender equality was reflected in UNAPF design (in terms of specific targets, sex-disaggregated data and indicators) and implementation, despite limited information in the UNAPF document about its cross-cutting nature. Gender equality is reflected in the results matrix with Outcome 2.1, yet, the indicators do

not seem fully aligned with the outcome objective. Gender equality is also reflected in Outcome 2.3, with several indicators disaggregating women and men. Nevertheless, there are several ways gender equality and women' empowerment can be better integrated in forthcoming UNSDCF strategies and results frameworks, and in line with June 2019 UNSDCF guidelines. There are some programming activities that UN organizations jointly do every year, for example on disabilities (UNDP and UNFPA) or on reproductive health policies (UNFPA and WHO), but having joint projects is not always possible because of challenges related to the mobilization of funds, double charging of administrative costs, or agency-specific priorities. Almost every United Nations organization has some activities on gender; however, there is limited joint programming. The capacity strengthening of the UN Thematic Gender Group, United Nations organizations and the preparation of a gender strategy are not taking place due to funding difficulties. A Participatory Gender Audit aimed at assessing the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT also made important recommendations that are directly related to the UNAPF.

Sustainability

Regarding sustainability, there are a lot of concrete examples of collaboration projects that were launched under the UNAPF that have been maintained over time by national partners and counterparts, or continued, replicated, or scaled up by the government. The UNAPF contributed to the greater sustainability of results, but it is still early in the programme cycle of the UNAPF (three and a half years) to be categorical about sustainability.

Collaboration with local NGOs contributed to the sustainability of the achieved results, as local NGOs have sometimes been more effective at the grassroots level. However, a lack of resources, ownership, cooperation and coordination, follow-up, phasing out, and mainstreaming of project results in national programmes or policies hinder the potential to maintain UNAPF benefits over time.

LESSONS LEARNED

The **first lesson learned** from this UNAPF is that there is a limit on how high-level the outcomes and indicators can be in such a framework. If they are too ambitious they are better placed in national strategy documents and roadmaps since the United Nations cannot significantly contribute to their achievement. The achievement of outputs purely depends on the allocated budget—be it state budget or funds which UN Agencies struggle to mobilize from external sources. Considering that the UNAPF frames the partnership rather than projecting exact interventions from the government or UNCT, the discussions tends to be built on feasible outputs that are subject to available funding.

The **second lesson** is that the effectiveness of UNAPF implementation can be improved if it is coordinated by a government body with an overarching and coordinating mandate with other government agencies.

The **third lesson** is that there is always a need to hold open discussions amongst all parties from the very beginning of projects to ensure sustainability and conduct a thorough analysis of the situation and needs. After confirming a project is needed it is important the project is replicated or taken to scale by the government vis-à-vis a national programme, policy, work plan, or budget. This means the project will be part of national work planning and budgeting, and will provide systematic and sustainable contributions to development processes.

The **fourth lesson** is that a number of non-resident organization projects have contributed to UNAPF outcomes and the achievement of national priorities. Despite UNRCO efforts to link the non-resident organizations to other UN entities and relevant government authorities it is important for the UNCT to be more inclusive of the expertise of different non-resident organizations, to allow the government to take full advantage of their unique expertise.

The **fifth lesson** is that extending some forms of participation to actors such as civil society organizations and academia, where feasible, in existing coordination mechanisms (including the UNAPF Steering Committee or results groups) is important for ensuring joint alignment of results and improving effectiveness and efficiency in results delivery, monitoring, reporting, and planning in the five outcome and cross-cutting areas.

The **sixth lesson** is that even if many partnerships happened at the agency level, the UNAPF helped promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas. New partnerships with different stakeholders were formed and older ones were consolidated to support UNCT work towards sustainable development. It is important for the UN to strengthen its partnerships and strategic alliances with non-governmental actors if it wants to pilot direct support for community interventions.

CONCLUSIONS

The **first conclusion** of the evaluation is that UNAPF outcomes are relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms, and standards, and in line with national priorities and strategies, nationalized SDG targets, and new national laws, policies, and strategies. Baseline assessments or other types of studies were conducted in addition to a Country Analysis, which was conducted during framework development, and helped to fully address development issues and underlying causes and challenges, based on stronger evidence. SDG implementation will benefit from a development system and government able to fully use the comparative advantages and added value of the United Nations, but also by together pursuing an integrated approach and creating cross-sectoral synergies to deliver collective results at all levels.

The **second conclusion** is that the design of the UNAPF Results Matrix could have better reflected what the United Nations system can do in the country. The UNAPF is important as an instrument for capturing a shared vision and mission, between the UN and government; however, results and indicators should be formulated in a way that allows for the effective monitoring and evaluation of results, and shows results attributed to UN interventions (outputs) and contributions (outcomes). Several indicators are too high and ambitious for the United Nations to achieve, even in an upper middle-income country where it is already difficult to measure and evaluate an upstream partnership framework, and especially toward advocacy and policy development related targets.

The **third conclusion** is that the UNAPF was overall effective in reaching expected outcomes and outputs, and some progress has been made in achieving national priorities, including strengthening national capacities and institutions, policy formulation and implementation, and data collection and analysis in all three UNAPF priority areas. Those subject to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention. Progress was also achieved in supporting the government in cross-cutting areas, advancing towards SDG achievement, empowering youth and women, and in the area of human rights. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the majority of planned interventions under outcome areas seem to have been

implemented during 2016-2018 or will be implemented between 2019-2020.

The **fourth conclusion** is that the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of United Nations organizations through the regular sharing of information. It resulted in a few joint programmes and in some joint programming. The UNAPF also increased inter-agency collaboration and participation through co-chairing results groups or collectively developing and monitoring JWPs. There is also good synergy within the UNCT, where agencies support each other whenever possible. That said, synergies could be enhanced and do not seem to have fully extended to inter-ministerial collaboration. There are still operational challenges in creating and implementing joint programmes, some of which can be addressed in-country by the UNCT and others at the organizational headquarters level.

The **fifth conclusion** is that it is not easy to understand from the results matrix how outputs can contribute to outcomes given that the matrix was completed for the outcome level only and does not include outputs (these are only recorded in the JWPs). Furthermore, the UNAPF was developed without an action plan, which could have specified the outputs. In such circumstances, outputs ended up in the Joint Work Plans. The 2010 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) guidelines are not to blame for this situation since they recommended for outputs to be listed either in the results matrix alongside outcomes or in the UNDAF Action Plan. However, the 2017 guidelines may have led to less useful tools, with the M&E function reduced to JWPs on the output level.

The **sixth conclusion** is the lack of clear criteria in the definition of outputs since there were different outputs introduced in the JWPs, including activities for single organizations. As a consequence, there are 47 outputs in the current JWPs. It would have been simpler to monitor and evaluate achievements at the highest level in the hierarchy of results, according to joined outputs (for example three to four per outcome), or after regrouping several activities from several organizations. It would have made the UNAPF a much more strategic document and simplified the reporting processes.

The **seventh conclusion** is that the comparative advantages and added value of the United Nations, including non-resident organizations, has been utilized in a variety of ways by national partners under the UNAPF.

The **eight conclusion** is that a stable political environment and good relationships between the government and the United Nations contributed to progress towards UNAPF outcomes, however, one of the constraints for implementation is limited coordination among government entities.

The **ninth conclusion** is that even if the government does not necessarily see the work it is doing with the United Nations as part of a broader framework of the UNAPF, and even if issues the UNAPF deals with go beyond one ministry as a key counterpart, the participation of numerous ministries in the results groups and M&E Group demonstrates joint ownership of the Framework.

The **tenth conclusion** is that organizations provided technical support through the UNAPF Human Rights Theme Group and the Gender Theme Group when reporting to human rights committees; however, the dialogue between the United Nations and government on human rights could be strengthened by joint interventions focusing on vulnerable groups.

The **eleventh conclusion** is that gender equality was reflected in UNAPF design and implementation, and almost every UNCT member has a project or activities on gender; however, there is limited joint programming on gender amongst UN organizations. A Participatory Gender Audit, aimed at assessing the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT, made important recommendations that are directly related to the UNAPF. Despite the needs, the capacity strengthening of the United Nations Gender Thematic Group and United Nations organizations, and the preparation of a gender strategy are not taking place due to funding difficulties. Following the UNDS reform, a separate budget could be allocated to gender issues by the UNRCO. To better integrate gender-based approaches in the next UNSDCF, an internationally validated methodology such as the 'gender scorecard' could be used when collating baseline and target data on UNCT performance regarding gender mainstreaming and collaboration between organizations in the field.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The UNCT and government should improve the design and usefulness of the next UNSDCF in accordance with new guidelines and vision of UNDS reform to capture a shared vision and mission, given the context of the SDGs.

Recommendation 2: The government should strengthen its ownership and coordination of the next cooperation framework.

Recommendation 3: The UNCT should promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas with a variety of stakeholders in order to enhance the effectiveness of the UNAPF.

Recommendation 4: The UNCT and government should encourage the involvement of NGOs and CSOs at more strategic levels in the next cooperation framework.

Recommendation 5: The UNCT is invited to strengthen joint programming and implement targeted joint programmes.

Recommendation 6: The UNCT and government should increase cooperation through results and thematic groups, and use them to strategically manage the UNAPF.

Recommendation 7: The UNCT and government should strengthen their use of effective results-based management (RBM) and M&E systems to strategically monitor and manage the UNAPF and next UNSDCF.

Recommendation 8: The UNCT, State Statistics Committee, and government ministries should strengthen collaboration in view of improving national capacities for data collection and analysis, especially given their importance for measuring progress on the SDGs and the next cooperation framework.

Recommendation 9: The UNCT should ensure greater mainstreaming of the UNSDCF guiding principle on 'leave no one behind' and the HRBA, as recommended in June 2019 guidelines.

Recommendation 10: The UNCT should ensure a greater mainstreaming of the UNSDCF guiding principle on gender equality and women's empowerment, as recommended in June 2019 guidelines.

Recommendation 11: The UNCT should pursue an integrated approach and create cross-sector collaborations to deliver linked results, strengthen equity-focused and upstream-downstream links, and develop and pilot integrated and convergent intervention models.

Recommendation 12: The UNCT should create a more inclusive and enabling environment for the participation and involvement of non-resident organizations in Common Country Assessment/Analysis (CCA), UNAPF, and UNSDCF processes.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020 (UNAPF). It is based on the UNAPF Evaluation Terms of Reference (see [Annex 1: UNAPF Evaluation terms of reference](#)).

The UNAPF focuses on three core result areas where the UN contributes to the national development agenda.

Priority area 1: Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work.

Priority area 2: Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services.
--

Priority area 3: Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters.

As such, the evaluation is considered a stepping stone that serves as an analytical tool in preparation for the next United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, which will be developed in accordance with the new UNDG guidelines. It suggests ways the next UNSDCF could be more pragmatic in achieving certain targets under the SDGs in an integrated manner, within national development priorities, and in tandem with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The evaluation covered the period of June 2016 to June 2019 and assessed the UNAPF according to: a) relevance, strategic positioning and design; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability; e) five programming principles, and f) coordination.

The evaluation provided the UNDS in Azerbaijan with an opportunity to reflect collectively on their contributions to development change and on the basis of expected UNAPF outcomes, identifying specific interventions that may have contributed to observable results and/or change.

The evaluation was commissioned by the United Nations Resident Coordinator Office with support from the UNCT and government counterpart (Ministry of Economy). It was conducted by International Consultant (Mr. Christian Privat) and a National Consultant (Mr. Rahim Saatov), see [Annex 7: Biographies of consultants](#).

The UNAPF was evaluated as per UNDAF guidelines provided by the United Nations Development Group. The framework document foresees a final evaluation in the last year of the UNAPF cycle. That evaluation will assess contributions made to national development priorities and goals; the relevance of UNAPF outcomes; effectiveness and efficiency of results achieved, and the sustainability of results. The focus has been on the extent to which the United Nations System has been able to effectively contribute to substantively strengthening national institutional and human capacities. The evaluation aims to inform the design of the next Framework and ensuing country programmes and projects by individual organizations.

This report was prepared by the International Consultant with support from the National Consultant, and under guidance provided by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).¹ It presents the country context, a description of the United Nations—Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (2016-2020), the evaluation context, the purpose, objectives and scope, as well as the approach and methodology. Includes are numerous annexes that present complementary information and tools used during the evaluation.

II. COUNTRY CONTEXT

Azerbaijan has undergone significant economic development since gaining independence in 1991, transitioning into an upper middle-income country. It has enjoyed an energy-fueled boom over the last two decades, remaining one of fastest-growing economies in the world and transforming into an increasingly assertive presence regionally. Economic growth was spurred by oil and gas exploration, high public expenditure, and reforms that support a market-based economy.

Azerbaijan enjoys the status of upper-middle income economy. Gross domestic product (GDP) growth rates averaged at 12.4% from 2004 to 2013 with steadily increasing contributions from the non-oil sector due to targeted government efforts. Still, economic growth remains highly dependent on growth in the oil sector. The volatility of oil prices is one of many externalities the country is exposed to and that re-emphasizes the importance of systemic transformational changes for securing more sustainable and inclusive growth in the long run.² Under the Vision 2020 development concept,³ a strategic document prepared by the government, the focus were on doubling GDP and strengthening Azerbaijan's position among high-income countries according to a World Bank classification based on gross national income per capita. Such contextual elements were addressed by UNAPF Priority Area 1, promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work.

The UNAPF has been developed in the context of the Republic of Azerbaijan's high overall human development. HDI). With an HDI score of 0.747, Azerbaijan (population of over 9.6 million people)⁴ ranked 76th among 187 countries in the 2014 Global Human Development Report.⁵ Life expectancy increased by six years between 1980 and 2012, and years of schooling rose by 0.4 years during that same period to 11.7 years. Significant investments have been made in improving education and health infrastructure. Progress toward the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has been largely positive.⁶

Azerbaijan created and continues to build on the successful 'ASAN Service Centre' (Azerbaijan Service and Assessment Network) model for service delivery using one-stop shops that dramatically reduced bureaucracy waiting times, and opportunities for rent-seekers. Another public legal entity, named *DOST* (Agency for Sustainable and Operational Social Security) and the National Observatory for Labor Market and Social Protection Issues, were established under the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population to improve governance in the field of employment, labour and social protection. These contextual elements were addressed by UNAPF Priority Area 2, strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services. During the recent years, important works have been implemented by

¹ Key UNEG guidance includes: Frequently Asked Questions for UNDAF Evaluations, UNEG, 2010; Quality Checklist for Evaluation ToR and inception reports, UNEG, 2010; Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, UNEG, 2010; UNEG Guidance on Preparing TORs for UNDAF Evaluations, 2012; and Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014.

² "Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals," Mission Report, Azerbaijan, 2017.

³ See https://www.undp.org/content/dam/azerbaijan/docs/sustain_development/AZ_Vision2020_government_draft_en.pdf.

⁴ State Statistical Committee data, 2015.

⁵ HDR 2014, p. 161, see <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-report-en-1.pdf>.

⁶ United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020, p. 15.

the government to develop ICT and accelerate the transition to information society in Azerbaijan. Today, 80% of the total population and 78.2% of households in the country are Internet users. In the Global Competitiveness Report 2019 of the World Economic Forum, Azerbaijan ranked the 43rd place among 141 world countries for the number of Internet users per 100 people, and this number is 1.5 times higher than the average indicator in the world. Today, 84% of males and 76% of females are Internet users in the country.

Azerbaijan is not a major greenhouse gas (GHG) contributor, however, considering the reliance of the economy on hydrocarbon production, the government should define new pathways to reduce the carbon footprint of economic development, especially in the energy sector, which is responsible for 75.9% of GHG emissions. Azerbaijan is committed, under the Paris Agreement, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 35% before 2030. On the other hand, Azerbaijan is highly vulnerable to climate change, particularly given the scarcity of freshwater resources and its location on the coast of the Caspian Sea,⁷ which suggests a need to strengthen national coping mechanisms and adaptive capacities. The country is part of all major UN conventions in the sphere of environmental protection, including three of the most important on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation. Azerbaijan ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1995 and acceded to the Paris Agreement, ratifying it in January 2017. These contextual elements were addressed by the UNAPF Priority Area 3, improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters.

At an early stage of independence, the Republic of Azerbaijan experienced a massive displacement crisis as a result of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict in and around the Nagorno Karabakh Region of Azerbaijan. As a result, more than one million people fled their homes, becoming refugees or internally displaced. In accordance with the Law on Citizenship of 1998, refugees from Armenia (along with Mesketian Turks from Central Asia) have been naturalized, becoming citizens and enjoying full access to social, cultural and political rights in Azerbaijan. Over two decades later, an estimated 620,000 people (as of 31 December 2018) from the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan and seven surrounding occupied districts are internally displaced (IDP), according to government statistics. Despite the fragile ceasefire of 1994, displacement remains a major challenge for the country and no political solution has been reached between the two sides.⁸

Azerbaijan faces challenges to sustain progress and avoid the ‘middle-income trap’, particularly given that a substantial number of households graduated from poverty but did not reach the ranks of the middle class.⁹ Although the country rose on the HDI to a higher human development category, when this value takes into account inequality the country’s ranking drops by 10%.

Evidence from the most recent overview of the demographic situation in the country highlights several areas of progress on gender equality that include longer life expectancy for men and women, as well as higher literacy rates among women. Research also suggests that women are now more likely to marry at an older age, have fewer children, have nearly an equal chance of residing in either rural or urban areas, and are more engaged in income-generating activities outside of the household.¹⁰ Nevertheless, despite

⁷ Azerbaijan’s Second National Communication to the UNFCCC.

⁸ United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020, p. 13.

⁹ Mainstreaming, Acceleration, Policy Support report, 2018.

¹⁰ “Population Situation Analysis: Beyond the Demographic Transition in Azerbaijan,” UNFPA/UNDP, Baku, Azerbaijan 2015.

available normative frameworks, a series of individual, institutional, and structural barriers continue to severely affect the effectiveness and sustainability of gender equality reforms. In addition, the lack of effective implementation and accountability mechanisms repeatedly undermines above-stated commitments.

Labour markets in Azerbaijan are characterized by structural challenges as supply-demand mismatches, underemployment, high youth unemployment, high levels of vulnerable and informal work, and regional labour market disparities. Because of Azerbaijan’s “youth bulge,” young people constitute the majority of unemployed in many parts of the country.¹¹ Currently, the unemployment rate in Azerbaijan is 4.9% in total, 9% among youth aged 15-29¹². There has been a 93% increase in the minimum wage, a 72% increase in the minimum pension covering 660,000 pensioners in the country. Allowances and pensions for 300,000 disabled people, increased on average by 100 percent, allowances and pensions of about 500,000 internally displaced people - by 50 percent. These changes resulted in significantly supporting the wealth of 4.2 million citizens due to comprehensive reforms made on the basis of the wide application of digital technologies and innovations in social protection since 2018, and the implementation of two social packages under relevant decrees by the President since early 2019.¹³

The Government of Azerbaijan clearly understands the challenges ahead and the need for holistic approaches in addressing them. It initiated a reshuffle of the government and implemented some measures to mitigate risks , which kick-started reforms in the financial sector and shifted focus to promoting entrepreneurship, sustainable non-oil economy expansion (particularly in agricultural, tourism and tech sectors, all of which receive targeted state support), and export-oriented growth. The government also continues to make considerable efforts to improve the overall living conditions of vulnerable groups and assumes full responsibility for the protection of, and assistance to, IDPs. However, the vast majority of refugees and asylum-seekers from other countries do not hold a secure legal status. While they enjoy free access to primary and secondary education and primary health care, they lack the legal right to decent employment and need financial and secondary health care assistance. In addition, the lack of clear legal status blocks their access to all social benefits, such as poverty allowance and pensions for old age or disability. Vision 2020, launched in 2012, consolidated medium- and long-term strategic national aspirations, and provided an overall framework for a number of national sectoral strategies and strategic road maps, as well as for expanding cooperation with international development partners.

Finally, the UNAPF document included a table that described the key development challenges in Azerbaijan, including economic, socio-cultural, and institutional and governance, environmental and geographic causes. This provides additional insights on the UNAPF context.

III. UNITED NATIONS—AZERBAIJAN PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK (2016-2020)

¹¹ MAPS Report

¹² State Statistics Committee, 2019

¹³ Information provided by the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Population.

The UNAPF 2016-2020, formulated via inclusive and participatory processes, is aligned with the national aspirations and priorities of Vision 2020. The UNAPF was developed with the realization that the role of the United Nations in Azerbaijan has evolved from one of providing development assistance to one of partnership.

The current partnership framework focuses on **three strategic priority areas**: (1) promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work; (2) strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services, and (3) improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters. Within these priorities the cross-cutting issues of human rights-based approaches; gender equality; youth; specific capacity development for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. institutional, technical, managerial), and improving the overall evidence base are present. Interventions under the three strategic priority areas include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Under the first strategic priority area, United Nations organizations provide support to the Government of Azerbaijan in implementing a range of activities that: boost employment and decent work for youth, women, refugees, IDPs and stateless persons; promote entrepreneurship and small businesses; promote skills development and education of workforce for non-oil sectors, and foster agricultural and rural development, and demining.
- The second strategic priority area focuses on: building the capacity of national actors to formulate and implement evidence-based equitable state policies, programmes and budgets with a particular focus on population dynamics, women, youth and vulnerable groups, and to independently monitor and report the situation of vulnerable groups in line with international recommendations, and to ensure that their situation conforms to international standards and state international obligations. It also focuses on improving vulnerable groups access to national protection systems and building their awareness of rights and of how to redress violations effectively, and ensuring that protection, education, health, and nutrition services are high quality and accessible to all, especially the most vulnerable, refugees, IDPs, stateless people, and victims of trafficking. Central national strategies and policies point to the need for effective institutional public service capacities, at both central and local levels, to sustain Azerbaijan's development gains. While progress has been noted in recent years—solidifying more effective and accountable governance, and achieving progress on the rights agenda—the government and UNDS recognize the importance of effective and accountable public and social services. The United Nations is committed to building partnerships that can clarify roles and responsibilities for more effective development policies, decision making and service delivery. Through institutional capacity development, the United Nations will seek to assist in creating social cohesion, including supporting efforts to ensure this takes place between the government and the people. Enhanced systems of local governance respecting rights-based approaches can significantly reinforce local participation indecision-making processes.
- The third strategic priority area focuses on: strengthening institutions and mechanisms for better monitoring, analysis and reporting on GHG emissions; promoting the application of climate change mitigation measures and green practices to reduce GHG emissions in the energy sector;

ensuring better planning, management, and sustainability of coastal and marine ecosystems; developing policies and supporting institutions and local farmers in conserving and sustainably using land/forest resources; strengthening capacities in the field of plant diagnostics and inspection with a focus on imported and exported products, and strengthening capacities for programming and implementation in the areas of public health.

The results framework of the UNAPF 2016-2020 outlines **five outcomes** that were operationalized through the development of Joint Work Plans. They are:

Strategic Priority Area 1:

- Outcome 1.1: By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups.

Strategic Priority Area 2:

- Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation.
- Outcome 2.2: By 2020, Azerbaijan has made progress in line with international human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review, and other treaty obligations, and has strengthened capacities for implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with international standards.
- Outcome 2.3: By 2020, quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results.

Strategic Priority Area 3:

- Outcome 3.1: By 2020, sustainable development policies and legislation are in place, are better implemented and coordinated in compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, recognize social and health linkages, and address issues of environment and natural resource management, energy efficiency and renewable energy, climate change, and resilience to hazards and disasters.

When this UNAPF was prepared 2010 guidelines did not ask for a specific theory of change. However though the UNAPF document mentioned that, UN organisations responsible for each UNAPF Strategic Priority Area will develop a respective theory of change for each outcome, this did not happen.

The JWPs form an agreement between United Nations organizations and implementing partners on the use of resources. They identify exact deliverables, responsible parties, as well as exact costs and available resources. The design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of Joint Work Plans are coordinated by three result groups, which are co-chaired by the government and United Nations. Joint annual reviews are convened and allow for the timely measurement of progress and performance, and adjustment of implementation. Annual progress reports are produced upon UNAPF implementation.

In terms of governance structures, a high-level UNAPF Steering Committee comprising senior government officials, representatives of the UNDS, and key development partners, provides strategic direction and oversight on the implementation of the UNAPF. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Minister of Economy and the United Nations Resident Coordinator.

The UNCT, comprised of representatives from various United Nations organizations accredited to Azerbaijan, and under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator, is responsible for the effectiveness of UNDS development activities in-country.

In addition, the UN Gender Theme Group, Human Rights Thematic Group, Communications Group, and Operations Management Team contribute to UNAPF implementation, as well as joint policy development and normative activities. The Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group provides technical assistance to the three results groups to sustain a robust and effective M&E system that monitors, evaluates, and reports on results stipulated in the UNAPF.

The UNCT has made much progress in the implementation of the United Nations—Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) 2016-2020 through a collaborative efforts captured in annual progress reports and the annual reports of the Resident Coordinator.

During the second half of 2018, the UNCT, in partnership with the government, conducted a mid-term review of UNAPF implementation through two exercises. The first was a rapid integrated assessment of UNAPF carried out against global SDG targets that showed 59% alignment. The second was a review of the UNAPF Results and Resources Framework with proposed changes discussed and agreed upon with the government.

IV. EVALUATION CONTEXT

At the national level, besides what is highlighted in the country context section, no specific emerging issues were highlighted in the ToR or the inception phase. However, further discussions took place with the UNRCO, United Nations organizations, government and other partners, which led to a deeper analysis of the context that may have influenced UNAPF implementation.

Primary users and stakeholders of this UNAPF evaluation are mainly state and governmental entities, and some civil society organizations associated with UN activities, but not planning, implementation, or reporting on the framework. A comprehensive stakeholder analysis was conducted during the inception phase ([see Annex 8: Stakeholder analysis](#) for more information).

At the international level, Member States reached historic agreements and set global agendas that have unveiled new visions for the future where there is more equitable, inclusive and sustainable development for people and the planet, with peace, justice and shared growth for all as central tenets, and nobody being left behind, as embodied in the SDGs and 2030 Agenda.

Apart from the 2030 Agenda, the UNAPF evaluation was influenced by UNDS reform and guidance.¹⁴ As pointed out in the recent United Nations Secretary-General's report on the repositioning of the UNDS, the

¹⁴ <https://undg.org/2030-agenda/> and <https://undg.org/programme/2030-agenda-section/>.

current United Nations Development Assistance Framework is the single most important country planning instrument in support of the 2030 Agenda.¹⁵ The Secretary General also noted that United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks should be a clear, action-oriented response to national development priorities in each country and integrate the Sustainable Development Goals. Frameworks will take a similarly comprehensive and integrated approach in responding to challenges according to national context and relevant regional dynamics over a five-year period.

V. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The purpose of the present UNAPF evaluation was to gather findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle, improve United Nations coordination in Azerbaijan, and support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in the country.

UNAPF evaluation objectives were to:

- Assess UNDS contribution to national development priorities through UNAPF outcomes and makes judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability);
- Identify factors that have affected UNCT contributions, answering the question of “why” performance is what it is, and explaining enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning);
- Draw lessons from past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNAPF cycle.

In terms of scope, this is the final evaluation of the current cycle of the UNAPF (2016-2020), covering the implementation period of 2016 to mid-2019. Consultants reviewed results achieved during the last three and a half years of UNAPF implementation and explored lessons learned, identified areas for joint programming, and analyzed challenges and opportunities. This is not ideal since the implementation of the UNAPF will continue to 2020; however, the timeframe of the UNDG roadmap towards a new UNSDCF requires the UNCT to conduct the evaluation at this time.

In terms of partners, evidence and findings embraced the views of key stakeholders. In terms of geographic scope, the evaluation dealt with all levels of UNAPF implementation, national and sub-national. In terms of programmatic scope, it covered the five outcomes.

The main limitation of this evaluation was it was conducted with a limited number of working days (35 days for the International Consultant and 25 days for the National Consultant). The preparatory phase of 10 working days was time consuming and the evaluation mission required an additional 10 working days in-country. A total of 15 working days were set aside for drafting the report and integrating numerous comments, mainly from United Nations organizations. The number of days was insufficient given the broad scope of the evaluation and UNEG and UNDG requirements, which are increasing, the number of documents provided to consultants, based on the number of meetings held, and the number of evaluation questions in the ToR (32) and subsequently considered in the inception report (41). Working with a national expert was useful for the International Consultant, but also created additional work when managing the National Consultant, coordinating his work and providing guidance on his inputs.

¹⁵ Repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda: our promise for dignity, prosperity and peace on a healthy planet, Report of the Secretary-General, 21 January 2017, A/72/684-E/2018/7, (pp. 12-13, among others).

The consultants recommend that more working days be planned for such a complex evaluation in the future—between 60 and 70 working days for similar sized countries. Furthermore, UNCT members should reflect on the situation and take appropriate measures to enhance the quality of UNSDCF evaluations, but not to the detriment of consultants. See also the section below on quality assurance.

VI. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

A. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

This UNAPF was assessed according to the standard set of OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programmatic interventions of the United Nations.

The key criteria and related questions for this evaluation were defined as follows:

- a) **Relevance:** The responsiveness of the UNAPF strategy and content, and its implementation mechanisms, to the needs and capabilities of the intended beneficiaries (including national institutions, communities, and policy frameworks);
- b) **Effectiveness:** The extent to which UNAPF results are being achieved;
- c) **Efficiency:** The return on investment of human and financial resources in terms of delivering the development results, including whether Delivering as One reduced transaction costs and increased efficiency of UNAPF implementation; and,
- d) **Sustainability:** The extent to which results can be sustained over time.

In addition, the evaluation looked at three other criteria:

- e) **Design:** The extent to which the UNAPF is designed in that it responds to the expected positioning of a “revitalized, strategic, flexible, results and action-oriented UNDAF as the most important instrument for planning and implementation” in the UN Development System;
- f) **Five programming principles:** The use of the five programming principles in a cross-cutting way in the UNAPF. This refers to the principles indicated in the 2017 UNDAF Guidelines: leave no one behind; human rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment; sustainability and resilience, and accountability.
- g) **Coordination:** The validity of the stated collective added value of the UNDS in Azerbaijan.

The methodological approach consisted in reviewing UNAPF programmatic interventions from the perspective of these criteria. These criteria and questions helped analyze the contribution of the UNAPF toward development outcomes. Criteria and questions were reviewed and improved with respect to the original ToR list of questions by the International Consultant. Furthermore, with respect to the ToR, and as a result of discussions during the inception phase, the “Five Programming Principles” were added as a new criterion, following suggestions from the consultants. They are defined as the cross-cutting use of the five programming principles in the UNAPF.

The original list of evaluation criteria and questions that was included in the original ToR is in [Annex 1: Terms of reference](#). The list that was amended and restructured during the inception phase, which also includes data sources and collection methods, is in [Annex 9: Evaluation matrix](#). This reviewed list of criteria and questions was used to produce specific questions to guide discussions for interviews and meetings, and can be found in [Annex 3](#).

B. EVALUATION APPROACH

The approach of the evaluation was participatory, flexible in design and implementation, ensured stakeholder participation and ownership, and facilitated learning and feedback. A desk review, interviews and meetings with key stakeholders, and triangulation of all information sources was carried out. This inclusive approach involved a broad range of partners and stakeholders, in addition to United Nations staff.

UNAPF evaluations are meant to be strategic exercises. This evaluation was set at a strategic level, which means that to provide an answer to evaluation questions the evaluation focused on strategic considerations and provided an assessment of the relevance of the UNAPF and its effectiveness, along with the efficiency and sustainability of UNAPF outcomes, interventions and strategies. The evaluation did not involve a detailed assessment of all UNAPF outputs and activities, instead focusing on key UNAPF achievements and all other evaluation criteria and questions.

In addition, the evaluation focused on assessing cooperation between the UNDS and government, and added value brought by the United Nations and UNAPF. It also involved investigating levels/types of cooperation between agencies, joint programming, communication and advocacy strategies, and the strategic role of the United Nations in-country and expectations of partners in the future. This also included an analysis of how interventions led to the results achieved by UN organizations, be that jointly or individually on nationwide interventions.

The way the UNCT managed and implemented the UNAPF was also assessed. This included mechanisms set up following UNAPF approval, the functioning of these mechanisms during the entire cycle, and the results produced (for instance JWPs, annual reviews, the mid-term review, and annual progress reports).

The evaluation used the contribution analysis to explore the cause and effect relationship referred to John Mayne's brief for that purpose.¹⁶

C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The overview of the methodology is the following:

- Preparatory meetings with the Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer, in the Resident Coordinator Office.
- A desk review of key documents, see [Annex 5: List of references and background documents](#).
- Preparation of a detailed inception report with an evaluation matrix, see [Annex 9: Evaluation matrix](#).

¹⁶ Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect, ILAC Brief No 16, John Mayne, May 2008.

- A stakeholder analysis, [see Annex 8: Stakeholder analysis](#) for more information.
- Evaluation mission by the international and national consultants from 9-17 July 2019. See [Annex 4: UNAPF Evaluation Mission Programme](#).
- Briefing with the United Nations Resident Coordinator.
- Meetings with various actors, see [Annex 6: List of people met and interviewed](#).
- Meeting with members from the three results groups. See [Annex 2: List of questions and agendas for UNAPF results group meetings](#).
- Interviews with officials from key ministries and national institutions. See [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Interviews with Heads of United Nations organizations, including non-resident ones. See [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Meetings with non-governmental actors and youth organizations, see [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Meeting with development partners, see [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Meetings with the M&E Group, Communication Group, and Operations Management Team. See [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Joint meeting with the three thematic groups of gender, human rights, and SDGs. See [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).
- Wrap up with the Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer in the Resident Coordinator Office at the end of the mission.

All sources of information allowed for a good triangulation of data on all evaluation criteria and questions.

1. Preparation meetings and inception report

The International Consultant and the Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting Officer had several preparatory Skype meetings and email discussions. The consultant prepared this inception report with a detailed methodology and work plan for the evaluation process, as well as numerous annexes, which have been updated and are included in this report.

The inception report was shared with the UNAPF Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) for comments. The International Consultant had a Skype meeting with the UNRCO and the UNERG during the inception phase of the evaluation to agree on the best possible approaches and methodology for this evaluation, taking context, objectives and timeframe into consideration. At this meeting the consultant made a PowerPoint presentation to highlight key elements of the approach and methodology.

2. Data collection and information sources

Information sources were key documents and other detailed documents (see below).

Data collection methods were a desk review, meetings/interviews with UN representatives; meetings with UNAPF results groups; meetings/interviews with national stakeholders in charge of priority areas 1, 2 and 3; joint meetings with theme groups; meetings with the UNAPF M&E Group, United Nations Communications Group (UNCG), and Operations Management Team; meetings with non-governmental actors, and meetings with development partners. For more information on data sources and data collection methods see [Annex 9: Evaluation matrix](#).

The consultants eliminated, to the maximum extent, information gaps through a significant effort of triangulation of information sources.

Both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered. The nature and context of the evaluation and the limitations of time and resources; however, required a stronger focus on qualitative information, keeping the exercise light for the UNDS, government, and civil society partners. In this respect, outcome orientation and time constraints were kept in mind, and only secondary data already available informed the achievement of primary UNAPF outcomes.

Given the time limitations of the evaluation exercise, the evaluation team was not asked to do any primary collection of statistical data related to UNAPF indicators. It relied on data already collected and presented by UNAPF stakeholders in available documents. Some disaggregated data was available and used in the evaluation of achievements.

3. Preliminary analysis based on the desk review and written sources

This was an evidence-based evaluation to assess the UNAPF performance against the criteria and questions outlined above, and to make recommendations for the rest of the current programme cycle and forthcoming one. It was expected that the evaluation would draw on existing documentary evidence from available and relevant UNDS and government analytical documents.

The primary document was the UNAPF, including the UNAPF Results Matrix, with its expected outcomes, indicators, baselines and targets, and the Joint Work Plans. Other documents included UNAPF annual progress reports, annual review meeting notes, the mid-term review, the UNCT and Resident Coordinator reports, agency level evaluations, minutes from Steering Committee, UNCT and results groups meetings, and other documents.

4. Stakeholders analysis

The UNAPF evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner, ensuring participation and involvement of key stakeholders (mainly government officials, civil society organizations, and development/UN partners) in the different phases of the evaluation.

A comprehensive Stakeholder Analysis was conducted during the inception phase to identify the primary users and stakeholders of this UNAPF evaluation—mainly government entities and a few civil society organizations. [See Annex 8: Stakeholder analysis](#), for more information.

A participatory-focused approach was adopted to involve central stakeholders, boost ownership of the evaluation, and incorporate the views of various stakeholders through meetings and interviews. Feedback on the evaluation report was obtained from stakeholders through meetings with the results groups, interviews, as well as circulation of the first and second draft reports to identify factual corrections from the United Nations and government.

The analysis was a helpful tool to address possible bias in the evaluation and define the sample of evaluation informants, which were chosen by the UNRCO. As the analysis was subject to budget and time constraints, it was decided that the consultants would meet the most accessible stakeholders

(geographically, linguistically, etc.) and those who were UNAPF direct beneficiaries or affiliated with implementing agencies. Besides meetings with NGOs, information was not collected from final beneficiaries or groups who may have been excluded or whose situation may have deteriorated due to the UNAPF interventions.

5. Mission to Azerbaijan

The International Consultant undertook a nine day mission in Azerbaijan (Baku) at the same time the national consultant started work with the mission. The mission took place from 9 July to 18 July 2019 and started with a debriefing with the UNRCO and Resident Coordinator. This was followed by meetings/interviews with UN Heads/Chiefs of Mission, government representatives, UNAPF Results Group co-chairs, workshops with results group members, and meetings with thematic groups, and donor organizations. The consultants conducted a debriefing at the end of the mission. See [Annex 4: UNAPF Evaluation mission agenda](#).

During the mission, the evaluation team met with a variety of stakeholders. Different lists of questions were used with different groups of respondents to triangulate findings and ensure that the data and conclusions were credible and convincing. The evaluation was conducted in an open, participatory manner, and every effort was made by the team to ensure respondents were treated confidentially, and in a manner that was sensitive to gender, cultural, institutional and other factors.

6. Meetings with results groups

The implementation of the UNAPF has been supported by results groups via United Nations organizations and key government representatives. The groups were established to support priority pillars and benefited from the participation of both resident and non-resident agencies. Following discussions with the UNRCO, it was decided to organize technical meetings with results group members without the chairs and co-chairs present. Meetings were organized by the Resident Coordinator Office, with the support of UN organizations and government counterparts (Ministry of Economy). The consultants prepared a list of specific questions. See [Annex 2: List of questions and agendas for UNAPF results group meetings](#).

The three meetings provided the UN and its partners with an opportunity to reflect collectively on the contribution of the UN system to Azerbaijan's development challenges, on the basis of expected UNAPF outcomes, identifying specific United Nations interventions that may have contributed to any observable result changes and in replying to evaluation questions.

One lesson learned; however, is that these meetings should have been complemented by an evaluation questionnaire based on evaluation questions and with a consolidated reply from each group—an idea explored during the inception phase. Indeed, these meetings provided information that was difficult for the evaluators to exploit because it was not precise enough and sometime contradictory. This made drafting of the report difficult.

7. Meetings with other groups

The consultants also met with other groups that played a role in UNAPF implementation: UNAPF M&E Group, the UNCG, the Operations Management Team, and the gender, human rights and SDG thematic

groups. Specific lists of questions were prepared for these meetings. [See Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings.](#)

It was decided to have a joint meeting of the theme groups given their importance in making the evaluation human rights and gender equality responsive. Consultants met with these groups to discuss programming principles and cross-cutting issues. This was particularly important in framing the approach and methodology for this evaluation, which referred to UNEG guidelines for integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation in several sections of this report.¹⁷ In addition, in the section on evaluation criteria and questions, specific criteria has been added to the usual OECD/DAC criteria (five programming principles), which was not in the ToR.

The consultants met other groups separately. With the M&E Group consultants discussed UNAPF design, the “SMARTness” of expected outcomes and indicators, the M&E framework, and monitoring and reporting. With the UNCG, the discussion was centered on the role of the group in supporting communication on the UNAPF. With the Operations Management Team the focus was on efficiency and links between operations and programming.

Similar lessons apply for meetings with other groups. The discussions were interesting; however, a questionnaire would have complemented the meetings and the consultants would have received more precise information from each group instead of depending on notes taken, which were not accurate enough, did not provide sufficient information to some question responses, and required significant effort in triangulating information with other sources.

8. Meetings and interviews with United Nations organizational heads and high-level government representatives

In addition to getting inputs from meetings with results and theme groups, consultants interviewed the heads of United Nations organizations and senior members of government; especially those in charge of co-chairing each priority area (1, 2 and 3), as well as others. This was done to glean complementary inputs from results groups’ co-chairs. In particular, key objectives of these meetings were to further analyze results achieved, addressing evaluation criteria and questions, and identifying lessons learned that can benefit the UNCT and the country in the implementation of the UNAPF and the next UNSDCF. These meetings added value to other information collection methods.

These consultations helped obtain information on the relevance, strategic positioning, effectiveness, and United Nations individual and joint contributions to the achievement of UNAPF outcomes. They provided insights for the future. The list of evaluation questions used can be found in [Annex 3: Guiding questions for specific meetings.](#)

A lesson learned from this process is that while individual interviews with heads of United Nations organizations were valuable for the evaluation, it would have been useful to have a meeting at the UNCT level to provide more consolidated views to the evaluators.

9. Meeting with non-governmental actors and youth organizations

¹⁷ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014, see <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>.

The consultants met with partners from civil society organizations, non-governmental actors, and youth organizations, particularly those representing vulnerable and marginalized groups. The sample of organizations were selected by the UNRCO. It should be noted that there are few NGOs or youth organizations working within the UNAPF framework; however, three meetings were organized with these actors. A guiding list of questions was prepared for this meeting. See [Annex 5: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).

10. Guidance and ethical standards

The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the 2016 United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and the UNEG–UNDG 2019 UNDAF evaluation guidelines. The UNEG Quality checklist for evaluation reports was also used and other guidelines were referenced in several sections of this report. The evaluation also applied ethical issues and considerations, including UNEG Ethical Guidelines, the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations system, and OECD/DAC evaluation principles, guidelines, and quality standards.¹⁸

UNEG ethical standards that guided the evaluation included the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and ethical safeguards for participants for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm).

The UNEG ethical considerations that consultants took into account in these meetings are as follows:

- **Confidentiality:** The evaluator shall respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. They will ensure sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.
- **Avoidance of harm:** Evaluations can have a negative effect on those who participate in them. Therefore, the evaluator shall seek to minimize risks to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation and maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur from negative or critical evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation.¹⁹

United Nations organizations and the UNRCO did not participate in these meetings as this evaluation aimed to learn about, and improve, development cooperation through enhanced dialogue and a shared understanding of development results and challenges, while taking into account that independence was a concern.

As the evaluation did not involve interviewing children other official ethical approval was not required.

11. Other meetings and field visits

A meeting with development partners who helped fund the UNAPF was organized. A meeting with private sector representatives was discussed but not contemplated further since they are not knowledgeable of

¹⁸ See in particular: the 2016 UNEG Norms and Standards (<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>), as well as the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations system (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>) and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (<http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>).

¹⁹ See the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (<http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>).

the framework and collaborate mainly with individual UN organizations. There may be other opportunities for such meetings during the UNAPF elaboration process.

Field visits were discussed with the UNRCO but not organized either. It was suggested to rely on other information collection methods to triangulate information. To be representative, visits should have been numerous enough and represented a wide range of stakeholders across the three UNAPF priority areas. Organizing such visits would have required an important investment of time on-site for both evaluators and evaluation commissioners.

12. Human rights and gender equality responsive evaluation

Significant efforts made this evaluation as human rights and gender responsive as possible. The evaluation analyzed three interrelated UNDAF Guidelines principles: LNOB, HRBA, and gender equality and women's empowerment, which guided most UNAPF implementation from 2017 onward as new UNDAF guidelines were issued that year, which coincided with the first joint work plan. This analysis is presented in the evaluation findings and in the section on the five principles, with a focus on these three principles. Other principles (results-based management, capacity development and environmental sustainability) are addressed in other sections.

For this analysis, the approach and methodology used the UNEG "Guidelines for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation."²⁰ The evaluation also used UNEG guidance on "UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator."²¹

A new criterion was added in the inception reports "five programming principles." This was done by consolidating some ToR questions and creating new and more specific ones. This provided a focus on human rights and gender equality and offered a clear overview of the inclusion of these principles in the UNAPF document and the implementation of these principles in the UNAPF cycle so far. This in turn provided a basis for specific recommendations, suggesting a greater mainstreaming of the UNSDCF guiding principle on gender equality and women's empowerment in line with June 2019 guidelines.²²

Consultants also carefully reviewed documents (UNAPF document, progress reports, etc.) to understand how the UNAPF document and implementation took into account these principles.

As mentioned, the consultancy team facilitated joint meetings of the three theme groups, which contributed to making the evaluation human rights and gender equality responsive. Group discussions went into depth on these programming principles so consultants could identify cross-cutting elements and understand how they were mainstreamed in the UNAPF document and implementation. This was done with a specific list of questions prepared for this meeting. See [Annex 5: Guiding questions for specific meetings](#).

The importance given to human rights and gender equality explains why this evaluation tried to reflect the views of various stakeholders, as much as possible, including non-governmental actors from vulnerable and marginalized groups. Specific meetings were organized with non-governmental actors and youth organizations.

²⁰ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014, <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>.

²¹ UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note, UNEG, 2018.

²² United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, Internal Guidance, 3 June 2019.

This was discussed in the Stakeholders Analysis as well, and human rights and gender equality was integrated by distinguishing five main types of stakeholders and specific examples:

- Duty bearers who have decision-making authority over an intervention, such as governing bodies or steering committees;
- Duty bearers who have direct responsibility for an intervention, such as programme managers;
- Secondary duty bearers, such as the private sector or parents;
- Rights holders (individually or through the civil society organizations acting on their behalf) who are the intended and unintended beneficiaries of the intervention; and,
- Rights holders (individually or through the civil society organizations acting on their behalf) who should be represented in the intervention, but are not or are negatively affected by the intervention.

To make this evaluation as human rights and gender responsive as possible, the following lines of inquiry were explored:

- The evaluation analyzed to what extent the HRBA had been reflected in the UNAPF document, and how it was used during UNAPF implementation. In particular, the analysis focused on whether UNAPF strategies, results and indicators addressed the standards of ratified human rights treaties (including international labor standards) and major recommendations of treaty body reports. Consultants also tried to determine if there was evidence of HRBA typical steps in the UNAPF document and implementation: (1) Causality analysis, (2) role-pattern analysis, and (3) capacity gap analysis.
- The evaluation also sought evidence for the extent to which the UNAPF strategies, results, and indicators were informed by the operational human rights principles of: (1) Non-discrimination and equality, (2) participation and inclusion, and (3) accountability and rule of law.
- The evaluation assessed if UNAPF outcomes, outputs, and indicators were fit to measure results in ways that ensured no-one is left behind in UN interventions. In particular, the evaluation looked for evidence that programme efforts successfully targeted and delivered development results to vulnerable groups.
- The evaluation analyzed to what extent, and in what ways, the concepts of gender equality, gender equity, and women's empowerment were reflected in the UNAPF (in terms of specific goals and targets set, sex-disaggregated data, and indicators). This included an assessment of how UNAPF strategies, results and indicators have been informed by gender analysis, and some understanding of how women and men experience problems differently. The evaluation asked stakeholders to offer examples on how HRBA and gender equality were applied during UNAPF implementation. Furthermore, the evaluation enquired into the existence of recommendations and a UNCT action plan following a SWAP gender scorecard assessment (or a similar exercise), which would provide insights into gender mainstreaming under the UNAPF, the ability to track budget allocations and, more generally, in addressing gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Finally, the evaluation determined ways that gender equality and empowerment of women can be better integrated in the next UNSDCF strategies and results framework.

13. Links between the UNAPF and SDGs

Some important developments took place domestically and globally since the UNAPF was signed in 2015, including the launch of the nationalization process of the SDGs that may have warranted, according to TORs, a strategic review of priorities, outcomes, and targets in the UNAPF document.

The joint meeting mentioned above included the SDG Thematic Group. Along with the desk review and interviews, it helped the consultants explore needs for the next UNSDCF in terms of: (i) reviewing the outcomes of the UNAPF in light of the nationalized SDGs (which has already been done against the global SDGs); (ii) providing a new direction for future activities to align the UNSDCF more closely with current national development priorities; (iii) developing links between ongoing United Nations programmes in the UNSDCF and SDGs, and (iv) developing recommendations for programming. In addition, consultants reviewed documents produced through the mid-term review (MTR) and reflected on all issues in several sections of this report.

14. Wrap-up meeting

Consultants planned to facilitate a UNAPF evaluation wrap-up meeting to summarize preliminary findings and recommendations generated by the evaluation process by way of a presentation to the UNRCO, UNCT, ERG, and Board. This was cancelled since many members were not in the country at the time the consultants' mission concluded.

15. Methods of analysis and report drafting

Regarding the "attribution" of United Nations results at the output level and analysis of "contributions" at the outcome level, the evaluation team used the "contribution analysis" and triangulation of multiple information sources to determine if the UN had made a tangible contribution to expected outcomes, and whether these influenced progress towards national development priorities.

The analysis of documents, meetings and interviews notes used 'before' and 'after' criteria to understand how behaviours changed or institutions performed prior to, and following, UNAPF interventions. This analysis offered alternative explanations for changes identified and tested their plausibility vis-à-vis UNAPF interventions. The analysis questioned stakeholders (during meetings and interviews) to imagine what the situation might have been without UNAPF interventions.

Despite these efforts, in a strategic outcome evaluation like this one, the UNDS contribution to change by way of expected outcomes and the delivery of outputs was difficult to prove. Rather, this evaluation examined whether there was a plausible case that could be made.

The evaluators presented a draft report, which included preliminary findings, lessons learned, conclusions, and provisional recommendations for current and future programming cycles. Recommendations were prepared by consultants, but were not discussed with primary stakeholders because of time constraints.

The report was prepared in accordance with UNEG guidelines, especially the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, and the FAQs for UNDAF Evaluations.

The first draft report was circulated by the UNRCO to identify factual corrections and suggested improvements from the UNCT. Consultants took this feedback into account and produced a second draft that was circulated to the UNCT and government partners (after a translation). They also synthesized all feedback received by the quality review (see section below), and produced a third report that was submitted to the UNRCO.

16. Quality assurance and management process

The UNRCO submitted the inception report for a quality assurance review by an outsourced company (Universalis) that was hired by the UNICEF Regional Office in Geneva to support UNDAF evaluation processes in countries of the region. The result of this review was provided to consultants who were grateful for the feedback and which raised interesting points that helped them improve the quality of the inception report.

Other aspects of quality assurance were included in this evaluation. An Evaluation Management and Oversight Board consisting of UNCT and government representatives was established to guide the evaluation process. The International Consultant had the overall responsibility for producing the UNAPF Evaluation Report and for the quality and timely submission of the report to the Evaluation Board. The Evaluation Board ensured that: 1) evaluation processes met UNEG norms, standards, and ethical guidelines, 2) evaluation findings were relevant and recommendations implementable, and 3) evaluation findings were disseminated and available for use and learning from the evaluation.

An Evaluation Reference Group was also established under the leadership and supervision of the Evaluation Board that was comprised of UNCT members and central stakeholders (national governmental and non-governmental counterparts). The ERG provided inputs and feedback on the evaluation design, facilitated access to information sources, and provided comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, the evaluation report in particular.

VII. EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Relevance and strategic positioning of the UNAPF

Relevance and strategic positioning were defined in the ToR as the extent to which the objectives of UNAPF are consistent with country needs, national priorities, the country's international and regional commitments on human rights, sustainable development and the environment, and the design of the UNAPF.

1. Relevance with respect to internationally agreed goals and human rights conventions

Finding: Evidence shows the UNAPF reflected the aspirations of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs. The UNAPF is also relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms, and standards.

The UNAPF document reflected the aspirations of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDGs. Building on the MDGs and broader Millennium Declaration it aimed to bring together efforts to further the social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development. The 2030 Agenda was endorsed at a high-level Special Summit in September 2015 in New York and required a new vision and a joined-up UNDS response to ensure the system was “fit for purpose” in supporting sustainable development and delivering effectively at the country level.

It should be noted; however, that at the time this UNAPF was developed in 2015, the Agenda 2030 document was being prepared and the UNCT may not have had sufficient time to fully align the UNAPF with Agenda 2030 and the SDGs.

The UNAPF document also reflected international commitments expressed in internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms, and standards. The document mentioned that the UNAPF followed up on recommendations generated by post-2015 national consultations, as well as conclusions from numerous international review processes. These included:

- Universal Periodic Review (UPR)
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)
- Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- International conventions on stateless persons and refugees, and guiding principles on internal displacement
- Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
- International Conference on Population and Development
- Beyond 2014 and the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)
- United Nations General Assembly Resolution on Non-Communicable Diseases (2011)
- Health 2020 policy
- United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, Japan (March 2015)
- United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP20) in Lima and the Conference of the Parties (COP21) in Paris (December 2015)

The UNAPF document also indicated that Azerbaijan has acceded or ratified 172 international treaties, protocols, and other instruments, including most core United Nations human rights treaties. In addition, it adopted the second National Human Rights Action Plan and implemented a number of relevant judicial and legal reforms. The UNAPF also specified that strategic priority areas had been informed by findings of the combined Country Analysis²³ and UNDAF Evaluation.

The importance given to the UNAPF and its implementation—against internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms and standards—was confirmed by documents and through meetings and interviews consultants conducted, which specified that:

²³ Country Analysis, UNCT in the Republic of Azerbaijan, May 2014.

- Human rights and gender equality are the fundamental principles that guide the implementation of the UNAPF and joint UNDS support of the government in achieving its national development priorities and meeting international commitments.
- The UNAPF implementation takes into consideration and promotes human rights (core human rights treaties, recommendations from human rights mechanisms including treaty bodies, special procedures, and the UPR).

2. Relevance with respect to national priorities

Finding: The UNAPF is extremely relevant with respect to national priorities, including Vision 2020 and new public investments and efforts on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Several other strategies mentioned in the UNAPF document were expected to feed into the implementation of the Vision 2020 strategy. Other national strategies, policies, programs and laws were issued during the UNAPF implementation, which remained relevant after its development.

In its Declaration of Commitment, the UNAPF document made a clear link with primary national priorities:

“In support of inclusive, equitable and sustainable development in the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Government and the United Nations Country Team pledge to work closely together to support fulfilment of the Vision 2020 development concept (hereinafter referred to as *Vision 2020*) as well as national implementation of the post-2015 development agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. In so doing, they will address the country’s development priorities in partnership with national counterparts, international development partners, civil society, the private sector, international finance institutions, and other stakeholders.”

The UNAPF built on government aspirations expressed in *Vision 2020*, which foresees the country becoming internationally competitive and economically diversified, with broader opportunities and decent work for all; a reduction in regional inequalities; strengthening of good governance, and increased benefits from quality social services. The national strategic priorities expressed in *Vision 2020* link with the UNAPF Outcomes in the table below.²⁴

Table 1: Links between Vision 2020 and UNAPF outcomes

Vision 2020	UNAPF outcomes
Toward a highly competitive economy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Formation of an economic model based on effective State regulation and mature market relations ● Improvement of the economic structure and development of the non-oil sector ● Support for scientific potential and innovative activity. 	Outcome 1.1: By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups;

²⁴ See UNAPF document, page 27.

<p>Improvement of transport, transit and logistics infrastructure and balanced development of regions</p> <p>Development of Information and Communication Technologies and ensuring a transition to an information society</p> <p>Development of human capital and establishment of an effective social security system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improvement of the population’s health and strengthening of the health care system ● Formation of a modern education system ● Improvement of the social security system ● Provision of gender equality and the development of the family ● Development of youth potential and sports ● Improvement of legislation and strengthening of institutional potential ● Development of civil society ● Promotion of productive and inclusive employment 	<p>Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation;</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: By 2020, Azerbaijan has made progress in line with international human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review, and other treaty obligations, and has strengthened capacities for implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with international standards;</p> <p>Outcome 2.3: By 2020, quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results.</p>
<p>Protection and effective management of cultural heritage</p> <p>Environmental protection and ecological issues</p>	<p>Outcome 3.1: By 2020, sustainable development policies and legislation are in place, are better implemented and coordinated in compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, recognize social and health linkages, and address issues of environment and natural resource management, energy efficiency and renewable energy, climate change, and resilience to hazards and disasters.</p>

Several other strategies were mentioned in the UNAPF document, which are relevant for its implementation such as the National Strategy for Information Society Development in the Republic of Azerbaijan (2014-2020), the State Programme for Improving Mother and Child Health (2014-2020), the State Programme on Population Development and Demography (2015-2025), the State Strategy for Education Development in the Republic of Azerbaijan, and the Azerbaijani Youth Development Strategy (2015-2025)

Since the development of the UNAPF several policies became relevant to the Framework, for example:

- The emergence of new economic strategic roadmaps for economic reform—the main areas that have been identified (green economy, enhancing the quality of the public and social services and inclusive labour markets) correspond to the three priority areas of the UNAPF.
- The Employment Strategy of the Republic of Azerbaijan 2019-2030.
- A new focus on diversification of industry.
- Efforts on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs.

- Nationalization of SDG targets and indicators, and submission of 2017 and 2019 Voluntary National Review reports to the High-Level Political Forum.
- The establishment of the National Coordination Council for Sustainable Development by Presidential Decree.
- Support from the International Labor Organization to the Self-Employment Program in the Republic of Azerbaijan

Other national strategies, policies, programs, and laws were issued during the UNAPF, which are also relevant to the UNAPF:

- The National Action Plan for the Promotion of the Open Government for 2016-2018 (2018).
- Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan “On Grain” (2016 and 2017).
- The Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the On the assessment of environmental impact (2018).
- National Action Plan on Early Prevention and Treatment of Childhood Disabilities 2018-2020 (2018).
- State Program on traffic safety in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2019-2023 (2018).
- Amendment to the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on Road Traffic (2017).
- The Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the Restriction of Use of Tobacco Products (2017).
- State Program for the Development of Official Statistics in the Republic of Azerbaijan in 2018-2025 (2018).
- National Strategy for Improvement of Solid Waste Management in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2018-2022 (2018).
- State Program on Digital Payment Expansion in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2018-2020 (2018).²⁵
- The Commission for Regulation of Labor Relations and Coordination (2017).
- Action Plan for Prevention of Non-Formal Employment in the Republic of Azerbaijan (2017).
- State Program for Social-Economic Development of Regions in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2019-2023
- Action Plan (2019) on Prevention of Sexual Selection of Children Until Birth for 2020-2025
- The National Strategy on Protection and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2017-2020 (2016)
- The Action Plan on Mitigation of Negative Environmental Impact of Wastes Generating from Plastic Packages in the Republic of Azerbaijan for 2019-2020 (2019)

3. Relevance with respect to development issues, and their underlying causes and challenges

Finding: The evaluation confirms the relevance of the UNAPF to addressing Azerbaijan development issues, and their underlying causes and challenges. Particular attention was given to the needs of vulnerable groups and improving living standards for all, which is in line with the SDGs and imperative of *leaving no one behind*. At the same time, the UNAPF intended to move upstream with approaches and assist policymakers in charting a course for new development goals in Azerbaijan, ensuring that the next generation of national goals has a greater emphasis on equity, quality and sustainability. In addition to baseline assessments and other types of studies, a Country Analysis was conducted to inform UNAPF development, which helped fully address development issues, and underlying causes and challenges.

²⁵ See document prepared for the Rapid Integrated Assessment, “Conduct a rapid mapping assessment of the alignment of existing policies to the SDGs,” which also contains a list of state programmes.

In terms of UNAPF relevance in addressing development issues, and their underlying causes and challenges, the UNAPF document explained that people in Azerbaijan have high expectations for tangible improvements in their daily lives and that increased dividends from stability and economic growth should enhance confidence in their future. Therefore, Azerbaijan should continue to manage its development process carefully to reduce inherent vulnerabilities in a diverse society and further consolidate and share best practices, with the expansion of inclusive development being critical.

The UNAPF document also observed that many middle-income countries face shared development challenges and have fallen behind in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Symptoms of the “middle-income trap” can be observed in most MICs and translates into stagnant growth; vulnerability to external shocks; growing inequality and social exclusion of some groups; failure to compete with low-income, low-wage economies in manufacturing exports; inability to compete with advanced economies in high-skill innovations; low levels of diversification; income inequality; youth unemployment, and market, institutional, governance and behavioural weaknesses that inhibit the adoption of the latest technologies. Many MICs fail to move to the high-income level and also face the risk of falling below the poverty line.

Moreover, the UNAPF detailed development challenges in Azerbaijan in a useful table that covered four categories of causes: economic; socio-cultural; institutional and governance; and environmental and geographic.

The UNAPF focused on the needs of vulnerable groups and improving living standards for all, which is in line with the SDG imperative of *leaving no one behind*. At the same time, the UNAPF intended to move upstream with approaches and assist policymakers in capitalizing on opportunities to review achievements in the country, refine existing goals, and chart the course for new development goals in Azerbaijan to ensure the next generation of national goals places greater emphasis on equity, quality, and sustainability.

Based on the reading of other documents and key informant inputs, evidence confirms the relevance of the UNAPF to addressing development issues in Azerbaijan, and underlying causes and challenges.

It should be noted that, to inform the current UNAPF, a Country Analysis was conducted.²⁶ This limited the availability of reliable baseline data and analysis at the beginning of the UNAPF and may have made it difficult to reach the groups of people most in need, or in fully addressing development issues for these groups and underlying causes and challenges. Nevertheless, although there was no CCA during UNAPF development, an analysis of the M&E Plan showed that baseline assessments and other types of studies were conducted by United Nations organizations. In addition, in the progress reports there are many examples of how United Nations organizations supported the government in data collection.

4. Comparative advantage of the United Nations Development System

Finding: The comparative advantages and added value of the United Nations, including some non-resident organizations, have been utilized in a variety of ways by national partners under the UNAPF.

²⁶ Country Analysis, United Nations Country Team in the Republic of Azerbaijan, May 2014.

An analysis of documents and meetings with key informants from the government and UN showed that national partners benefited from a number of comparative advantages brought by the United Nations (including non-resident organizations) through the UNAPF implementation. Partners appreciated the following:

- Vast array of expertise at its disposal (globally) that could be deployed to support Azerbaijan efforts in achieving the SDGs.
- Strategic platform provided by the UNAPF, which brought the mandates, technical expertise, and resources of United Nations organizations in Azerbaijan to ensure increased impact on national development.
- The UNDS as a reliable partner for development cooperation; national partners have a sense of reliability when cooperating with the United Nations and trust based on long-term partnerships.
- Capacity to bring human capital improvements and train people.
- Capacity of the UN to work at political, policy, and strategy levels to accompany social and economic development.
- Value added of the UN in upstream work, advocacy and policy support as a promoter, a broker, and a think-tank.
- Expertise available within the UNDS, including non-resident agencies.
- Capacity to assist by showcasing its experience in offering innovative solutions to address development challenges, following Azerbaijan's repositioning from a recipient country to a regional player.
- United Nations positioning as a partner of choice for impartial and high-quality support, technical expertise, and advice on development needs.

5. Design of the UNAPF

Findings: The UNAPF is important as an instrument to capture a shared vision and mission for the United Nations and government, and is an enabling and broad enough framework. However, there are some limitations in its focus and design, in particular because of insufficiencies in the "SMARTness" of the results matrix. Some indicators are formulated in a way that does not allow for the effective monitoring and evaluation of results. Several indicators are high and too ambitious for the United Nations to make significant contributions. An additional challenge is related to the difficulty of monitoring and evaluating results, especially advocacy and policy development targets.

The design of the UNAPF was defined in the ToR as the extent to which the UNAPF is designed to respond to the expected positioning of a, "revitalized, strategic, flexible, results and action-oriented UNDAF as the most important instrument for planning and implementation" in the UNDS.

The evaluation found the focus of the UNAPF is to guide the work of the United Nations and Government of Azerbaijan on certain strategic priorities, and help all connect to economic, social and environmental issues. The UNAPF is an important instrument to capture a shared vision and mission, between the UN and government. Each entity has their own mandate, structure and technical areas and all partners see what they can bring to serve the general goal. The three pillars under the UNAPF are still priority areas for the government.

According to key informants, the UNAPF outcomes and outputs have been designed in a way that allows at least some UNDS attributions (outcomes) and contributions (outputs) to be captured. Indeed, all key stakeholders, contributions, roles and required resources are clearly outlined in the UNAPF document and work plans, and all United Nations organizations were given the opportunity to contribute.

The UNAPF provides a collective and integrated response to the national priorities of the government in three strategic priority areas, five outcome areas, and aims at achieving targets set for 47 outputs during 2019-2020. The evaluation found that the number of outputs varied over the years, but not substantially. Joint Work Plans had 46 outputs in 2017 and 44 in 2018. This shows that the UNCT adapts the outputs every year, depending on developments, which shows a positive adaptability of the UNAPF implementation over time. The evaluation makes other observations about the quantity of outputs in other sections of this report including the section on the challenge of measuring results.

Nonetheless, in terms of challenges related to the focus and design of the UNAPF document it was observed that UNAPF actors were critical about Framework focus and design, in particular because of insufficiencies in the “SMARTness” of the results matrix. The evidence shows the main limitations pertaining to the results matrix are as follows:

- Some indicators are formulated in a way that does not allow for effective monitoring and evaluation of results.
- For some indicators it is not possible to measure change despite modifications made in 2018 after the MTR.
- Some indicators are not measurable, in general or at this point in time. Measuring their impact in the long-term is even more difficult.
- The coverage of some indicators is questionable. Employment, for example, only measures the reduction in the percentage of unemployed but not the percentage/number of the employed workforce.
- Some indicators may not be fully adjusted and brought in line with United Nations Climate Change Convention indicators.
- Several indicators are very high, and too general or ambitious for the UN to significantly contribute to or achieve (e.g. the indicator on the increase of GDP average annual growth rate in non-oil sector, which is a macro level indicator). Though the UNDS can provide employment opportunities to a few hundred people it cannot substantially influence the increase in GDP. The United Nations wants to show its contribution, but the UNAPF has not been always realistic in these cases. GDP growth is an impact level indicator and needs collaborative efforts from all partners, mainly government.
- This raises the issue of how the UN can assume responsibility for action in Azerbaijan and how many development contribution claims can be made. It is difficult to report on achievements if a goal is to improve GDP. In this case, it is difficult for the United Nations to claim anything because it has little control on this particular goal. Outcomes correspond to changes at the institutional level and behavioral changes. Therefore, outcome results can only be achieved together with the government and other partners.
- Some indicators are not placed under the relevant outcome. For instance, the indicator on road traffic incidents is not specifically relevant to environmental and ecological issues.
- Another indicator referring to the sustainable use of rural lands is not well defined.

It should be noted that the UNAPF was already formulated in 2016, when several United Nations Representatives started new positions in Azerbaijan. This meant they inherited an UNAPF they had not prepared and had limited insights into.

That said, the UNAPF is an enabling and broad enough framework. For example, the Global Fund suggested the government purchase medicines for communicable diseases, such as HIV and tuberculosis, through an international organization, and the UNAPF structure was not an obstacle when UNDP sustainably procured medicine. Government institutions often ask if UNDP can help with capacity building, training or study tours, technical assistance, rolling out programmes, or procurement. In this regard, UNDP has a mixed portfolio, and demands can often be met within the UNAPF framework. The evaluation concludes that the UNAPF is flexible enough to accommodate specific demands from government institutions.

B. Effectiveness of the UNAPF

The effectiveness of the UNAPF was defined in the ToR as the extent to which the UNCT contributed to outcomes defined in the UNAPF.

1. Effectiveness of the UNAPF with respect to expected outcomes

Finding: Some progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of national priorities, including strengthening national capacities and institutions, policy formulation and implementation, data collection and analysis (in all three UNAPF priority areas), Progress was also achieved in supporting the government in cross-cutting areas, advancing towards SDG achievement, empowering youth and women, and in the area of human rights. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the majority of planned interventions under outcomes seem to have been implemented during 2016-2018 or will be implemented between 2019 and 2020.

This section summarizes the results achieved by the UN in Azerbaijan when implementing the UNAPF during 2016-2018. It is mainly based on UNAPF progress reports for 2017 and 2018, given that they provided good information on the most important achievements.

This section highlights achievements on the SDGs, given their importance, which is formally part of Priority Area 1 within the latest 2018 and 2019-2020 JWPs. The section then reports progress for each priority area, and makes a special reference to youth, women, and human rights as cross-cutting issues.

For assessing progress against Joint Work Plans, United Nations organizations reported against output indicators set in JWPs by providing the current status of indicators and showing progress using a color-coded “traffic light” approach where green represented “achieved”, yellow was “partially achieved”, orange was “constrained,” and red was “not achieved.”

In 2017, 27 output indicators were achieved, 50 were partially achieved, four were constrained, and eight were not achieved. In 2018, 57 indicators were achieved, 33 were partially achieved, 20 were constrained, and 16 were not achieved. An analysis of these numbers shows a relatively good level of achievements each year, with an increase from 2017 to 2018, due to the fact that many activities started in 2017 and

were achieved in 2018. Results can also be considered good given that they report three years of implementation, from 2016 to 2018, and two years remained when reporting was completed at the end of 2018. The two remaining years are 2019 and 2020.

It is also noted that 2016 is not covered by the JWPs and the UNCT retroactively collected budgetary information for that year. New activities were communicated and added throughout the UNAPF cycle and integrated in JWPs.

Overall, the evaluation considers the majority of planned interventions under outcomes seems to have been implemented during 2016-2018 or will be implemented between 2019 and 2020.

The UNCT provides a collective and integrated response to national priorities in three UNAPF strategic priority areas, five outcome areas, and in several cross-cutting areas.

Support to government in advancing towards SDG achievement

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015. Over the last three and half years, Azerbaijan has demonstrated a firm commitment towards achieving the 2030 Agenda and SDGs.

The United Nations worked with the National Coordination Council for Sustainable Development (NCCSD), established in 2016 and chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister, the State Statistical Committee, and other institutions, to identify policy and programming actions that can accelerate SDG achievement. The UN and UNDP played special roles in supporting the NCCSD from day one. UNDP engaged different groups, including the private sector, media, parliamentarians and the public, among others, in understanding the Global Goals and actions they could take. UNDP and other organizations also organized many events, workshops, and other activities across the country, including:

- Capacity building support and policy advice provided to the NCCSD and the State Statistical Committee for the SDG nationalization process. The UNDS assisted the NCCSD in preparing its first and second reports on the Voluntary National Review, which were presented at the United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development in New York in July 2017 and 2019, respectively.
- The UNCT assisted the government with the Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) exercise to formulate policy options for the SDGs. Azerbaijan was also one of the first countries to engage with MAPS. Under the leadership of UNDP, and with involvement of the UNCT, a team of experts carried out a MAPS mission to Azerbaijan in May/June 2017. The exercise built upon the Rapid Integrated Assessment conducted in Azerbaijan in November/December 2016 by the NCCSD with UNCT support. After extensive consultations with the government, civil society, and the private sector, the mission produced a draft MAPS report outlining concrete policy options and recommendations that could accelerate the SDGs nationally, focusing on: an inclusive labour market, greener growth, greater gender equality, and enhanced social service delivery. Progress was reviewed at a MAPS follow-up workshop in Baku in February 2018.

- United Nations organizations supported the Baku Forum for Sustainable Development, organized October 25-26, 2018, and were dedicated to strengthening regional partnerships in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.
- FAO carried out various activities, including an assessment of SDG implementation in agriculture, food, fisheries and forestry, as well as awareness raising and capacity development for public sector, parliamentarians, and the private sector.
- The conceptual framework and format of a National Informational Portal on SDG indicators, including gender-disaggregated indicators, was developed by the government with UNDP support and launched in July 2019. Vital to implementing the 2030 Agenda is having a strong statistical system that can measure and monitor progress across the SDGs. Several United Nations organizations (FAO, UNFPA, UNDP, UNICEF and WHO) worked closely with the National Coordination Council for Sustainable Development, State Statistical Committee, and other institutions to improve data mining and analysis for monitoring SDG achievement. Other results in this area included: (i) Sex-disaggregated data became available for 10 more indicators and integrated into the national population database; (ii) the Washington Module for collecting disability related data was tested through the National Family Budget Survey in 2018 and will be integrated in the 2019 Census; (iii) State Statistics Committee staff and those from other related institutions were trained on SDG indicators and data visualization as impactful ways to communicate externally; (iv) in-depth analysis of data collected through Child Deprivation Studies in 2015 and 2017 provided insight on the impact of the financial crisis on children and their families; and (v) a socio-economic assessment of 83% of refugee households was conducted, providing information on living conditions, food consumption, incomes, and more.
- To raise public awareness and engage with civil society, business, and media, the UNCT and NCCSD developed and launched a Joint SDG Campaign Strategy for 2017 and 2018. In 2017, the foundation for a series of advocacy and awareness raising activities was laid, which included an agreement with ASAN Radio (public radio station) to broadcast weekly bulletins on the SDGs, as well as identifying partners to translate messages into local languages, design promotional materials, and place stands and posters in public places.
- Many other activities were implemented to raise awareness on the Sustainable Development Goals in partnership with various government agencies, the private sector, scientific and academic institutions, civil society and non-governmental organizations. Key panel discussions were dedicated to the SDGs in various high-level events: the Baku Forum on Sustainable Development and the Republican Innovation Competitions. In this regard, the Ministry of Economy finds it expedient to assign focal points within relevant government agencies to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of UNAPF cooperation.
- A conference on “Health and gender: Responsibilities of European Union member states’ and Eastern Partners’ Parliaments, and the role of the European Parliament in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 3 and 5” was organized by UNFPA in 2017 at the national Parliament in cooperation with Euronest Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee on Social Affairs, the European Parliamentary Forum on Population and Development, and the United

Nations. The conference included sessions that specifically looked at the role of parliament in implementing the SDGs, with examples from other countries.

- Finally, during 2018, in its efforts to prioritize and nationalize the SDGs the government issued a list of prioritized goals and indicators for accelerated achievement towards the end of the year, but no national targets were set due to lack of baselines.
- The strong UN focus on policy formulation and implementation helped shape strategies in agriculture, health, and social service sectors. The National Employment Strategy (2019-2030), developed with support from ILO, was approved by the President of Azerbaijan in October 2018. The Law on Environmental Impact Assessment of Azerbaijan, supported by DPUNAPF, entered into force in July 2018.

Strategic Priority Area 1 - Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development underpinned by increased diversification and decent work

Vision 2020 goals: Towards a highly competitive economy; balanced development of regions; development of human capital; ensuring transition to an information society.

Outcome 1: By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.

The Government's 2020 Vision aims to create a more diversified and highly competitive economy, powered by a skilled workforce, and where financial growth is balanced across regions. In the last three and half years, the United Nations - Azerbaijan Partnership Framework saw progress in support of this ambition with improvements in employment sector management, gains made towards diversifying the economy, and where marginalized people were given new skills and employment opportunities.

Job seekers and employees are set to benefit from new national strategies and frameworks finalized through the partnership in 2018, while thousands of young people, women and rural residents gained new skills and access to employment opportunities. A key element of the government's development vision involves a more diversified economy and the Partnership Framework helped make important progress in high potential sectors such as agriculture and ICT. New opportunities for those affected by conflict marginalization were also delivered.

This is the summary of results (at the output level) of United Nations activities in Azerbaijan in the implementation of the UNAPF between 2016 and 2019. Presented are key achievements, lessons learned, and challenges.

The UN supported the government in boosting employment opportunities, skill development, and education of the workforce in non-oil sectors, paying particular attention to the economic empowerment of women and vulnerable communities. Targeted capacity building activities helped equip young and unemployed people, including women, with basic professional, business development, and organizational

skills. As a direct result of these capacity building activities, many were able to set up their own businesses or get a job.

The National Employment Strategy (2019-2030) was approved by the President in October 2018, enabling better management of Azerbaijan's labour resources, employment, and social protection. 2,631 persons were females and 1,426 persons were youth from total 10,352 persons employed by self-employment program implemented by the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of Population in 2019. The highly successful Women's Resource Centres, which help rural women realize business ideas, expanded to three additional districts and supported over 1,000 women in 2018, bringing the total to 6,000 women supported across the country. Result group members noted that subsidy and stimulation programmes were introduced by the government to increase youth employment, self-employment was promoted (a concrete example being the creation of "Simplified Support to Family Businesses" in 2016, which carries out socially oriented projects and supports family businesses, and now works with 350 family businesses), and the three SYSLab centers (Systems Laboratory for Innovation and Employment) were created to promote employment, especially for youth, with UNDP support.

In the area of migration and refugees, the UN promoted labor migration and its inclusion in broader national development policy objectives. Despite this the vast majority of refugees still lack the legal right to decent employment. UNHCR advocated for improving asylum decision making and integration procedures for refugees and stateless people in accordance with best international experience and practices.

In the area of food and agriculture, FAO helped enhance food security by supporting the implementation of government reform agendas, strengthening institutional and technical capacities, drafting policy, strategy, and legislation in seed production and certification, land consolidation, and antimicrobial resistance. It is important to note that, assistance provided to the government in the development of a new National Strategy on the Adoption and Promotion of Organic Agriculture, as well as in the design and introduction of the certification system on organic agriculture, created new opportunities for farmers across the country.

Strategic Priority Area 2 - Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services

Vision 2020 goals: Improvement of legislation and strengthening of institutional potential; development of human capital and provision of an effective social security system; balanced development of regions; development of civil society; ensuring transition to an information society; protection and effective management of cultural heritage.

Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation.

Azerbaijan has seen rapid socioeconomic changes with wide-ranging reforms, including the modernization of public services. The United Nations- Azerbaijan Partnership Framework supported this critical process by enhancing the ability of institutions to design laws, policies and action plans informed by evidence and transparently implemented. The Partnership Framework helped strengthen the ability of national institution and staff to deliver social services and secure Azerbaijan's borders. Work to ensure that

services reach vulnerable people continued with innovative methods of supporting those on the margins piloted or expanded.

E-governance took several steps forward with the trialing of the ‘Mobile Signature’ to improve public service delivery, and new online features now provide easier access to information and services for foreigners and Azerbaijanis alike as they cross national borders. The Partnership Framework supported the government in its efforts to ensure that social services are available to all members of society, including children, women, and people with disabilities. This involved finding more effective and innovative ways of reaching refugees, the displaced, and otherwise vulnerable, through mobile legal aid clinics and better coordinated systems for child protection.

WHO, UNICEF and UNFPA supported several projects aimed at strengthening the national health system in Azerbaijan. These included reviews on child mortality, promotion of exclusive breastfeeding, capacity building of health personnel in infant and young child feeding practices, monitoring of immunization systems, implementation of a nationwide STEP²⁷ survey on risk factors associated with non-communicable diseases, upgrading national legislation in the area of flour fortification, implementation of mandatory health insurance pilot projects and the national maternal and child health programme, as well as the preparation of the National Reproductive Health Strategy for 2017- 2020.

In the area of social services, UNICEF developed the Child Centered and Equity Focused Social Services Strategy in cooperation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, and local NGOs to broaden the range of services and support mechanisms of welfare assistance for vulnerable and at-risk families. It was a step towards a fully comprehensive approach to child protection. The National Strategy on Juvenile Justice was drafted with support from the World Bank and submitted to the Ministry of Justice. UNICEF also supported the development of a comprehensive system for Early Detection and Prevention of Childhood disabilities by developing a national action plan and offering training of trainers on the monitoring of child development for primary health care level pediatricians. A number of activities were implemented to stimulate an active participation of youth in decision-making and resilience building.

Important efforts were made in rendering education more inclusive for all children and to better target pre-school age children. Continued advocacy for inclusive education resulted in the approval of a State Programme for Development of Inclusive Education 2018-2024. With support from UNICEF, the one-year pre-school attendance rate for five-year old children increased from 14.2% in 2014 to 75% in 2018.

At the regional level, UNDP helped share Azerbaijan’s experience in implementing pension reforms with high-level staff of the Extra-Budgetary Pension Fund under the Ministry of Finance of Uzbekistan. Likewise, UNDP shared the one-stop-shop model of “ASAN service” with a number of countries using the South-South Cooperation modality. UNICEF, in collaboration with colleagues from UNCT Georgia, carried out a qualitative study on the situation of street children in both countries.

Box: Examples of results achieved in supporting vulnerable communities with the UN support in 2017

²⁷ The STEPS Noncommunicable Disease Risk Factor Survey is a survey methodology to help countries begin to develop their own surveillance system to monitor and fight against noncommunicable diseases. For additional information, see <http://www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/steps/en/>.

- About 2,000 people from vulnerable groups received legal aid.
- About 4,000 disadvantaged children and youth benefited from social service projects.
- About 3,000 IDPs, refugees and other vulnerable people improved their vision and hearing by receiving eye-glasses or hearing aids from the Government of Japan.
- 226 refugees accessed secondary healthcare services.
- The in-service teacher training programme for more than 4,600 teachers from 61 regions contributed to the School Readiness Programme reaching 103,000 children.
- The Project “Inclusion of 3-5-Year-Old Children in Community-Based Preschool Education”, which started in 2017 with the financial support of UNICEF and the European Union currently covers a total of 6,197 children in 320 communities in 32 regions.
- 296 refugees accessed primary and secondary education and specialized training programs.
- 52 children with intelligent disabilities have been engaged in regular classes and received education in an inclusive setting.
- Internally displaced people set up 74 businesses.
- 201 refugee and asylum-seeker households benefited from financial assistance.

Strategic Priority Area 3 - Improving environment management and resilience to hazards and disasters

Vision 2020 goals: Environmental protection and ecological issues; improvement of legislation and strengthening of institutional potential; development of human capital.

Outcome 3.1: By 2020, sustainable development policies and legislation are in place, better implemented and coordinated in compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, recognize social and health linkages, and address issues of environment and natural resource management, energy efficiency and renewable energy, climate change and resilience to hazards and disasters.

With climate change affecting every country, including Azerbaijan, the United Nations worked with both industry and government to introduce measures to cut emissions and help people and economic sectors adapt. The Partnership Framework supported the government to put in place the right laws, policies and systems that better manage the environment and agricultural sector, and shield both from harmful economic activities. As people across the country are vulnerable to earthquakes, floods and other natural disasters, this Framework also supported a variety of national actions to ensure resilience in the face of natural and man-made disasters.

The Partnership Framework backed the Government of Azerbaijan as it strove to slash greenhouse gas emissions by 35% by 2030,²⁸ with UNDP support. This involved assisting the government in taking stock of current emissions, and providing decision makers with critical information to underwrite the most effective policies and actions to counter climate change. It also involved working with the State Oil Company of Azerbaijan to showcase how the private sector can take action. Meanwhile, environmental protection and the management of forestry, marine and national parks were improved with new laws developed in collaboration with the United Nations and measures taken to improve sustainable forest management. The latter included the opening of Azerbaijan’s first Marine National Park, which covers an

²⁸ Compared to the base year (1990).

area close to 100,000 hectares along the coast of the Caspian Sea. Moreover, policy advice was provided to the government for reformation and improvement of the forest management system in the country. A National Forestry Program, developed with technical support from FAO, was sent to the Cabinet for approval.

Highlights include the Law on Environmental Impact Assessment of Azerbaijan that entered into force in July 2018 and the preparation of six pieces of secondary legislation to implement this law. With UNECE and FAO support, the government boosted its ability to manage locust outbreaks with a new monitoring system and through training responsible officials. Likewise, for the first time since independence, the government uses sustainable forest management criteria and indicators for application in forestry inventory and management planning. Support was also provided to improve the sanitary and phytosanitary control capacities of the government by strengthening institutional and staff capacities in the field of plant diagnostics, inspection, and relevant procedures related to imported and exported agricultural products, as well as modernizing the National Phytosanitary Laboratory and Republic Quarantine Expertise Centre.

Furthermore, UN organizations provided technical expertise to the government on better monitoring, analyzing and reporting on greenhouse gas emissions, carbon flows, and carbon storage potential, as well as reporting under major multilateral environmental agreements. In addition, public debates on the renewable energy future of Azerbaijan were facilitated in collaboration with the State Agency for Alternative and Renewable Energy Sources and UNDP. A dialogue involving policy and decision makers, energy companies, NGOs, academia and private sector representatives stimulated discussions about the renewable energy sector in the country for the first time.

Empowering youth

Around 30% of Azerbaijan's population are between 14 and 29 years old. Through the Partnership Framework the United Nations worked to empower young people as positive agents of social change. This involved supporting them in engaging their peers on social issues and the SDGs, along with promoting positive images of young people with disabilities, and providing opportunities for youth to enhance their skills in decision-making, public participation and STEM.

To ensure that efforts are more responsive to the needs and concerns of young people, and to engage them in decision making processes, the United Nations in Azerbaijan reactivated the United Nations Youth Advisory Council (UNYAC) in 2016. This Council provided important insights, helping shape the United Nations work with young people. In 2018, 11 young council members from diverse backgrounds continued to make progress and the highlights included:

- To reach youth, 17 young leaders were selected as SDG ambassadors and equipped with the necessary skills and tools to promote the Global Goals among young people.
- A United Nations—government joint pilot initiative strengthened existing Youth House functions to better deliver youth engagement activities.
- The first national Master's degree course was launched to prepare professional young people on supporting youth development. Six higher education institutions agreed to implement the programme as of September 2019.

- A cutting-edge robotics lab opened its doors to students for the first time in Azerbaijan. This one-of-a-kind facility helps students understand computer and robotic technologies, and enhance their competencies in programming, mechanics, and electronics while also boosting learning in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Empowering women

Efforts to achieve gender equality through a twin-track approach were intensified. A Participatory Gender Audit was held to assess the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT in line with the UN strategy for advancing gender equality in policies to ensure design and development of more gender-responsive programmes and projects. A series of important initiatives were undertaken to generate further evidence regarding the prevalence rates of gender-based violence (GBV) in the country; barriers to the economic advancement of women in private sector; factors impeding effective implementation of gender transformative programming; costs and benefits of modern family planning methods, along with others. A series of advocacy events engaging hundreds of thousands of people were held to improve policy making to promote girls' and women's rights and address GBV and gender-biased sex selection. An action plan to prevent gender-biased sex selection was developed and is set for implementation. Moreover, the National Action Plan on GBV prevention and response and a National Action Plan on Gender Equality were prepared with UNFPA support.

Human rights

The United Nations boosted stakeholder ability (from government, civil society and legal communities) to better implement human rights in Azerbaijan. Advocacy efforts promoted the rights of children, while the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was used to reflect on, and celebrate, the history and fundamental importance of human rights. The occasion was marked with artistic expressions and a call for everyone to stand up for human rights. The capacities of thousands of school-aged children were improved on how to guard against human trafficking. National Master Trainers on child rights are now equipped to facilitate training on child rights in the country. The Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the Protection of Children from Harmful Information has been adopted.

United Nations joint support was instrumental in helping the government improve the enforcement of international standards in the area of human rights, strengthening national capacities to collect and process data, as well as using data in the application and design adequate policies. Several data collection activities generated quality data on the situation of vulnerable populations.

The UNAPF focused expressly on vulnerable groups and a number of projects address different groups such as IDPs, people with disabilities, and war veterans—demonstrating UNAPF effectiveness in promoting the SDG pledge of *leaving no one behind*. According to results group members, projects and initiatives include: support to the realization of international human rights standards in the country, and the empowerment of young people (e.g. 17 youth ambassadors), women (support to over 1,000 rural women through Women Resource Centers), and people with disabilities (through different projects, including those on economic empowerment).

As a final word in this section on effectiveness, it is worth mentioning that at the 2018 Steering Committee meeting the Deputy Minister of Economy considered that although 2017 was challenging for the country,

several achievements were attained under the UNAPF. Progress was observed on outcome indicators like the Human Development Index and gender equality indicators. At the most recent 2019 Steering Committee meeting the Minister of Economy stated that the UNAPF contributed to skills development in the non-oil sector, the modernization of agriculture, and sustainable use of natural resources.

2. Positive factors and challenges in achieving results

Finding: Some of the main factors that contributed to progress towards UNAPF outcomes has been a stable political environment and good relationships between the government and United Nations. In terms of challenges, limited coordination among government entities has been a constraint in UNAPF implementation.

A stable political environment and good relationships between the government and United Nations played an important role in making the UNAPF produce more effective results. In addition, throughout the UNAPF, international experiences and best practices were utilized on different levels, which enhanced effectiveness in reaching results by learning from other countries.

Documents, and information from results group meetings and interviewees indicated that limited coordination among state entities seems to have been a constraint for UNAPF implementation. Information-sharing has not been optimal among partners, which delayed and weakened work effectiveness.

It is important to note; however, that the Ministry of Economy considers it has completely fulfilled its coordination function towards the implementation of the aforementioned document in both holding results groups and Steering Committee meetings, and in exchanging information or addressing other issues within its competence.

C. COORDINATION AND PROCESSES

Coordination was defined in the ToR as the validity of the stated collective added value of the UNDS in Azerbaijan.

1. Synergies amongst United Nations agencies, joint programming and joint programmes

Finding: The UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among UN programmes through the regular sharing of information. It resulted in a few joint programmes and some joint programming by United Nations organizations. The UNAPF also increased inter-agency collaboration and involved UN organizations in participation or co-chairing of results groups, and in collectively developing and monitoring Joint Work Plans. There is also a good synergy within the UNCT where agencies support each other when possible. Challenges in creating and implementing joint programmes include operational and practical implications, for example double charging, or the fact that agencies work with different strategies, or an increasing competition for funding. Some solutions can be found at the UNCT level while others should be sought at headquarters level.

The UNDAFP document indicated it would apply the most appropriate and feasible elements of the Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One (DaO). The UNCT used the Standard Operating

Procedures to accelerate UNAPF implementation and deliver joint results. This was done through the procedural pillars of: One Programme; Common Budgetary Framework; One Leader (to finalize and endorse the UNCT Code of Conduct); Operating as One (to initiate the Business Operations Strategy approach); Communicating as One (to formulate a joint communications strategy), and developing a joint resource mobilization strategy. All pillars are addressed in different sections of this evaluation report.

The evaluation found that through different mechanisms the UNAPF contributed to achieving better collaboration amongst UN programmes. The UNAPF increased inter-agency/organizational collaboration that involved results group participation and JWP design, implementation, and reporting. The UNAPF is an opportunity for UN organizations to remind themselves about the importance of aligning organizational approaches and supporting each other whenever possible. For example, IOM's counter-trafficking work has some health-related components the organization is considering connecting to a WHO strategy on the technical side.

UNRCO support and strategic leadership is improving due to increased capacities and resources, including those outlined in the UNDS reform framework, which strengthened the Resident Coordinator Office by delinking it from UNDP and increasing funds as of January 2019.

United Nations organizations recognized; however, that synergies could be enhanced and the UNAPF implementation has weaknesses. For instance, organizations do not necessarily see the document as a guidance framework, but rather a reference document. Furthermore, collective efforts between agencies are not visible and there are limitations in inter-ministerial collaboration.

The UNAPF document indicated that the UNCT is collectively responsible, at a strategic level, for the implementation of the UNAPF through joint programmes (where appropriate), partnership building, planning/reporting, and joint advocacy efforts, within the strategic outcomes and cross-cutting areas. The evaluation observes this ambition was not fully met, since there are few joint programmes that implement the UNAPF in a coordinated manner.

The main programme is: "Addressing rights and well-being of women with disabilities and veterans of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict."²⁹ Programme duration is 24 months, from December 2018 to December 2020 and has an estimated budget of \$995,540 US dollars. The joint programme is funded by the government and co-funded by UNDP and UNFPA. It uses a parallel fund management modality and is designed to contribute to the achievement of UNAPF Outcome 1: "By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups." The programme is implemented in Baku, Masally, and Salyan, and aims to complement government efforts to protect, respect, and fulfill the rights of people living with disabilities with a specific focus on women and war veterans of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The main government partner is the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population. The project will be implemented in close partnership with the State Committee for Family, Women and Children's Affairs, and the State Statistics Committee. Active partnerships involve local authorities, public and private employers, media, communities, and NGOs for the successful implementation of the programme. A total of 6,000 beneficiaries (up from the 2,500 initially planned) will benefit, directly and indirectly, from improved livelihoods opportunities and accessible space. The

²⁹ See Joint Programme document, Addressing rights and well-being of women with disabilities and veterans of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

availability of quantitative and qualitative data on the vulnerabilities and capacities of target groups will be improved, and changes in public perceptions will be promoted to reduce stigma and discrimination against people with disabilities.

Another joint programme implemented under the UNAPF was “Women economic Empowerment in the South Caucasus.” This three-year regional project coordinated by UN Women in Georgia is implemented by UNDP in Azerbaijan—the outcome of a joint UNDP and UNFPA assessment of the opportunities for, and challenges to, women’s participation in the private sector of Azerbaijan.

The UNAPF document further added that key means of implementation would be further refined during UNAPF implementation through coordination mechanisms, some of which are likely to require collaborative programming or funding. The UNCT should thus strive for robust joint programming and inter-organizational cooperation, and explore opportunities for resource mobilization and more “joined-up” approaches, applying the most appropriate and feasible elements of the Standard Operating Procedures for DaO.

The UNAPF was implemented in a coordinated way between agencies through *joint programming* and/or *joint initiatives*. However, the evaluation feels this other ambition may have fallen short of initial expectations. A few examples are outlined below.

In the area of gender, through the Gender Thematic Group workplan, UN organizations listed gender-related activities for agencies to carry out, but did not co-fund activities through parallel funding. There are also successful examples of joint efforts between agencies under the framework of 16-day campaigns organized annually by UNFPA against GBV, vis-à-vis Gender Thematic Group (GTG) activities in close partnership with the State Committee for Family, Women, and Children’s Affairs, and through local NGOs to scale up advocacy efforts for eliminating GBV in the country. See the section on gender equity and women’s empowerment for more information on UNAPF gender mainstreaming.

In the area of youth empowerment, the UNCT supports the increased utilization of the UN Youth Advisory Council (UNYAC). This is an advisory group where UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, WHO, and the UNRCO bring together the Secretariat, Presidential Administration, the Ministry of Youth and Sports, and all other ministries trying to work in this area. Several United Nations organizations (UNFPA, UNHCR, UNV, and UNDP) and UNYAC, under the leadership of UNICEF, united to provide an integrated package of services to government-run Youth Houses in the districts of Mingachevir and Binagadi. More than 1,200 young people benefited from basic life skills, SDG knowledge, volunteerism, reproductive health education, gender-based violence prevention, and psychological and legal counseling as a result. The rolling-out of other joint Youth House activities is on-going.

The evaluation found there are challenges in creating and implementing Joint Programmes including the following operational and practical implications:

- Double charging when mobilizing funds for projects. When several organizations apply for funding from a donor only one can be selected as the lead agency to receive awarded funding. Transferring part of the money to another causes double charging due to organizational General Management Support fees, which are deducted automatically by an electronic system (e.g. Atlas). Usually

donors, especially the European Union, do not accept more than one bank account. The multi-donor trust fund will hopefully work to address this double charging issue.

- Some organizations have core and donor funds, which allows them to set their own approaches. Others work more on a project-based approach. There are also different programme cycles. For instance, WHO and OHCHR have two-year programme cycles.
- The development of the first Joint Work Plans took time and the first was implemented mid-2017. By then, organizations were already implementing projects so consolidating activities under new JWPs took time. The initial presentation of the JWPs took place at results group meetings on 11th May 2017. Signing by government counterparts was not finalized before August 2017.
- Organizations work according to different strategies with some focusing more on operational activities and others on policy advice. Although such action would be complementary, bringing them into a joint programme may be difficult.
- There was limited UNRCO staff in 2016-2017 to support programmes. In 2016, the Office had only one staff member vs. the six it now has. In accordance with UNDS reform, the capacities of M&E and coordination were advanced with the new functions of development coordination officers established for partnerships and finance and in data management, results monitoring and reporting. The UNRCO is expected to be stronger following the addition of a Strategic Planning Advisor and Economist in the near future. All will help the Office bring a new level of understanding to the institutional mechanisms available.
- UNAPF planning, which was perhaps overambitious for some, reflected estimated budget and programme interventions that could not be met.
- The reluctance of some UN organizations to collaborate, particularly in areas of potential cooperation, points to increasing competition for funding.
- Limited awareness about the UNAPF among line ministries is required to ensure effective cross-sector cooperation and support joint commitments through joint programmes.

In conclusion, evidence shows that some efforts were undertaken by the UNCT to implement the UNAPF through joint programmes and programming, which enhanced mutual accountability for shared results. The UNAPF should be used as an instrument to stimulate joined-up approaches, synergies and substantive joint programming and joint programmes, where feasible and to deliver in a more cohesive way. Moreover, there is an opportunity to enhance joint programming, based on the UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, and UN Women Common Chapter Initiative. Following the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review, resolution 71/243, as well as the Secretary General's reforms for the repositioning of the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women have committed to working better together with a view to achieving greater coherence in support of results. This commitment is embodied in the Common Chapter of their respective strategic plans for 2018-2021.

At a 2019 UNCT retreat an interesting exercise was conducted to identify areas of possible cooperation and partnership opportunities between agencies, which proved to be engaging and productive. Possible joint activities were captured in Appendix V of the UNCT retreat report.

2. Involvement of non-resident organizations

Finding: The UNRCO has been very supportive in linking non-resident organizations to other agencies and relevant government authorities based on the UNAPF, and with an aim to conduct joint

programming in Azerbaijan. A number of non-resident projects have contributed to UNAPF outcomes and to achievement of national priorities. Nevertheless, there is a need for the UNAPF and UNCT to be more inclusive of the expertise of different non-resident organizations and allow the government to take full advantage of their unique expertise.

The Resident Coordinator Office increased its outreach and communication to non-resident organizations, including IAEA, IFAD, UN-Habitat, UNCTAD, UNECE, UNEP, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNODC, and the World Bank in Azerbaijan, to improve cooperation. All these entities except three (IFAD, UN-Habitat, and UNESCO) have signed the UNAPF. All except for IAEA are named in the UNAPF Results Matrix. Five, namely UNCTAD, UNECE, UNEP, UNESCO, and UNIDO, have their financial contributions listed in the UNAPF Results Matrix. However, only two entities (UNECE and UNEP) contributed to JWPs. The World Bank was initially a co-chair of one of the results groups but withdrew from this role in the early stages of implementation. While it was not part of UNAPF joint planning, monitoring or reporting processes it attended the UNCT retreat in 2019 and attended other United Nations initiatives.

The evaluation made a special effort to get non-resident feedback via written responses to a list of questions and/or interviews over Skype/telephone to gain a better understanding of their involvement and perspectives on the implementation of the UNAPF. Efforts were made to not only understand the dynamics of organizational involvement in the UNAPF, but also possible reasons if they were not involved. Most non-resident organizations were contacted.

UNECE mentioned the majority of planned interventions under the outcomes were implemented. UNECE also regularly cooperated with agencies with national presence. Planning cycles of the UNAPF and regular UNECE budget differ, which impacts the number of interventions that could be forecasted at the stage of UNDAFAPF signature. During UNAPF development UNECE usually integrates already known and approved interventions under the UNAPF; however, when relevant activities are approved by UNECE inter-governmental processes at a later stage partners regularly communicate planned and delivered activities to the UNRCO for further integration into JWPs.

UNEP mentioned that as Azerbaijan is transitioning its relevance evolves during the cycle. Yet, the document is important in terms of strategically guiding actual work and the priorities to be identified and implemented by line ministries. The current UNAPF was affected by a leadership change at the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources in terms of relevance and priority-setting.

UN-Habitat has not been engaged in the current UNAPF cycle but intends to participate as a non-resident agency in the upcoming United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework. UN-Habitat aims to extend its operations in Azerbaijan and is strengthening engagements with the UNRCO, UNEP, IOM, and State Committee for Diaspora Engagements, State Statistics Committee, and other partners, on country and regional-level initiatives that would be in support of the UNAPF objectives. UN-Habitat's current areas of engagement consist of providing technical assistance for the Diaspora and Urban Summit together with IOM; supporting city level planning in Ganja; monitoring and reporting on urban SDG targets, and supporting a regional programme together with UNEP on urbanization and climate change adaptation in the Caspian Sea region.

UNCTAD is part of the United Nations Secretariat and reports directly to the General Assembly. With limited non-core, extra-budgetary resources, UNCTAD extra-budgetary resources are mainly organized by

themes, not by countries. At the country level, and in the context of DaO, UNCTAD involvement depends on the capacity of the UN Resident Coordinator Office to effectively design a resource mobilization strategy and invite organizations (including non-resident agencies) to benefit from such resources. If effective, initial mobilized funds act as a catalyst for UNCTAD to dedicate additional resources. Once these funds are secured (from a One Fund in support of the UNDAF and/or governmental funding related to the delivery of UNDAF outcomes) UNCTAD is in a position to prioritize the UNDAF, free extra-budgetary funds pertinent to UNDAF outcome themes, and redirect part of its core resources to regular staff time and salaries.

UNCTAD stressed it was not in a position to dedicate funding for Azerbaijan from extra-budgetary resources earmarked by theme or core resource. UNEP mentioned that UNAPF outcomes and goals should be more realistic to accommodate different financial allocation and resource mobilization scenarios.

UNCTAD wishes for its unique expertise to be better recognized and used at the country-level by the Government. UNCTAD works in the three pillars of research, consensus building, and delivery of technical cooperation. If well-funded, UNCTAD can effectively translate policies into effective joint programmes in support of the UNDAF outcomes.

Several agencies mentioned that mapping the available UN expertise in-country, including non-resident organizations, could lead to better coordination and effectiveness of UN interventions. In this regard, the IAEA mentioned it has recently engaged in development cooperation with the United Nations in Azerbaijan, as brokered by the UNRCO. IAEA cooperation with the government of Azerbaijan is longstanding and based on a bilateral Country Programme Framework with the government. As some of the initiatives IAEA works on (or intends to work on) have overlapping aspects with the work of WHO or FAO, for example, coordination is deemed important.

All non-resident organizations interviewed mentioned that the UNRCO has been supportive in linking them to other agencies and relevant government authorities whether it is based on the UNAPF or with the aim to conduct joint programming in Azerbaijan. The role of the UNRCO is seen as crucial in coordinating development efforts and vital for innovation and fostering joint UN programming. UN-Habitat is willing to champion the implementation of the “UN system-wide strategy on sustainable urban development.”

UNIDO projects have contributed to the UNAPF outcomes and the achievement of national priorities. For example, the UNIDO Resource Efficient Cleaner Production component was aligned with the need to decrease the use of resources/economy diversification in view of the 2014-2015 financial crisis. UNIDO also contributed to strengthening national capacities and assess small and medium size manufacturing enterprises, as well as conduct advanced cleaner production assessments. A series of forums dedicated to different aspects of resource use by industries were conducted, which contributed to the finalization of the national resource efficient cleaner production primer that rolled out in Azerbaijani. However, UNIDO was not part of the broader JWP planning or reporting processes.

The World Bank mentioned that the reason for its withdrawal from the co-chairmanship of one of the results groups at the beginning of UNAPF implementation was because it was agreed unanimously, following discussions with the government, ILO and other UN agencies, that UNDP was better suited to co-chair. Notwithstanding, cooperation happened in a participatory and inclusive manner and the World

Bank was invited to different sessions, retreats, and comprehensive discussions throughout the UNAPF period, as UNAPF priorities are in alignment with World Bank priorities in Azerbaijan.

The Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources noted that a range of activities in several areas, including Priority Area 3, were implemented in cooperation with resident organizations, such as the World Health Organization and the World Bank, and non-resident organizations, such as UNEP, the Economic Commission for Europe, Industrial Development Organization, International Agency for Atomic Energy, and UNESCO some of which have not been considered in the UNAPF Results Framework.

Based on interviews and questionnaire replies the evaluation team wishes to highlight several suggestions made by representatives from non-resident organizations, which may be useful for the current UNAPF and next UNSDCF:

- Several mentioned a more inclusive and enabling environment for the participation and involvement of non-resident organizations in CCA/UNSDCF processes, and the establishment of effective coordination mechanisms, would allow the UNCT and country to better benefit from the unique and specific expertise of these agencies towards achieving national priorities. Outreach to non-resident organizations can be institutionalized. Concrete ideas included improved information sharing, mailing lists for all heads of organizations or focal points, newsletters, briefing papers, opportunities to remotely join UNCT meetings using information and communication technology (ICT) solutions, and brokering of new partnerships with relevant partners on overlapping technical areas. Such ideas would enable the next UNAPF to be more inclusive and allow the government to take full advantage of the unique expertise of different agencies at the country level.
- UNCTAD suggested including economic issues beyond their social angles, for example, macroeconomics issues like debt management, investment, and trade facilitation, all of which are relevant to Azerbaijan.
- UN-Habitat highlighted that rural-urban development, housing, and other related areas should include involvement of the private sector and the civil society and reflected in the UNAPF; building on the last goal of balanced regional development (with specific focus on building the capacity of small and secondary cities). A City Prosperity Index analysis or urban profiling could be a strategic move for the territorial planning of metropolitan regions, secondary cities, and rural areas, while improving the overall evidence base. Environmental aspects should be brought to the fore, including climate change outcomes that impact communities and the economy. The role of cities should be looked at for scaling up prosperity measures to the national level. Protection and effective management of cultural heritage, affordable and adequate housing for IDPs, rural-urban migration, and joint analyses and implementation of the rural-urban continuum could be highlighted with IOM and FAO.
- UNIDO stressed the importance of a critical analysis of the constraints to building production capabilities, in addition to the necessity of assessing progress on the development of production capabilities at the micro level and structural transformation towards productive sectors at the meso and macro levels. The prioritization of UNSDCF pillars, based on a full-fledged CCA analysis

should ensure a balanced “economic, social and environment nexus” to effectively contribute to achieving the SDGs (as embedded in the new CCA/UNSDCF guidance).

- UNIDO suggested the CCA also include a detailed assessment of the root causes of economic stagnation (e.g. lack of stakeholder production capabilities, identifying gaps and weaknesses in the national production system, and assessing the quality of links, relationships and interaction among domestic firms, foreign firms, government, NGOs, and universities).
- UNIDO also suggested that in *leaving no one behind* attention should be given to different types of entrepreneurs, who are trying to survive and are critical to economic growth of the country. Production capabilities of the survival type should be strengthened in order to put them on a sustainable pathway and facilitate the structural transformation of the economy as a whole.
- Finally, the next UNFSDCF should benefit from an effective and orchestrated country-level resource mobilization strategy facilitated by the UNRCO, which would include new forms of partnerships and financing mechanisms to realize the SDGs locally. According to the UNCTAD, resource mobilization (e.g. establishment of a One UN Country Fund managed by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, access to government funding, and standard UN inter-agency agreements) can produce a catalytic effect that allows organizations, such as UNCTAD, to dedicate required human resources and non-core funds earmarked according to theme.

3. Coordination mechanisms – Steering Committee, results groups and other groups

Finding: Existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee, results groups, theme groups (human rights, gender, SDGs), and others (UNCG, M&E, OMT) helped ensure a joint alignment of results and supported effectiveness and efficiency in delivery, planning, monitoring, and reporting on the five outcomes and in cross-cutting areas. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement in extending participation to actors such as CSOs, academia, and the private sector, where feasible, and to address the operational challenges these partners face.

A joint high-level UNAPF Steering Committee, comprised of senior government officials, Heads of United Nations organizations, development partners, and other stakeholders oversees the collective support provided for achieving broad UNAPF strategic outcomes. The Committee provides strategic guidance to the results groups and monitors and reviews project implementation. The Steering Committee holds at least one annual meeting to review progress in achieving UNAPF objectives, as noted in the UNAPF document and Steering Committee ToR. Its first meeting took place in January 2017, its second in June 2018, and its third in May 2019.

Three UNAPF Results Groups were established, one for each strategic area, co-chaired by government ministries and UN organizations. There were a few changes subsequently, especially with the World Bank leaving the co-chair position of the first results group. The results groups are currently as follows:

- UNAPF Result Group on Economic Growth and Decent Work, which is co-chaired by UNDP, ILO, and the Ministry of Economy.
- UNAPF Results Group on Institutional Capacity and Public/Social Services, which is co-chaired by UNICEF and the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population.
- UNAPF Results Group on Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction, which is co-chaired by FAO, UNDP, and the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources.

Several interviewees considered that existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee, results, thematic and other groups are adequate for enhancing effectiveness in delivering results, monitoring, reporting, and joint work planning.

Nevertheless, the same respondents thought there is room for improvement. First, these platforms should include civil society organizations, academia, and the private sector, where feasible. In the case of private sector involvement it was suggested that a public-private partnership format can boost private sector contributions to achieving development results. This could be improved through the inclusion of representatives from civil society and the private sector in results groups in the upcoming UNSDCF. NGO representatives pointed out there has not been much opportunity created for NGOs in the cooperation process, including the Steering Committee and results groups, and there is a need for greater collaboration between NGOs, the government, and the United Nations. In their commentary, the Ministry of Education indicated that it is beneficial to involve civil society organizations, academia, and the private sector or expand their activities in terms of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the new cooperation framework.

Secondly, evidence gathered through the evaluation identified other operational challenges:

- The Steering Committee met once a year though agreeing on meeting times has not been easy.
- The government is not fully engaged in results groups and leadership commitments could have been stronger.
- Some UNDS members (especially, but not exclusively, the smallest ones) have not been able to fully participate in results groups due to a lack of time and human resources.
- Results group meetings often offer little interaction aside from a mere exchange of views.
- The development of a unified national development plan would enhance government engagement in UNAPF implementation because it would be linked to the plan, and bring the issues to the fore of the national agenda.
- Members of results groups change frequently, which reduces their effectiveness. The high turnover of government participants has hindered cooperation because some participants are not sufficiently prepared and/or informed to contribute to discussions.
- There is a significant need to improve coordination and information sharing at high and working levels amongst all partners, especially state actors.
- With more capacities and time, a strengthened UNRCO should be in a position to better coordinate the work of result groups.

Thematic and other groups also play an important role in UNAPF implementation. They have been a place to encourage collective thinking and increase consideration of cross-cutting aspects (such as gender and HRBA in programming work).

The joint inter-agency and inter-governmental Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group was reestablished in 2017 to assist the UNAPF Steering Committee and three result groups in monitoring, reporting on, and evaluating UNAPF implementation. In 2018, the government assigned two co-chairs from the Ministry of Economy and State Statistics Committee to the inter-agency and inter-governmental M&E Group (UNDP represents the UN as the third co-chair). The M&E Group has provided extensive

support in monitoring, reviewing, reporting, and evaluating UNAPF implementation. The role of the M&E Group is important to improve accountability to the partners, develop matrices, and monitor indicators.

All mechanisms (Steering Committee, results, thematic and other groups) play an important role in the current UNDS reform context. In 2019, the primary focus of the UNCT was the implementation of the UNDS reform, ensuring a smooth transition of the Resident Coordinator system and building the capacity of the UNRCO to support the effective and efficient coordination of the United Nations in Azerbaijan, and further empower collective action towards joint goals by making joint decisions on programming, administration, and resource management. The reform undoubtedly ushers in opportunities for greater integration and coherence of UN programmes, resource mobilization, and operational efficiency.

Regarding the SDGs, interviewees explained that some government institutions are aware of the Global Goals, but not across all levels. Because it is important the government is well informed there is a need for UNAPF focal points within each government entity to keep cooperation coordinated among different entities. All government and non-government partners need to know their roles in the UNAPF. While there is a national coordinator from the government side for the SDGs there should also be one for the UNAPF.

It is worth mentioning that members of UNAPF results groups from the government are also members of national SDG Working Groups. And members of the Steering Committee from the government are also part of the National Action Group for 'Vision 2020'. The Secretariat of the National Coordination Council for Sustainable Development under the Ministry of Economy was the major coordination unit of the government, which collaborated with the UNRCO to facilitate government engagement.

Finally, greater involvement of the Cabinet of Ministers Office (which has oversight functions on different ministries) could enhance the enforcement, ownership, power, and accountability mechanisms of the framework.

The Ministry of Economy replied to the United Nations Letter on appointing the Cabinet of Ministers as the coordinating agency for the implementation of the UNAPF and stated the issue should be discussed at the level of the Cabinet of Ministers.

4. Data collection and analysis

Finding: There is rich collaboration between different United Nations organizations, the State Statistics Committee, and other ministries, all of which strengthened national capacities for data collection and analysis. Nevertheless, sometimes the United Nations does not know to what extent data is fully reliable, or limited analysis of the data is conducted, or there are discrepancies between statistical data produced by different sources. This can create major obstacles for better understanding the current situation and deprivations, properly designing interventions, effectively measuring results, and using evidence for policy development and decision-making.

The UNAPF also strengthened national capacities for data collection and analysis, as well as quality data production and reporting by involving highly specialized experts. Results group workshop participants emphasized the importance of involving local experts in data collection and analysis. Not only is the creation of data important, but also developing a culture of using this data. There is a need for continuous support in this area. Thanks to UN cooperation data collection improved significantly at the Ministry of

Labour and Social Protection of Population, with a labor contract registration system that now has 1.5 million labor contracts disaggregated based on sex, age, location.

Different UN organizations collaborate on SDG indicators with the State Statistics Committee in different spheres, with a focus on strengthening capacities related to monitoring the SDGs. The launch of the National Information Portal on SDG indicators is a good example of cooperation between the State Statistics Committee and UNDP.

The State Statistics Committee also cooperated with UNFPA on preparing a national census in October 2019 on awareness raising, production of advocacy materials, and communicating them to the public. With UNICEF, it is already the third year that the Statistics Committee works on collecting information related to household violence and children. The Committee also collaborates with the World Bank on the preparation of the development strategy of Azerbaijan 2030, which should be finalized by the end of 2019. The major components of this strategy are on ICT and human capacity building.

Despite good collaboration, data collection, analysis and reporting remains a big challenge in Azerbaijan. The State Statistics Committee has weak capacity to analyze, develop trends, establish baselines, and use it, according to many United Nations representatives. This means there is little sufficiently reliable data in the ministries. The State Statistics Committee has a solid block of data available; however, the United Nations does not always know if it is reliable (or to what extent). As an example, UN Women analyzed the data produced by the Statistics Committee since 1992 and found the reason for an exponentially increasing skew in the sex ratio of newborn babies in Azerbaijan is based on sex-selected abortions. In this case, the data was reliable but no one was analyzing the data in this way. The evaluation team considers that data collection and analysis are important to focus attention on relevant UNAPF outcomes and agency programmes. They also have implications on budget planning and resource allocations.

In draft report comments, the State Statistics Committee pointed out that in order to assess the development level of the national statistics system, and administrative and technical capacities in the area of statistics in terms of the compliance with the relevant international standards, the State Statistics Committee conducted a Global Assessment of the Azerbaijan National Statistical System in 2016-2017 with the European Union Bureau of Statistics (Eurostat), the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, and the European Free Trade Association. Findings from this assessment showed the national statistics system was mainly in compliance with relevant international and European standards. Also, Société Générale de Surveillance Azeri LTD—a local department of the SGS Company with a reputation in the audit field globally—conducted a certification audit of the second stage in the Administrative Office of the State Statistics Committee and at local statistics offices, where a quality management system was applied. Based on the findings of that audit, the Administrative Office of the State Statistics Committee and 13 local statistics offices were awarded with international certificates of compliance (ISO 9001:2015) in the areas of processing and distribution of official statistical data. A first for statistics institutions in the Commonwealth of Independent States.

The Committee cooperates with the European Union, IMF, UNDP, UNFPA, ILO, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, Asian Development Bank, OECD, Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, Eurostat, CIS Interstate Statistical Committee, and other international organizations. The Committee exchanges information with national statistics services around the world and replies to incoming inquiries. There were no negative remarks about the State Statistics Committee by organizations on sources of statistical data. All

information on the data collection processes of the State Statistics Committee and about data sources are described in detail in the Metadata System established at the Committee since 2010. All metadata are fully open to users and have been posted on the official website of the State Statistics Committee (<https://www.azstat.org/MetaDataInd/>).

The choice of data source is important because some are produced annually (national statistics) and others every five years (demographic and health surveys). Frequently produced/collected data allows for timelier monitoring of programme results and supports both the UN and government to properly plan budgets, allocate resources, and adjust accordingly.

The State Statistics Committee added that information on maternal and child mortality is submitted by the Ministry of Health of Azerbaijan to the State Statistics Committee and there are no inconsistencies between institutions on statistical data. The State Programme on the Development of Official Statistics in the Republic of Azerbaijan 2018-2015 was approved by an order dated February 14, 2018 from the President of Azerbaijan. One of the goals of the program is to obtain statistical information ensuring international comparativeness for the assessment of the social welfare status of mothers and children and the human development in the country, as well as the achievement of SDG targets. It also considers launching the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey in 2021-2022 by the State Statistics Committee in cooperation with the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Internal Affairs, State Committee for Family, Women and Children Issues, UNICEF, and other related institutions.

The use of methodologies may also change statistical indicators drastically, for example maternal mortality data produced using the international classification of diseases (ICD 9) definition would drastically increase if ICD 10, which uses a broader definition of the concept, was used. If this methodological approach changes after the start of the UNAPF, monitoring and measuring progress becomes more difficult. The choice of data source and methodological approaches is also important for all other SDGs. All aspects need to be taken into account for the next UNSDCF.

The 2018 UNICEF mid-term Review pointed out that insufficient mechanisms for data collection and analysis, and a weak monitoring and tracking system, are major obstacles for better understanding the current situation, properly designing interventions, effectively measuring results, and using evidence for policy development and decision-making. Limited data also prevented quality financial assessments and cost analyses that are critical for policy development, programming and planning processes when achieving tangible results for children. The lack of quality and disaggregated data requires continuous efforts and innovative solutions.

At the 2018 Joint Annual Review, the State Statistics Committee pointed out that strengthening data collection is important and the analysis of information submitted by state institutions for the purpose of identifying national targets should be central. There is a need for United Nations expertise in identifying the information needs of the state institutions on the SDGs and compatibility with quality standards. Some issues arise on the statistical methodology that create challenges for the M&E of SDG targets in the future. Consulting with specialized United Nations agencies is useful for avoiding challenges.

5. The challenge of measuring results

Finding: Several UNAPF outcome indicators are at a too high of a level to be easily measured and it is difficult or impossible to determine the UN contribution. These are indicators where the United Nations may have little direct or significant influence, especially in a higher middle-income country like Azerbaijan. At best, it is possible to attribute some results to the UNDS, through the achievements of outputs. In addition, it is not easy to understand from the Results Matrix how outputs can contribute to outcomes given that the matrix was completed at the outcome level and does not include outputs. Furthermore, the UNAPF was developed without an Action Plan, which could have specified the outputs. There are 47 outputs in current JWPs, which is a lot. Having a few outputs per outcome would make it easier to monitor and evaluate achievements at the highest level in the hierarchy of results and would make the UNAPF a more strategic document and process.

As mentioned in the design section of this report, one challenge related to the design of the UNAPF that has some implications on M&E is that some outcomes are not easily measurable. Evaluators considered that UNAPF outcome indicators are at a too high of a level and concur with remarks made by result group members and other interviewees. As these are development indicators from the country point of view it is difficult or impossible for the United Nations to significantly contribute to results and determine its contribution. For example, under Outcome 1 the indicators related to GDP (average annual growth rate in non-oil sector), competitiveness (global competitiveness index score), and unemployment (rate disaggregated by sex and age), are all indicators where the UN may have little direct or significant influence, and even less in a higher middle-income country like Azerbaijan. At best, it is possible to attribute some results to the UN through the achievements of outputs. The absence of an integrated national development plan (besides Vision 2020 and the strategic roadmaps) makes such measurement more difficult. An additional challenge is that organizations have different planning and reporting systems, and bringing them together creates a greater reporting burden.

UNDAF guidelines say that UNDAF should report on the contribution of the United Nations and not on achievements that are out of reach. These are, however, problems common to many UNDAFs around the world.

In addition, evidence shows that it is not easy to understand how outputs can contribute to the outcomes given that the matrix does not include any outputs—an option offered to UNCTs by way of 2010 UNDAF Guidelines. Furthermore, the UNAPF was developed without an Action Plan, which could have specified outputs, as recommended by the same 2010 guidelines. Joint Work Plans were developed for 2017, yet, key informants and the evaluation considers the lack of an UNAPF Action Plan was a missing step in the process.

It should be noted that the 2010 UNDAF Guidelines suggested keeping the Result Matrix at the outcome level and added: "The Government, other national stakeholders, and the UN Country Team may opt to add outputs to the results matrix, provided that the detailing of outputs adds value. In general, it is preferred to keep the UNDAF results at a high-level so that the UNDAF remains a strategic and inclusive document." The 2017 guidelines specified that, "While outputs are not required for the UNDAF, the UN system may choose to develop outputs as part of the outcome theory of change, which underlies work plans."

Interview subjects explained that while the UNAPF was designed in line with 2010 guidelines it was implemented under the influence of the 2017 guidelines where there was no ongoing reference to the UNDAF Action Plan. Joint Work Plans became the primary tool to operationalize the UNAPF by translating outcomes into concrete, measurable, and time-bound outputs and activities (including an annual budgetary framework). This is what the UNCT diligently did.

The M&E Thematic Group suggested that in the new UNAPF Results Matrix, in addition to outcomes, there should be common, joint, and stable outputs that reflect the contribution of several agencies. In the current UNAPF, every year some outputs are removed and new ones added. Moreover, when SDG outputs were defined it was difficult to know under which outcome these outputs should be placed. Therefore, a new output was created under Outcome 1: "National capacity of Azerbaijan increased for implementation of SDGs." This became the 16th output for this outcome.

Based on these observations, the evaluation suggests the Results Matrix of the next UNSDCF could have a column for expected UN contributions with another for partner contributions. Instead of including a long list of partners, as is the case in the current UNAPF, only primary ones could be mentioned with an abridged explanation about their role. A good example is the current UNPSD from Georgia (2016-2020).

In designing the current UNAPF the process of agreeing on outcomes was unclear, explained the M&E Thematic Group. While the government insisted on high-level indicators, such as GDP growth, UN organizations suggested that only the indicators that would be implemented should be included in the Results Matrix.

Finally, there is also the issue of the inclusion of outcomes in the Results Matrix and outputs in the JWPs; or the way they were formulated by various organizations and the coherence of insertion. For instance, while UNDP merged several projects as "activities" under a general output in accordance with its CPD, FAO preferred to insert some projects as separate outputs. This could be due to projects that were difficult to merge under a single output or according to another organization's outputs. However, FAO merged projects under common outputs where possible. There are also examples of three to four organizations merging their activities under one output.

The evaluation notes there are 47 outputs in the 2018 JWP. Ideally, considering the spirit of the 2010, 2017, and 2019 guidelines, there should be three to five outcomes (which is the case) per outcome, which would make it easier to monitor and evaluate achievements the a highest level and would make the UNAPF a much more strategic document and process. Having designed an UNAPF without outputs and an Action Plan may be partly to blame for this situation and should be a lesson learned for the next UNSDCF.

Related to these observations, a new global platform launched by UNSDG (UN Info), will soon show contributions from the UN, government, and other sources. By 2020 the use of this platform will be made compulsory for all UN organizations. Slowly there will be a shift from Joint Work Plans to UN Info for planning and reporting purposes.

In terms of capacity building amongst national partners in evaluation, some organizations have activities to support this. Evaluations conducted by the UN supported national capacity building; however, the M&E Thematic Group considers that efforts need to be strengthened in this area. According to primary

informants, no capacity building of national partners on evaluation or joint evaluations with the government have taken place. In general, evaluations are conducted by external consultants to allow for independent and un-biased assessments. It is important to intensify efforts in building national evaluation capacities that strengthen results-based management, the evaluation culture, evidence-based learning, and accountability for development results.

6. Joint Work Plans

Finding: The UNAPF Result Groups developed three annual and biannual JWPs, one per each strategic priority area, which encapsulated outputs, specific actions, and resources required to achieve broad UNAPF strategic outcomes for the year. In assessing progress, UN organizations reported against output indicators set in the JWPs by providing the current status of indicators and showing progress using a color coding scheme, which is important and laudable work. The UN and partners managed to use JWPs to better align their work for more effective and efficient results delivery; however, planning for, monitoring and tracking 47 outputs proved to be a challenge, which could be reflected upon for the next UNSDCF.

UNAPF Result Groups held their first consultations in May 2017 jointly with four National Working Groups on SDGs. These consultations resulted in the development of three annual Joint Work Plans, one per each strategic priority area, which encapsulated outputs, specific actions, and resources required to achieve broad UNAPF strategic outcomes for the year. Joint Work Plans are approved each year by the Steering Committee suggestion of having two-year Joint Work Plans for 2019-2020 was approved. The Ministry of Economy, however, finds it important to develop more understandable Joint Work Plans in terms of structure and design.

For assessing progress, UN agencies reported against output indicators set in the JWPs, by providing the current status of indicators and showing progress using a color-coded scheme in a table format: green for “achieved,” yellow for “partially achieved,” orange for “constrained,” and red for “not achieved.” To allow for consistency organizations adjusted their target indicators for 2017 only taking into consideration that some set multi-year targets in the original JWPs. UN organizations also provided a brief description of key achievements and lessons learned/challenges to complement indicator status updates with a narrative. This is important and laudable work in the spirit of the UNDAF Guidelines.

While the UN and its partners managed to use JWPs to better align their work for more effective and efficient results delivery, evaluators found that planning for and monitoring as many as 47 outputs may have been a challenge, which should be reflected upon for the next UNSDCF. At the 2016 UNCT retreat, the regional facilitator gave the example of Turkey, which included 15 outputs in the JWPs.

7. Annual reviews, mid-term review, and progress reports

Finding: The preparation of Joint Annual Review Meeting reports, two UNAPF Annual Progress Reports, and Resident Coordinator Annual Reports are commendable efforts by the UNCT and have been useful sources of information for this evaluation. The user-friendly format used for the 2018 progress report allowed the UNCT to use reporting information for broader communication purposes. The evaluation also found that a useful and timely MTR was conducted, which allowed the UNCT to reflect on alignment of the UNAPF with global SDG targets and to improve the future measurement of indicators.

The evaluation found Joint Annual Review Meeting reports (2017 and 2018), two UNAPF Annual Progress Reports (2017 and 2018), and UNRCO Annual Reports to be useful sources of information for this evaluation. Consultants referred to these documents in all sections of this report. Achievements were well summarized and a special effort was made with the 2018 report, which was produced in a user-friendly format—useful, not only for reporting, but also for communication purposes.

An internal mid-term review of the UNAPF was conducted in November/December 2018. Planned for the third year of UNAPF implementation, it used expertise from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and UNRCO capacity in close collaboration with the M&E Group and results groups. A lot of developments occurred in the time since the UNAPF was developed in 2015 and endorsed in 2016. There was a need to assess UNAPF alignment with the SDGs and to look at progress and lessons learned, along with challenges, and opportunities. The evaluation found the following MTR results:

Rapid Integrated Assessment of UNAPF against global SDG targets: The alignment exercise with the SDGs was carried out using the integrated assessment tool, identifying the coverage level of SDG targets by UNAPF. Members of the M&E Group were also introduced to the tool in a half-day workshop. A full report of the assessment was developed and presented to the UNCT and government by the expert. The exercise showed the UNAPF was 59% aligned to *global* SDG targets. It was, however, noted that this exercise would have been more beneficial carried out against *national* SDG targets. The results will be utilized as guidance for the preparation of the next UNSDCF cycle.

UNAPF Results and Resources Framework review workshop: The UNCT convened a half-day workshop to review UNAPF Results and Resources Framework (progress against indicators, risks and assumptions, and indicative resources framework) and to make proposals for adjustments. The report of the workshop and proposed changes were discussed in a separate meeting with the participation of result group co-chairs. The Ministry of Economy consolidated feedback from government agencies and submitted feedback and suggested amendments. Changes included missing data for the indicators, adjustments to indicators (e.g. wording, targets, baselines), and adding new indicators (if a significant segment of UN work was not covered). Risk and assumptions sections were also reviewed and adjusted. Subsequently, the 2019 Steering Committee Meeting reviewed these changes and endorsed them.

The evaluation found this MTR was both timely and useful as it allowed the UNCT to reflect on the alignment of the UNAPF to global SDG targets, and to also to think about further aligning the framework to the SDGs. In addition, as a key component of the UNAPF M&E system, a calendar and multiyear M&E plan was produced by the UNCT with inputs from the M&E Group and based on guidelines from UNDCO. Evaluators found this plan to be detailed and well done as it includes surveys and studies, monitoring systems, reviews, and evaluations, all linked to UNAPF outcomes, with the UN organization in charge of each item, relevant partners, and costs.

8. Government ownership of the UNAPF

Finding: The participation of numerous ministries in the results groups and M&E Group demonstrates some joint ownership of the Framework. Nonetheless, there has not been significant ownership of the UNAPF document by the government, which does not necessarily see the work it is doing with the UN as part of the broader UNAPF framework. Issues the UNAPF deals with go beyond one ministry as a key

counterpart. Moreover, the absence of a unified national development plan, which covers not only the economic sector but also the social and human rights sectors, limits government capacity in guiding the identification of priority areas of UN support on a more regular basis.

In addition to the participation of numerous ministries as co-chairs (see previous section), in 2018 the government assigned two more co-chairs from the Ministry of Economy and the State Statistics Committee to the inter-agency and inter-governmental M&E Theme Group, which signals some joint ownership of the Framework also in the area of M&E.

That said, according to several UN organizations and national partners, there has not been significant ownership of this framework document by the government, which does not use the UNAPF as a key instrument to address the development needs of the country. The evaluation found there might be a few reasons for this situation.

First, the issues covered by the framework are multi sectoral and go beyond one ministry, thus a shift to a government entity with an overarching coordination mandate might improve the effectiveness of UNAPF implementation.

Second, with line ministries, UN organizations have excellent relationships and many projects; however, there is no unified national development plan. There is the Vision 2020 document and strategic roadmaps on the national economy and its main sectors, but these focus more on the economy, infrastructure and tourism than on the social sector, human development, and gender. Moreover, the absence of a unified national development plan makes it difficult for the government to guide the identification of priority areas support.

9. Partnerships and strategic alliances

Finding: The UNAPF helped promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas, even if many partnerships were at the agency level. New partnerships with different stakeholders were formed and older ones were consolidated to support UNCT action for sustainable development. Nevertheless, the UN is called to strengthen its partnerships and strategic alliances with non-governmental actors and to address difficulties in financial management of NGO/CSO partners, which limits direct support to community level interventions and sometimes reduces the effectiveness of interventions. NGOs appreciate the support provided by the UN and ask for more active and wide-ranging assistance.

Key informants affirmed that the UNAPF promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas. In 2017 alone, twelve UN agencies partnered with more than 37 governmental and non-governmental agencies to achieve targets set for 2017 and covering 47 outputs that year. In 2018, UN agencies partnered with approximately 70 government and non-government agencies. Several documents describe the extent of new UN partnerships and strategic alliances, which are summarized below:

- Under leadership of the Resident Coordinator, the UN established strong working relationships with the Vice-President's office, which proved fruitful. Two new projects on disability and aging,

jointly implemented by UNDP and UNFPA through the MLSP and ASAN, were developed with financial support from the VP's office.

- UNDP revived its long-standing partnership with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population under its new leadership by engaging in the new "Creating Inclusive and Decent Jobs for Socially Vulnerable Groups" project.
- UNDP entered into a new partnership with UN Women, a non-resident UN organization, through a sub-regional project supporting women's economic empowerment/
- UNDP worked with the Ministry of Health for the provision of procurement services including supply of reagents and medicines for HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis in 2019. UNDP also developed a partnership with the newly established State Tourism Agency to resume implementation of its project "Capacity Building of the Azerbaijan Tourism and Management University."
- CSOs and the State NGO Support Council remain major development partners of the UN and are continuously engaged in the development, implementation, and evaluation of UNCT projects.
- UNDP is providing various capacity building and grant opportunities to 37 NGOs. The list includes almost all active NGOs in the country (human rights defenders, think tanks, etc.). Concrete examples of projects are, "Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable population" (2016-2018), and "Promoting the role of the Civil Society in Gender Sensitive SDG Implementation" (2018-2020). The latter project can be presented as a successful example of CSO engagement.
- UNICEF built new partnerships with the Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan for a nutrition programme, and with the State Council Support to NGOs under the Auspices of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan through a MoU.
- UNICEF is implementing a three-year programme on "community-based integrated social services for the most vulnerable children and families" with the financial support of the European Union and in cooperation with NGOs/CSOs in 2019-2021. Other new UNCT partners are the Bar Association of the Republic of Azerbaijan for support to juvenile justice reform, the ASAN Service and Volunteers on child rights promotion, and the International Dialogue for Environmental Action on SDG advocacy and climate change.
- A new partnership between UNICEF and the State Agency for Mandatory Health Insurance was initiated.
- Partnership with the private sector, particularly American and German chambers of commerce, was strengthened in support of the 2030 Agenda and to revive the Global Compact.
- UNDP partnered with PriceWaterhouseCoopers to assist in the restructuring of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, under its new leadership.
- Collaboration also took place on the SDGs with the State Statistics Committee, which cooperates with UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNHCR, and ILO in different spheres, with a focus on strengthening capacities related to monitoring the SDGs via a new monitoring platform (website).
- Under the reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system in 2019, the existing Development Coordination forum (chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator) is used as a mechanism and platform for galvanizing development partner support for the SDGs and the UNCT. Consultations took place with primary development partners (European Union, USAID, Swiss Cooperation Office, IFIs) and the business sector to ensure adequate financing of the SDGs while increasing overall social responsibility. The UNRCO relaunched the The Global Compact Initiative to mobilize the private sector.
- The UN also continued collaboration with the scientific community, for instance with ADA University and Western University. Cooperation was strengthened with Parliament, local

executive power authorities, and other partnerships were developed with the newly established Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency, and the Food Safety Agency.

- Collaboration with the media increased, including local and social media outlets.

FAO renewed its partnership with the Government of Azerbaijan by launching a new FAO-Azerbaijan Partnership Programme, an AFSA initiative on the improvement of legislative frameworks, and links with international food safety systems (e.g. CODEX, with the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources for revision of National Forestry Program 2020-2030), modernization of the fishery sector, as well as strengthening capacities for implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions in the agriculture and land use, land-use change, and forestry sectors.

- FAO also entered into a new joint partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, Ministry of Emergency Situations, and Azerbaijan Food Safety Agency for reducing POPs and other obsolete pesticides. This partnership covers a joint initiative of the “Regional Development” Public Union of Heydar Aliyev Foundation, IDEA Public Union, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, and FAO by establishing fruit gardens for low income families. An initiative with the National Confederation of Entrepreneurs Organizations supports private sector investments in implementing SDGs in food and agriculture.

Through the UNAPF it was planned that the UNDS in cooperation with the government would further harness the ability of civil society and strengthen the awareness of social partners and institutions on international standards and conventions to help non-state actors contribute to Azerbaijan’s social and economic development. With a growing emphasis on youth volunteerism (e.g. ASAN Centres and the First European Games hosted by Azerbaijan in June 2015), there was room to utilize these resources to a greater degree. In facilitating this the UN had valuable experience and best practices to share.

Volunteering opportunities were enhanced to offer young people the chance to develop professional and personal skills and allow them to play a positive role in society. In 2018, the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) continued to help highlight youth volunteerism as a force for sustainable development. Young people from all backgrounds were encouraged to get involved. Meanwhile, national volunteering opportunities were offered across United Nations and Government initiatives. UNV also helps to integrate volunteerism into the United Nations system and across policy, legislation, and programming with Government partners. In 2018, to have a holistic understanding around national volunteer engagement and their contribution, UNV invited the Government to undertake a National Situation Analysis on volunteerism. Findings showed how diverse volunteerism, involving youth, women, and people with disabilities, contributes to more effective development solutions.

The evaluation found these initial plans may have not been fully met and meetings confirmed this finding. CSOs raised several important points about the UN collaboration with NGOs:

- The NGO sector is not strong in Azerbaijan and NGOs appreciate support provided by the UN, however, they ask for more active and wide-ranging support. Amendments introduced to the national law in 2013 required the mandatory registration of donors and grant agreements, which led to obstacles in United Nations activities in Azerbaijan implementations through the NGOs stalled and services procured from commercial entities.

- Various working group meetings between government entities, ministries, committees and other government agencies took place with UN representatives. However, these meetings typically did not include representatives from parliament, local government, or civil society organizations. In meetings where representatives from civil society, human rights groups, municipalities, authorities of executive powers were in attendance it was as observers and could not contribute. There is a need for more interactive formats to engage all participants in development strategies and activities. Similarly, some informants mentioned the importance of strengthening collaboration with civil society in the implementation of Joint Work Plans.
- The NCCSD, along with State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs is a UNDP government partner in the European Union-funded “Promoting the Role of Civil Society in Gender-sensitive SDG Implementation” project. The Project involves 37 NGOs in capacity building activities and nine direct grants to NGOs, enabling them to implement their own SDG-related and gender-sensitive initiatives. This is one of the largest initiatives with NGOs, and a follow-up to the project, "Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations."
- UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, and UNHCR seem to be the most active UN organizations collaborating with CSOs. Notable government partners include the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population, Ministry of Youth and Sports, and the State Committee on Family, Women and Children. Some projects provided social services, capacity building, awareness raising on different topics targeting children and youth, IDPs, and other vulnerable people in Baku and other regions of Azerbaijan.
- In recent years, the role and prominence of national NGOs may have deteriorated whereas opportunities should be expanded and they should have access to international donor agencies. The UN should have meetings with CSOs and involve the government in this type of cooperation.

The requirement of needing to obtain approval for the right to provide grants remained in force, making it difficult for UNCT members and other development partners to provide grants to, or work independently with, NGOs in the country. The 2018 UNICEF MTR Review pointed out that difficulties in financial management with NGO/CSO partners limited direct support to community level interventions and sometimes reduced effectiveness. The situation is improving in this regard since a number of NGOs received grants from UNDP and UNICEF within the European Union funded project as they have managed to register their grants with the Ministry of Justice within a one-month period since 2018.

- Finally, an evaluation of the European Union and UNDP project resulted in an interesting remark from a NGO on the issue of ‘sustainability’ and link to ‘social enterprise’: “The reality is that the old NGO model simply cannot be sustained in a time of shrinking government funding and increased calls for efficiency and impact in international development. It is time to realize that NGOs need to become more independent from governments, financially resilient and accountable for their activities.”

10. Effectiveness of joint communication

Finding: The UN Communication Group helps the UNCT to communicate as one by supporting events and organizing joint activities. It prepared a three-year communications strategy aligned with the UNAPF and is guided by an annual work plan that includes specific events and activities throughout the year. The UNCG focuses on events, which involve wider public participation. It also publishes monthly newsletters and tries to involve influencers, such as celebrities and bloggers, to reach wider audiences.

The UNCG supports the UNCT in “Communicating as One,” by supporting events, organizing joint activities, etc. The UNCG meets monthly and prepared a three-year communications strategy aligned with the UNAPF. The UNAPF was developed when there was no representative of the UN Department of Global Communications in Azerbaijan.

The Group’s Annual Work plan includes specific events and activities throughout the year and is approved by the UNCT. The document is flexible and changes are made as needed. At the end of the year actual implemented activities are presented to the UNCT.

The UNCG reports to the UNCT and provides information to the Steering Committee, results and thematic groups. With the UNAPF at the heart of its activities the UNCG works with all UN organizations on communication activities, for example in developing press releases, advocacy campaigns, working with social media, sharing information about activities, promoting events and special UN days, or engaging youth around the SDGs. The Group communicates results achieved by using figures and turning them into stories. It works on specific topics such as gender equality, health, environmental protection, youth and others, and offers to make UN activities more visible to partners and the public.

The evaluation considers the following innovations important because they increase the reach of the UN in-country and support UNAPF outcomes implementation:

- In the past, communication activities tried to inform what the UN was doing, but now UN global offices ask communication teams to go beyond just informing to involve the public. In a beach clean-up event dedicated to the World Environment Day in June, about 1,000 young people participated. The UNCG increasingly focuses on events like these that involve wider public participation. Furthermore, the Group’s methods and styles evolve: in 2019, the UNCG started focusing producing digital information like infographics, videos, and posters.
- Advocacy is central to “Communicating as One.” For instance, the Resident Coordinator and UNHCR Country Representative used World Refugee Day to speak also about issues that are of concern for UNHCR in front of 100 government officials.
- As the diplomatic community wants to know what the UN is doing, the Communication Group started publishing monthly newsletters it sends to all embassies. The UNCG also prepares daily press-reviews and social media monitoring reports with a focus on issues of interest for the UN. These reviews are shared with United Nations organizations, as well as head offices. The Group also recently developed a new strategy to involve influencers, such as celebrities and bloggers, because their access to wider audiences. Furthermore, the UNCG participates partner activities and aims to organize a training for journalists on the SDGs.

11. Effectiveness of resource mobilization

Finding: The resource envelope for UNAPF implementation was estimated at \$71,840,500 US dollars; however, some UN organizations may have been overambitious when formulating the current UNAPF results matrix. There is a need for the UNCT to explore opportunities to move away from individual approaches to resource mobilization, where possible, towards more coordinated approaches in order to add value by joining forces.

The resource envelope for the UNAPF implementation was estimated at \$71,840,500 US dollars out of which the UN would provide an estimated \$31,910,000 US dollars from its available resources between 2016-2020. Anticipated resources to be mobilized in support of UNAPF outcomes are estimated at \$39,930,500 US dollars. About \$18,300,000 US dollars will be spent under Strategic Priority Area 1, \$36,774,500 US dollars under Strategic Priority Area 2, and \$16,766,000 US dollars is earmarked for Strategic Priority Area 3.

The following table from the UNRCO presents the adjustment against UNAPF budgetary framework (per agency).

UN Agencies	Estimated contribution(original)	Estimated contribution adjusted
FAO	13,500,000	13,500,000
ILO	150,000	150,000
IOM	1,560,000	1,560,000
OHCHR	100,000	100,000
UNCTAD	400,000	400,000
UNDP	26,200,000	26,200,000
UNECE	660,000	660,000
UNEP	500,000	500,000
UNESCO	460,000	460,000
UNFPA	2,000,000	2,000,000
UNHCR	0	3,422,865
UNICEF	20,033,500	13,745,000
UNIDO	3,200,000	3,200,000
WHO	3,076,000	330,000
Total	71,839,500	66,227,865

Also, some agencies changed their estimated contributions to the UNAPF as a result of MTR discussions since previous ones were not realistic.

An analysis of documents confirms that several UN organizations may have been overambitious when formulating the current UNAPF Results Matrix, which is reflected the estimated budget of expected programme interventions. This is despite a reduction in state budget over the previous years before UNAPF implementation (nearly \$13 billion US collars in 2013; \$9 billion US dollars in 2014).

That said, there is not a huge difference between the amount planned (\$71,839,500) and adjusted (\$66,227,865).

Under the 2018 JWP, the UN delivered \$15.9 million US dollars in development assistance to achieve a number of UNAPF targets, including nationalization of the SDGs, institutional capacity building, youth empowerment, and advancing human rights and gender equality. This number, together with 2016³⁰ and 2017 expenditures, reached \$47.6 million (or more than 50% of the delivery rate) against estimated financial contributions in the UNAPF. The 2017 UNAPF Progress Report underscored that UNAPF targets for 2017 (covering 47 outputs) were worth \$16,480,777 US dollars.

The following table from the UNRCO presents the budget update against UNAPF commitments (per agency).

UN Agencies	2016	2017	2018	2019-2020 (planned)	Total 2016-2020	UNAPF commitment (original)	UNAPF commitment adjusted
FAO	1,473,807	1,032,506	1,052,062	7,694,000	11,252,375	13,500,000	13,500,000
ILO		260,000	180,000	982,300	1,422,300	150,000	150,000
IOM		2,095,667	1,584,504	1,855,103	5,535,274	1,560,000	1,560,000
OHCHR		18,000	83,000	125,000	226,000	100,000	100,000
UNCTAD					0	400,000	400,000
UNDP	10,005,877	8,492,254	8,559,566	18,600,645	45,658,342	26,200,000	26,200,000
UNECE	26,000	66,000	35,000	151,000	278,000	660,000	660,000
UNEP		75,000			75,000	500,000	500,000
UNESCO					0	460,000	460,000
UNFPA	569,900	495,000	709,621	1,622,100	3,396,621	2,000,000	2,000,000
UNHCR	2,422,000	2,294,380	2,382,660	3,956,000	11,055,040	0	3,422,865
UNICEF	806,879	1,340,443	1,208,798	4,959,630	8,315,750	20,033,500	13,745,000
UNIDO					0	3,200,000	3,200,000
WHO		223,000	157,500	88,000	468,500	3,076,000	330,000
Total	15,304,463	16,392,250	15,952,711	40,033,778	87,683,202	71,839,500	66,227,865

It is worth noting that under the current United Nations funding architecture all UN funds and programmes established by the General Assembly are principally funded through voluntary core contributions. Specialized agencies continue to receive core funding through separate contributions. The UN Secretariat receives pooled funds from Member States and peace-keeping operations are funded by Member States separately. Along with pooled funds (e.g. thematic trust funds or global funds), which operate as pass-through mechanisms, there are various resource mobilizations schemes and innovative financing mechanisms.

³⁰ Despite the fact there was no JWP in 2016, during the MTR the decision was taken to retroactively collect financial data for 2016 from agencies and count it as part of UNAPF implementation.

The evaluation concluded that the UNCT should explore opportunities to move away from individual approaches to resource mobilization towards coordinated ones. Ethical concerns regarding private sector funding and business integrity should also be considered, which could also be looked at as part of a resource mobilization strategy. There is a need for a resource mobilization strategy where UN organizations do not compete for resources but rather scale up and add value by joining forces.

Development partners explained that in Azerbaijan the European Union cooperates with UNDP, IOM, UNICEF, and FAO, and is likely to continue to do so. However, the landscape is shrinking due to the middle-income status of the country and some donors, such as GIZ and Norway, are phasing out. Development partners were critical about UN positioning and noted that the UN does not seem to be working as one family under one strategic framework, and that speaking with one voice is difficult.

D. EFFICIENCY

Finding: It is hard to determine if UNAPF results have been achieved at a reasonably low cost, with reduced transaction costs for the government and each UN organization, and to avoid duplication. The Operations Management Team and Business Operations Strategy in alignment with the rest of the UNAPF cycle (2018-2020) allowed the programming side of the UNAPF to be fully supported by the operations side. The UNCT decided to focus on business operations harmonization management, common procurement, common human resources, common finance, and common information and communication technology. The OMT currently focuses on common office premises. The use of different platforms by agencies creates challenges in streamlining human resources, finance, administrative tools, and operations—some of which are beyond the control of the UNCT.

The efficiency of the UNAPF was defined in the ToR as the extent to which outcomes are achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.). The consultants met with the Operations Management Team to discuss efficiency issues that may have a bearing on UNAPF implementation. The OMT existed before this UNAPF as a standard structure that brings agencies together from an operational point of view. At the moment, the UNDP Resident Representative is the Chair of the OMT.

The OMT works on a common premises and the UNCT started implementing the Delivering as One policy in 2015–2016, including “Operating as One.” It was important the programming side of the UNAPF be fully supported by operations since the two areas were interconnected and interdependent.

Organizations came together through subgroups in support of the concept around different policy or operational areas. For example, agencies that shared the same office premises worked on improving joint activities, looking at sharing the same resources, systems and tools, such as connections, telephone systems, etc. Another subgroup of agencies explored implementing the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers.

To have a fully common procurement or human resources, the guidelines, rules and procedures of organizations needed to be synchronized. The use of different ERP platforms created challenges in streamlining human resources, finance, administrative tools, and operations—some of which are beyond

UNCT control. It was realized that it is sometimes not necessarily more efficient or effective for agencies to use the same systems, tools, or policies. Based on these considerations, the OMT developed the “Operating as One” concept, presented it to UNCT, and started in this direction.

In 2017, the OMT was tasked by the UNCT to develop a BOS document in alignment with the rest of the UNAPF cycle (2018-2020). An independent consultant was hired to review and map who was doing what and the volume of operations, and to recommend collaborative actions. The BOS document was approved in April 2018, which is when the OMT started implementing the plan.

The outcome areas the UNCT implemented immediately were the following: business operations harmonization management, common procurement, human resources, finance and ICT. The outcome areas that required further discussion amongst UNCT members, and were difficult to implement, were common logistics and facilities.

A survey of local Banks for better service delivery to the entire UN system was completed November 2018 and IT and telephone systems were improved in the UN House. The delinking process started September 2018/January 2019. It was decided at the global level that UNDP will still provide backbone services to UNRCOs. After that the OMT annual work plan was drafted and shared with all agencies.

The OMT is now tasked to further optimize organizational activities, and in line with the UN reform, to have as many offices as possible implementing One UN House principles by 2021. The OMT did a survey to determine the existing office capacities of organizations; the idea was to develop a concept note to support a proposal the Resident Coordinator had flagged in a meeting with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, which was to house all UN organizations in one building to optimize activities. For the time-being UNDP, UNFPA, WHO, DSS, UNODC, UNOPS, UNICEF and ILO are located on one premise, while FAO and IOM have their own, and UNHCR and OHCHR share another common premise. The move into one building depends on if the government will provide a building free of charge. Currently the United Nations House and FAO premises are offered free of charge by the government.

Another task is to develop BOS 2.0, but new guidelines are not yet available. In comparison to BOS 1.0, BOS 2.0 is expected to be more concrete, less bureaucratic and obliging, and offer more freedom to organizations regarding their commitments.

For joint work the United Nations should have one programme with similar rules and regulations. For example, before, UNDP could not use the Long Term Agreement of other organizations but others could use those of UNDP. Now UNDP can use UNICEF resources and many other simplifications have happened, leading to some sharing taking place. However, there are still a lot of obstacles (e.g. joint audits). BOS version 1.0. talks about joint audit but it is not possible to use one if organizations have their own internal audit systems. For finance or human resources different online platforms are used.

Common human resources cannot be fully implemented because of the different systems in play. There have been attempts to combine services but the obstacles (e.g. one agency uses SAP and another Atlas) make it a challenge to bring them together. However, organizations have used the expertise and resources of others (e.g. interview panels in recruitment processes, common roster of consultants, etc.)

E. PROGRAMMING PRINCIPLES

Five programming principles of the UNAPF were defined in the inception report and used in a cross-cutting way in the framework.

The UNAPF was prepared using 2010 UNDAF Guidelines, which referred to five inter-related programming principles used in UNDAF design and implementation: HRBA, gender equality, environmental sustainability, capacity development, and results-based management.³¹ Implementation was also guided by 2017 guidelines, with similar principles³². It was deemed important that this evaluation integrate a gender and human rights lens. Furthermore, the 2017 UNDAF Guidelines emphasized the role of disaggregated data collection and analysis in support of UNDAF implementation and monitoring. Other principles outlined in the 2017 Guidelines were *sustainability and resilience*, as well as *accountability*.³³ Furthermore, the approach and methodology for this evaluation made use of, and referred to, UNEG Guidelines for integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation in several sections of this report in order to make the evaluation as human rights and gender responsive as possible.³⁴ The evaluation also used UNEG guidelines on UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicators.³⁵

The UNAPF document indicated that building on the five core United Nations programming principles (mentioned on the previous page) would allow for key strategies for effective UNAPF implementation to be mainstreamed throughout the UNAPF process:

- Strengthening policy implementation, institution building and systems development.
- National capacity development paradigm that represents the heart of the United Nations mandate and expertise.
- Better access to, and distribution of, development benefits to ensure social inclusion (part of this strategy included the UNAPF strengthening national capacities to ensure that international human rights mechanisms and standards, and gender equality norms, are substantively mainstreamed into key policy planning and implementation processes).
- Improved and innovative knowledge management.
- Promoting and monitoring the implementation of international agreements and obligations of Azerbaijan while supporting the design and application of effective social policies and programmes that increase social cohesion and reach the most vulnerable groups.

It was not possible to look in detail at all principles within the timeframe of this evaluation, so priority was given to HRBA and gender equality. This section analyzes the *leaving no one behind*, human rights-based approach, and gender equality and women's empowerment principles, which guided most UNAPF implementation from 2017 onward.

1. *Leaving no one behind* and human rights-based approaches

³¹ For details on the five programming principles and other key cross-cutting issues, refer to How to Prepare an UNDAF: Part (II) Technical Guidance for UN Country Teams, Chapter II, January 2010. For guidance on their practical application, see the [Guidance Note: Application of the Programming Principles to the UNDAF](#), January 2010.

³² Programming principles, UNDAF companion Guide, UNDG, 2017.

³³ See: UNDAF Guidance, UNDG, 2017 -- <https://undg.org/document/2017-UNDAF-guidance/> and UNDAF Companion Guidances, see <https://undg.org/programme/undaf-companion-guidances/>.

³⁴ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014, see <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>.

³⁵ UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note, UNEG, 2018.

Finding: *Leaving no one behind*, human rights, and gender equality, are all fundamental principles for the UNAPF and United Nations joint support to the government in achieving national development priorities and meeting international commitments. There is, however, limited information in the UNAPF document about how these principles would be cross-cutting. The HRBA was reflected in some outcomes the Results Matrix, those in reference to Treaty Bodies in particular. UNAPF results and strategies were also driven, or at least informed by, the standards and principles of Azerbaijan’s ratified human rights treaties. However, HRBA has not been reflected in a systematic, sustained, and purposeful way in UNAPF implementation through the use of HRBA steps (causality analysis, role-pattern analysis, and capacity gap analysis). There was not enough analysis to identify who the vulnerable are, where they are, and their needs, or to elaborate on how the UN can contribute. The capacity of government counterparts to address the needs of vulnerable groups, and the importance of disaggregated data, were not continuously developed. Agencies provided technical support through the UNAPF Human Rights Theme Group and the Gender Theme Group when reporting to human rights committees, however, dialogue between the United Nations and government on human rights could be strengthened by joint interventions that focus on vulnerable groups.

Human rights and gender equality are the fundamental principles that guide the implementation of the UNAPF and United Nations joint support to the government in meeting international commitments. The UNAPF document reaffirms UN coherence across some crosscutting themes such as gender equality and HRBA for leveraging resources and coordinating efforts across agencies. It is important to note that the principle of “Leave no one behind” was introduced in the 2017 UNADF Guidelines and became more significant in UNDAF processes and the 2019 UNSDCF Guidelines, which is reflective of its importance to the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.

An HRBA approach to development is a conceptual framework for sustainable development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and principles, and operationally promotes and protects human rights. Under the HRBA, development plans, policies and processes are anchored in a system of rights and corresponding obligations as per international law, including civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights, and the right to development. HRBA requires human rights principles (equality and non-discrimination, participation, accountability) guide UN development cooperation and focus on the capacity development of ‘duty-bearers’ to meet their obligations and ‘rights-holders’ to claim their rights.³⁶

UNDAF principles were mentioned with little emphasis on the current UNAPF document, which indicated that crosscutting themes would be addressed by the UNCT groups on gender, human rights, and HIV/AIDS for leveraging resources and coordinating the efforts of different organizations.

By contrast, the previous UNDAF contained an interesting table that indicated areas where cross-cutting issues would be considered for each UNDAF Outcome: “Reflection of cross-cutting issues in the UNDAF Outcomes.”

Regarding *leaving no one behind*, the evaluation found some UNAPF outcomes and indicators in the Results Matrix were not fit to measure results, and in a way that would ensure that no-one is left behind

³⁶ United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, Internal Guidance, 3 June 2019.

by United Nations interventions. In particular, evaluators found that Outcome 1.1 (diversification of the economy, enhanced sustainable growth, and decent work) targets youth, women, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, but indicators did not measure the effects of UN interventions on these groups. Outcome 2.3 however (by 2020 quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results), has the potential to better respond to the “leave no one behind” principle, with several indicators that target vulnerable groups.

Thematic group members (gender, human rights and SDGs) specified that to apply the principle of *leave no one behind* to the next UNSDCF there should be methodologies that identify specific vulnerable groups. They stressed there was not enough information to identify who the vulnerable are, where they are, what their needs are, or to elaborate on how the UN can contribute.

One of the other challenges is that United Nations cooperation is affected by the quality of engagement by government counterparts on this principle. The capacity of government on the importance of some issues related to the needs of vulnerable groups and importance of disaggregated data was not continuously developed. The government approach emphasizes that achieving economic growth for the majority of the population would have a positive spillover effect for improving opportunities for vulnerable groups.

It should be noted that the United Nations Sustainable Development Group (UNSDG) issued recent guidance on “leave no one behind,” which could be useful to address these issues and help prepare the next UNSDCF.³⁷ The guidelines offer a methodology on operationalizing LNOB with five steps for analysis, action, monitoring, accountability and meaningful participation. These are applicable to the diverse planning and programming contexts the UNDS leads or supports. A gender perspective should be applied throughout all steps. Women and girls are often some of the most deprived and disadvantaged in groups that are marginalized. The steps are:

- STEP 1: Who is being left behind? Gathering evidence.
- STEP 2: Why? Prioritization and analysis.
- STEP 3: What? What should be done.
- STEP 4: How? How to measure and monitor progress.
- STEP 5: Advancing accountability for LNOB.
- Cross-cutting guidance: Meaningful participation.

The guidelines offer practical information for integrating LNOB in the CCA and UNSDCF. Another recent publication from the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) could be useful with respect to data collection and analysis.³⁸

Regarding HRBA, the evaluation found it is reflected in the Results Matrix in Outcome 2.2 (by 2020, Azerbaijan has made progress in line with international human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review and other treaty obligations, and has strengthened capacities for implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with international standards). Furthermore, the indicators are relevant with respect to the outcome and both address standards of ratified human rights treaties (including

³⁷ Leaving No One behind, A UNSDG Operational Guide for UN Country Teams, Interim Draft, 18 March 2019.

³⁸ Human Rights-Based Approach to Data, Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2018.

international labour standards), refer to the implementation of recommendations issued by key Treaty Bodies plus the number of submissions to Treaty Bodies from the government, civil society and UN agencies, and are aligned with international standards of the foreign workers recruitment processes.

In addition to the Results Matrix, the UNAPF document mentions the international standards and core human rights conventions and instruments. As Azerbaijan has signed all major treaties and conventions, support was requested from the United Nations in developing approaches, attitudes and visions, and reporting on the implementation of these treaties. The UNAPF document also detailed development challenges in Azerbaijan in a table that covered four categories of causes: economic; socio-cultural; institutional and governance, and environmental and geographic.

The evaluation noted there are 14 outputs in the Joint Work Plans under Priority Area 2 that are aimed to help Azerbaijan make progress in line with international human rights mechanisms and standards, and strengthen capacities for implementation, monitoring, and reporting. Organizations provided technical support through the UNAPF Human Rights Thematic Group on reporting to human rights committees (i.e. CRC, CEDAW, CESCR, and the UPR), and on providing follow-up observations and recommendations.

The HRBA is reflected in some Results Matrix outcomes, in particular the reference to Treaty Bodies. Based on achievements described in the section of this report on effectiveness, it is clear that UNAPF results and strategies were driven, or at least informed by, the standards and principles of government-ratified human rights treaties. Specific results and strategies are linked to many concluding observations and recommendations of Treaty Bodies. Moreover, there are concrete examples of the UNCT and implementing partners applying the three 'operational' principles of HRBA (non-discrimination and equality, participation and inclusion, and accountability and rule of law).

However, despite these achievements there is no evidence of systematic or sustained application of the HRBA process during the preparation of the UNAPF, in subsequent annual reviews, or in the mid-term review process. This requires at least three steps carried out jointly with programme partners:

1. Structured causality analysis of major development challenges to understand the root causes of the non-fulfillment of human rights;
2. Role and pattern analysis to make clear expected duties of the state in respecting, protecting and fulfilling human rights obligations to specific rights holders, in line with ratified treaties; and,
3. Capacity gaps analysis for both duty bearers and rights holders to identify the specific capacities that enable sustained action.³⁹

Overall, this suggests that the end result of the programming process was informed by human rights standards, principles, and concerns, but arriving at that point was not based on a structured and purposive application of the entire HRBA approach.

An example of an inter-agency activity is a year-long campaign launched to mark the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in December 2017. As part of celebrations to mark UN Human Rights Day, this campaign promoted the understanding of how the Universal Declaration empowers all and encouraged reflection on the ways every citizen can stand up for human rights. The launch event

³⁹ How to Prepare an UNDAF: Part (II) Technical Guidance for UN Country Teams, UNDG, 2010. 22-23. See also HRBA Common Learning Package.

brought together over 50 representatives from state agencies, parliament, international organizations, civil society, academia, and mass media.

Discussions with stakeholders identified the following weaknesses in the implementation of HRBA,

- It is unclear in the UNAPF document and other reports how this principle is cross-cutting in UNAPF implementation. For instance, while it is clear in Priority Area 2 (14 outputs) there is no specific explanation on how it is mainstreamed in priority areas 1 and 3.
- The human rights component is considered weak in UNAPF implementation by some informants the consultants met. They considered that dialogue between the United Nations and government is limited. Discussions on human rights are downscaled though member states are concerned about human rights in Azerbaijan. The UN is called to continue human rights discussions with the government, to channel its concerns to the highest levels of government, and to be more active in the field of social cohesion.
- Some NGOs also stated that human rights are less emphasized by the UN, due to their sensitive nature. There are also limitations in terms of what topics NGOs can hold training on (for example LGBTQAI topic) and they do not feel sufficient political level support by the United Nations on sensitive issues.
- Building capacity and raising awareness of UN programme staff and national partners on the UN human rights system and thematic topics is a continuous need. It was suggested that a joint workshop could be organized that would include sessions on UN Treaty Bodies, UN Special Rapporteurs, and specific topics related to gender, child-rights, rights of refugees, IDPs, migrants, the right to development, etc.

2. Gender equality and women's empowerment

Finding: Gender equality and women's empowerment were reflected in UNAPF design (in terms of specific goals and targets set, sex-disaggregated data and indicators) and implementation, despite limited information in the UNAPF document about cross-cutting nature. Gender equality is reflected in the Results Matrix with Outcome 2.1 fully dedicated on gender, however, indicators do not seem to be fully aligned to the outcome objective. Gender equality is also reflected in Outcome 2.3 with several indicators disaggregating data on women and men. Nevertheless, there are several ways gender equality and women' empowerment can be better integrated in forthcoming UNSDCF strategies and results frameworks, and in line with the June 2019 UNSDCF Guidelines. There are some activities UN organizations jointly do every year, for example on disabilities (UNDP and UNFPA) or reproductive health policy (UNFPA and WHO). Yet, having joint projects is not always possible with challenges related to the mobilization of funds, double charging of administrative costs, and agency-specific priorities. Almost every UN organization has projects or activities on gender, however, there is limited joint programming between them. Despite the needs, capacity strengthening of the UN Gender Thematic Group and UN organizations, and the preparation of a gender strategy, are not taking place due to funding difficulties. A Participatory Gender Audit aimed at assessing the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT made important recommendations that are directly related to the UNAPF.

The evaluation analyzed to what extent, and in what ways, the concepts of gender equality, gender equity, and women's empowerment were reflected in the UNAPF (in terms of specific goals and targets, sex-

disaggregated data, and indicators). This included an assessment on how UNAPF strategies, results, and indicators have been informed by a gender analysis and some understanding of how women and men experience problems differently. The evaluation determined the ways that gender equality and empowerment of women can be better integrated in upcoming UNSDCF strategies and results frameworks, and a specific recommendation was formulated with several suggested actions, in line with the June 2019 UNSDCF Guidelines.⁴⁰

The UNAPF document indicated that central to many development challenges is gender equality. While Azerbaijan had taken a series of important steps to address women's vulnerabilities, evidence-based data revealed that women were still at major risk of individual, institutional and structural discrimination in the public and private sectors. For example, 54% of graduate students in 2016-2017, 55.3% in 2017-2018, and 54.1% in the 2018-2019 were women, and 56% of PhD students and 45% of professors in 2017, and 57% of PhD students and 48% of professors in 2018 were women.⁴¹ Indicators of women's involvement in primary, secondary, and tertiary education were nearly equal to those of men.

In addition, data on the representation of women in decision-making positions and employment revealed persistent horizontal and vertical disparities in all sectors with women concentrated mainly in low-wage sectors such as education, health, and social services. Prevalent gender stereotypes and attitudes reinforce traditional gender roles and create grounds for diverse forms of gender-based discrimination such as early marriage, gender-biased sex selection, and domestic violence. The UNAPF document also made reference to the fact that the Azerbaijan Country Analysis underscored that gender equality provisions were critical for sustainable development processes and recommended that efforts should be intensified to close *de facto* gender gaps.

The evaluation found that gender equality is reflected in the Results Matrix with Outcome 2.1 fully dedicated to gender (by 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence based and gender responsive policy formulation and implementation). That said, indicators do not seem to be fully aligned to the outcome objective. Gender equality is also reflected in Outcome 2.3 (by 2020, quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results) with several indicators disaggregating women and men. United Nations organizations jointly undertake joint programming activities on gender every year. There have been discussions about having a joint programme on gender, but this is not always possible due to funding issues where several organizations apply for funding from a donor, the European Union for example, but only one can be selected as the lead agency to receive awarded funding. Transferring part of the money to another agency causes double charging of administrative costs. See previous section on synergies between UN organizations, joint programming and programmes.

⁴⁰ United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, Internal Guidance, 3 June 2019.

⁴¹ Numbers provided by the Ministry of Education. Figures are updated by the Ministry as of August 2020: 80% of teachers working in general education facilities are women; every year, 75% of teachers that are employed through centralized competition are females; the special weight of teachers is increasing in the management system: 6 rectors (13%), 37 vice-rectors (21%), 15 college directors (28%), 36 deputy principals (31%), 11 principals of vocational education facilities (13%), 40 deputy principals (45%), principals of 1244 general education schools (33%), and 3965 deputy principals (54%) are women. Representation of women in the science sector is also high in Azerbaijan: 54% of graduate students, 51% of PhDs working in higher education facilities, and 46% of professor doctors are women. There is increase in the number of girls in the statistical indicators of undergraduate students: girls are 50.0% of total students and 50% of students of this degree have been also girls. There is also increase in the number of girls that are graduate students: the number of girls at this education degree has been 54.0%. And more than 60 percent of students enrolling in this stage have been girls.

The evaluation asked stakeholders to offer examples on how gender equality was applied during the UNAPF implementation. Based on documents, meetings, and interviews, evaluators found the key achievements in the area of gender equality and gender-sensitive development to be:

- UNCT advocacy for gender equality and empowerment, which was effectively coordinated by the Gender Thematic Group under UNFPA leadership and gained momentum in 2018 with the development and launch of a number of important activities in support of national efforts.
- The 16 Days of Activism campaign against gender-based violence was led by UNFPA in close partnership with nine UN entities, the State Committee for Family, Women, and Children's Affairs, and local NGOs. Partners aimed to scale up advocacy efforts for eliminating GBV in the country.
- Various resources and reports were produced by UNFPA to ensure gender-sensitive policy development and implementation. These included GBV Essential Service Packages (ESPs) and standard operating procedures, the analysis of data collected during the national survey on GBV prevalence rates, and the statistical yearbook "Women and Men in Azerbaijan, 2018." UNDP and UNFPA partnered with State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs, Women's Association for Rational Development, and the Embassy of Switzerland (as a donor) to carry out an analysis on gender-specific barriers that hinder women from pursuing business opportunities, securing decent jobs, and building successful careers in the private sector. In addition, the first draft of the qualitative study on the economic costs of GBV, and findings from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey, are available. Also, a manual on physical and sexual violence against girls was developed and piloted by UNFPA in four districts of Azerbaijan.
- Advocacy efforts for informed decision-making when addressing gender-based discrimination and violence resulted in the production of several major draft documents (with UNFPA support to the government): the revised draft of the National Action Plan on Gender Based Violence and a draft of the National Action Plan on Gender Equality.
- UNFPA supported the government on the development of the VI State Report to the UN Committee on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). An international expert assisted the national steering group on developing the report. The report, with information on Azerbaijan's progress on gender equality in the past four years, was submitted to CEDAW in 2019.
- UNFPA provided support to the government on the development of the Beijing+25 national review report. Thanks to UNFPA and UNRCO efforts several local NGOs and youth leaders were invited to participate at relevant regional review meetings organized by UN Women.
- UNFPA implemented a joint advocacy initiative with WHO on reproductive health policies.
- UNFPA support to the government included the development of an online inter-agency GBV database for the purpose of informed decision making on the issue. The database helps relevant authorities collect and store information on GBV cases from line ministries, local executive committees, and NGOs with the intent to assist GBV victims. SCFWCA is the administrator of the database and it is currently operational. Furthermore, efforts for new sex disaggregated indicators to be integrated in the national statistical database continued. Prevention of skewed sex ratio at

birth in Azerbaijan has been one of the strategic priorities of UNCT for several years. The sex ratio in the country continues to be 114/100, which means every year 12,000 to 15,000 more boys than girls will be born. UNFPA assisted in drafting the National Action Plan on Prevention and Response to Gender Biased Sex Selection (GBSS) in 2018 to improve the situation.

- To raise the profile of girls' rights and advocate for the centrality of young women in society. UNICEF and the National Soccer Federation launched a joint #GirlsCan campaign, reaching more than 260,000 people via social media.
- There is a repository of gender resources developed according to the GTG framework with contributions from almost all agencies, and following recommendations of the Participatory Gender Audit. All UNCT members and United Nations staff have access to it, and information on all local and international gender experts, local NGOs, reports and manuals, online tools, etc. The extent to which the repository is used depends on encouragement from leadership and gender focal points.

The evaluation enquired about the existence of recommendations and UNCT action plan following a SWAP gender scorecard assessment or similar exercise, which would provide insights on gender mainstreaming under the UNAPF, the ability to track budget allocations, and address gender equality and women's empowerment.

A participatory gender audit (PGA) was commissioned by the UNCT to strive for gender equality through a twin-track approach. The audit assessed the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT and ensured the design and development of more gender-responsive programmes and projects. An issue-based coalition recognized the PGA as one of the best practices in the region.

The evaluation analyzed the participatory gender audit and found recommendations directly related to the UNAPF would be useful for the UNCT to consider in preparing the next UNSDPCF and include:

- Implementing a joint and integrated gender mainstreaming strategy and work plan for the UNCT Azerbaijan with pooled resources. Be supported by the Gender Theme Group and linked to the UNAPF and national indicators for the SDGs. Build on the synergies established for the GTG to go beyond the addition of individual organizational activities to agree on more integrated and coordinated implementation plans with joint activities and pooled resources for 2018 onwards. This can be linked to UNAPF three strategic objectives, SDG Coordination Council (not just SDG 5), and CEDAW concluding comments (Coordination No 3).
- Develop an interagency work plan (not just a strategy) on gender sensitive communication products for the UNAPF (Coordination No 5).
- Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems, and capacities on gender mainstreaming, including budget tracking on allocations, and expenditure on gender equality (M&E No 1).
- Consider implementing a joint GTG project on the design and monitoring of gender indicators in relation to the UNAPF, but with government partners for the SDGs and the assistance of experts within the UNCT and various regional/HQ offices of UNCT organizations (M&E No 5).

The evaluation identified other ways that gender equality and women's empowerment can be better integrated in forthcoming UNSDCF strategies and results framework. To start, recent UNEG guidance on

“UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator” is useful.⁴² In addition, the UNDG “Resource Book for Mainstreaming Gender in UN Common Programming at the Country Level”⁴³ and “Resource Guide for UN Gender Theme Groups”⁴⁴ can be used to articulate gender equality and women’s empowerment, and *leave no one behind* in the context of current UNAPF implementation and the next UNSDCF. Even if the focus is on evaluation UNEG guidelines on “Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation” are equally insightful.⁴⁵

Other suggestions gathered from documents, meetings, and interviews are as follows:

First, there is a need to strengthen the capacity of the UN Gender Theme Group, however, significant capacity building activities are not taking place due to funding difficulties. Strengthening UN staff members’ capacity on gender issues is important if the UN wants to mainstream gender in all its programming. Developing a gender strategy has stalled due to the lack of funding to hire a consultant.

Second, the Gender Theme Group proposed that under the next UNSDCF, for specific thematic areas such as gender, the Resident Coordinator system could budget some funds to be distributed among organizations. Considering that majority of UN agencies receive resources through projects, donor priorities affect what can be prioritized. It is the same for joint programmes. Within thematic groups it is not possible to go beyond discussing individual activities. Following the delinking process, a separate budget should be allocated by the UNRCO for these themes. The partnership considered the most successful is the annual 16 Days of Activism campaign where all organizations contributed a modest sum. It is hoped that the new UNRCO system will be able to allocate funds for such projects and actively coordinate all partners. Political will by UN leadership is important to effectively mainstream gender and implement PGA recommendations. Alternatively, there should be mechanisms in place to receive funding from donors, which can be used without double charging. These options should help overcome challenges to *delivering as one* for gender equality.

Third, to better integrate gender-based approaches in the next UNAPFSDCF, gender equality and gender equity should be considered. The emphasis should not be on numbers but impact, and there should be more qualitative indicators disaggregated by gender. According to a desk review conducted by UN Women in 11 countries, not all indicators related to gender, equality, or women’s empowerment have been fully considered and covered in UNAPF Azerbaijan. Some issues need increased attention, for example the gender pay gap. Issues mentioned in the MAPS mission report, such as a rise in the trafficking of women, the gender pay gap, indicators under the SDGs, etc., should also be taken into account. Indicators related to gender under the SDGs and government priorities can be considered. Furthermore, the Gender Scorecard is an internationally validated methodology that could be used for baseline and target data on UNCT performance regarding gender mainstreaming and synergies between organizations in the field. Fourth, the Gender Theme Group is usually part of the results groups during the development of UNAPF documents. Every agency has a gender focal point, which may include people who are not necessarily gender specialists. For the preparation of the next UNFSDCF it is recommended that an expert be involved

⁴² UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note, UNEG, 2018.

⁴³ Resource Book for Mainstreaming Gender in UN Common Programming at the Country Level”, UNDG, 2018 –

<https://undg.org/document/resource-book-for-mainstreaming-gender-in-un-common-programming-at-the-country-level/>.

⁴⁴ Resource Guide for UN Gender Theme Groups, UNDG, 2018, see <https://undg.org/document/resource-guide-for-gender-theme-groups/>.

⁴⁵ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014, see <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>.

to properly address needed aspects. UN Women specifically recommends at least one gender specific outcome in the next UNSDCF.

Fourth, under the next UNSDCF members of thematic groups can identify challenges to be addressed, prioritize three to four challenges, and think of relevant activities. United Nations leadership and government partners can be requested for financial allocations. There is a need to be realistic and flexible to adjust and prioritize depending on the availability of financial resources. Thematic groups should make efforts to contribute during the CCA assignment that is due to start shortly.

Fifth, NGOs pointed out that gender-based domestic violence, women's rights, employment and access to free or low-cost legal aid, premarital medical examinations, etc., need to be dealt with. NGOs also referred to UNICEF's role in building social service protection for children and women at risk of violence.

As a final remark on the guiding principles, key informants suggested that all crosscutting issues (*leaving no one behind*, gender, human rights, young people, people with disabilities, and emerging issues such as aging, etc.) should be mentioned in the next UNSDCF. They are not duly reflected in the current UNAPF.

F. SUSTAINABILITY

Finding: There are many concrete examples of collaborative projects launched under the UNAPF that have been maintained by national partners and counterparts, or replicated and scaled up by the government. While the UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results it is still early in the programme cycle (three years and a half) to be categorical about sustainability. Collaboration with local NGOs contributed to the sustainability of achieved results as they have sometimes been more effective at the grassroots level. However, a lack of resources, ownership, cooperation and coordination, follow-up, phasing out, and mainstreaming of United Nations project results in national programmes or policies hinder the potential to maintain UNAPF benefits over time.

Sustainability of the UNAPF was defined in the ToR as the extent to which benefits from development interventions have continued or are likely to continue after completion.

The evaluation considers there is potential for UNAPF benefits to be maintained over time by national partners and counterparts. Potential is strengthened by the relevance of the UNAPF to the SDGs, Vision 2020, and Strategic Roadmaps. There are many concrete examples of collaborative projects launched under UNAPF that have been maintained over time by national partners and counterparts, or replicated and scaled up by the government. Yet, it is still early in the UNAPF programme cycle (three years and a half) to be categorical about sustainability. The UNAPF, contributed to the sustainability of results, as follows:

- UNDP supported the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources in the development of legislature related to the creation and preservation of Gizilaghaj National Park, which was created in 2018 and became the first national marine park in Azerbaijan.
- Preparing the national strategy on the conservation of soil, as well as the preservation of the Kura River resulted from UNDP and FAO cooperation on a project related to preservation of natural

resources, forests and land, and UNIDO/UNEP/FAO cooperation on an initiative supporting the Stockholm Convention and programme of action. The IOM project in Nakhichevan on rehabilitation of traditional water systems led to sustainability. Since 2018, IOM has implemented a new rehabilitation project that covers eight regions in the South-West of Azerbaijan (mainly populated by IDPs): Aghdam, Aghjabadi, Barda, Fuzuli, Ganja, Gazakh, Ghoranboy, and Goygol.

- The National Forestry Plan FAO helped prepare several years ago was finally approved following the arrival of the new Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources of Azerbaijan. This showed the importance of government ownership for development sustainability.
- UNDP supported the development of teaching materials for a vocational school in Ismayilli, and the Ministry of Education adopted these materials for use in other vocational schools. The Ministry of Education endorsed the initiative and is scaling up pre-school coverage across the country. The provision of vocational training opportunities was undertaken by UN organizations, which is considered important for sustainability. Similarly, the 2018 UNICEF mid-term review pointed out that incorporating programme results in systematic and institutional changes, like building programme training methodologies and tools in the national pre-service and in-service training system, is one of the best ways to ensure sustainability. This was reflected in training packages developed through education programmes and guidelines on monitoring child development that were adapted by national training institutions and became part of regular development training.
- Within the framework of the UNDP project “Support to Establishment of Regional Vocational Competency Center in Ganja,” financed by the European Union, a workshop in Ganja Vocational State Education Center for Industry and Technologies was put into service and six curricula were prepared. Within the framework of the UNDP project “Support to Establishment of Model Vocational Education Center in Lankaran Economic Region,” financed by the European Union, a workshop with necessary equipment was put into service in Jalilabad State Education Center and six curricula were prepared.
- National capacities have been enhanced under the UNAPF through the development of guidelines on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings by government institutions, and NGO guidelines on the management of shelters and assistance centers.
- In the case of the Food Safety Agency, FAO ensured smooth operationalization of a newly established agency by providing timely and effective technical advisory services and capacity development in the areas of institutional structuring, as well as international trade. Launching the FAO-Azerbaijan Partnership Program on sustainable development of agriculture with a \$10 million US dollar government contribution with the first three projects focused on livestock and seed sector development, is an indicator of high government ownership and sustainability of coming results. 7 projects are planned to be implemented within the framework of the FAO-Azerbaijan Partnership Program (FATP). Most likely, the result of ongoing FAO and Ministry of Agriculture support to rural young people to implement business ideas in the food and agriculture sector, in particular the creation of 100 new businesses under the Agrarian Employment Enhancement Project, will be sustainable after the completion of the project in 2020. In addition to the Increasing Employment in Agriculture Project (AMAL), the Azerbaijani Women Engaging in

Agricultural Activities Project (AFAG) which is being implemented within the framework of the FATP will also contribute to supporting of Azerbaijani women engaging in the agricultural sphere, encouraging women to work in the agricultural sector and improving the social welfare of people living in villages. Methodical support provided to the State Statistical Committee and other related institutions by FAO make quality data available for monitoring SDG implementation in food and agriculture, and is an example of sustainability.

- Established in 2016, the “Simplified Support to Family Businesses” is part of a programme on enhancing socio-economic life in all regions. The initiative received one million *manat* in initial seed from the government to build the system and start production. Now self-sustaining, it receives no funds from the government and even contributed 1.6 million *manats* to the state budget in the form of tax payments. Support from the European Union, UNDP, and other partners (SOCAR, PASHA Holding) via ad hoc non-financial grants supported the development of a project that now works with 374 families.
- Over 50% of Women Resource Centres established receive support from state-funded institutions as newly-created NGOs—an important step towards sustainability.
- Under the self-employment programme, developed with the support of ILO, the government finances a significant number of self-employed people per year.
- Since 2018, in two of the Youth Houses under the Ministry of Youth and Sports, the joint project titled ‘Joint Youth Houses Initiative of the Ministry and UN’ is being implemented. Several UN agencies conduct activities for the development of youth in this pilot Youth House. The UN turned over all operational responsibilities to the youth houses, which seem to be sustainable as they continue to function.

However, though there are examples of sustainability a lack of resources, ownership, cooperation, coordination, follow-up, phasing out, or inclusion in national programmes or policies, hinders the potential to maintain UNAPF benefits over time. This evaluation highlights the following constraints:

- While complementarities, collaboration, and synergies among UNAPF partners contributed to greater sustainability of results, cooperation, including among government ministries and UN organizations, needs significant improvement.
- Though regular monitoring activities are conducted during projects implemented with government partners, after the projects end the UN engages in little to no follow-up so it is not known what happens in terms of sustainability. For example, the UN has worked with shelters and assistance centers between 2016-2019, but now it is not known how sustainable contributions have been. It is therefore important to employ practical strategies with government entities to ensure projects are taken over and continued. It can be done through building the institutional capacities of partners by developing and localizing methodologies and training trainers.
- UNFPA established a network of reproductive health centers across Azerbaijan, which was an important and successful project, and appreciated by the Ministry of Health. Nonetheless, in the

end, it was not sustainable, which was why it was not properly phased out and taken over by the government.

- UNFPA also provided health and reproductive health services, organized advocacy on family planning, and promoted the use of contraceptives. But because contraceptives were not on the essential drug list of the Ministry of Health, it was not sustainable. Cooperation was not sufficiently based on the needs of the people or planned together with the government.
- UNHCR advocates the government assume greater responsibility for refugees by providing them with better legal protection and mainstreaming them in existing social services. Though they are protected from refoulement, most are merely tolerated because they fall under UNHCR protection. But because they lack secure legal status they effectively live in a situation of protracted limbo. UNHCR hopes they will receive complementary protection once the long-awaited Law on Complementary Protection is approved or, if not for some groups, residence permits are handed out, which provide access to social, economic, cultural rights, including the right to decent employment. Some refugees have been in Azerbaijan for 15-20 years but have not been able to access legal employment. The situation puts them in a vulnerable situation, making them dependent on UNHCR assistance, which is not sustainable.
- The sustainability of Women Resource Centers, funded by the Government of Switzerland, European Union, USAID, and Coca Cola is still under question. After being launched and funded since 2011, it still requires additional funds. One explanation is that it was a social project at the outset, but is now oriented toward economic opportunities.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED

The **first lesson** from this UNAPF is that there is a limit on how high-level outcomes and indicators can be in such a framework. If too ambitious they would be better placed in a national development plan, for instance, since the UN cannot significantly contribute to their achievement.

The **second lesson** is that the effectiveness of UNAPF implementation can be improved if it is coordinated by a government body with overarching and coordinating mandates with other government agencies.

The **third lesson** is there is always a need to have open discussions amongst all parties from the outset of projects to ensure sustainability and conduct a thorough analysis of the situation and needs. After confirming a project is needed, it is important that the project is included in the national programme or policy by the government. Doing so means the project will be part of national planning and budgeting, and provide systematic and sustainable contributions to development processes.

The **fourth lesson** is a number of non-resident organizations have contributed to UNAPF outcomes and the achievement of national priorities. Despite UNRCO efforts to link organizations to others in the UN or relevant government authorities, based on the UNAPF, it is important for the UNCT to be more inclusive of different non-resident organizations and allow the government to take full advantage of their unique areas of expertise.

The **fifth lesson** is that allowing various actors to participate (civil society organizations or academia, where feasible) in existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee and results groups, is important for ensuring a joint alignment of results, and improving effectiveness and efficiency in delivering results, along with monitoring, reporting and planning in the outcome and cross-cutting areas.

The **sixth lesson** is that even if there were many partnerships at the agency level, the UNAPF helped promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas. New stakeholder relationships were formed and older ones consolidated to support UNCT work for sustainable development. Nevertheless, it is important the UN strengthen its partnerships and strategic alliances with non-governmental actors if it wants to pilot direct support to community level interventions.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The **first conclusion** of the evaluation is that UNAPF outcomes are relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms and standards, and in line with national priorities and strategies, the nationalization of the SDGs, and new laws, policies and strategies. In addition to baseline assessments or other types of studies, a Country Analysis was conducted during UNAPF development, which helped fully address development issues and underlying causes and challenges based on stronger evidence. SDG implementation will benefit from a development system and government fully able to use the comparative advantages and added value of the UNDS and also pursue integrated approaches that create cross-sector synergies in delivering linked results at all levels.

The **second conclusion** is that the design of the UNAPF Results Matrix could have better reflected what the UNDS can do in-country. The UNAPF is an important instrument for capturing the shared vision between the UN and government; however, results and indicators should be formulated in a way that allows for the effective monitoring and evaluation of results, shows results attributed to UN interventions (outputs), and highlights results where the UN contributed (outcomes). Several indicators are high and too ambitious for the UN to achieve, even in an upper middle-income country where it is already difficult to measure and evaluate an upstream UNAPF—this is especially true with regards to advocacy and policy development targets.

The **third conclusion** is the UNAPF was effective overall in reaching expected outcomes and outputs, and some progress was made in contributing to the achievement of national priorities, including strengthening national capacities and institutions, policy formulation and implementation, and data collection and analysis in all three UNAPF priority areas. Progress was also achieved in supporting the government in cross-cutting areas, advancing towards SDG achievement, empowering youth and women, and in the area of human rights. Overall, the evaluation concludes the majority of planned interventions under the outcomes seem to have been implemented during 2016-2018 or will be implemented in 2019-2020.

The **fourth conclusion** is that the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among UN programmes through the regular sharing of information. It resulted in a few joint programmes and in some joint programming. The UNAPF also increased inter-agency collaboration and invited UN organizations to participate as co-chairs of results groups and in developing and monitoring Joint Work Plans collectively.

There is also good synergy within the UNCT, where agencies support each other when possible, however, synergies could be enhanced and do not seem to have fully extended to inter-ministerial collaboration. There are still challenges in creating and implementing joint programmes, some can be addressed at country-level by the UNCT and others by organization headquarters.

The **fifth conclusion** is it is not easy to understand from the Results Matrix how outputs can contribute to outcomes, given that the matrix was designed only at the outcome level and does not include outputs, which are only recorded in the JWPs. Furthermore, the UNAPF was developed without an UNAPF Action Plan that could have specified outputs. Under such circumstances the outputs ended up in the Joint Work Plans. 2010 UNDAF Guidelines are not to blame for this situation since they recommended having outputs in the Results Matrix or in the UNDAF Action Plan. However, the 2017 guidelines may have led to less useful tools, with M&E functions reduced to JWPs and related reporting without the use of a M&E Framework.

The **sixth conclusion** is a lack of clear criteria in defining outputs since there were different outputs introduced in the JWPs, some at very different levels, including activities for single organizations. As a consequence, there are 47 outputs in the current JWPs, which is a lot. It would have been easier to monitor and evaluate achievements at the highest level of the hierarchy of results, via a few joined outputs (for example three to four per outcome), and by regrouping activities from several organizations. In addition, it would have made the UNAPF a more strategic document and simplified reporting processes.

The **seventh conclusion** is the comparative advantages and added value of United Nations, including non-resident organizations, have been utilized in a variety of ways by national partners in the framework of the UNAPF.

The **eighth conclusion** is the stable political environment and good relationships between the government and UN are some of the main factors that contributed to progress towards the UNAPF outcomes. One of the constraints for UNAPF implementation, however, is limited coordination among government entities.

The **ninth conclusion** is that even if the government does not necessarily see the work it is doing with the UN as part of the UNAPF, and even if issues the UNAPF deals with also go beyond one ministry as a key counterpart, the participation of numerous ministries in the Results Groups and in the M&E Group as co-chairs demonstrates some joint ownership of the Framework.

The **tenth conclusion** is that despite technical support provided through the UNAPF Human Rights Theme Group, or Gender Theme Group on reporting to human rights committees, dialogue between the UN and government on human rights could be strengthened, possibly by joint interventions focusing on vulnerable groups.

The **eleventh conclusion** is gender equality was reflected in UNAPF design and implementation, and almost every United Nations organizations has some project/activities on gender. Yet, there is limited joint programming on gender generally speaking. A Participatory Gender Audit, aimed at assessing the extent of gender mainstreaming across the UNCT, made important recommendations directly related to the UNAPF. Despite the needs, the capacity strengthening of the Gender Theme Group and UNDS, and the preparation of a gender strategy, are not taking place due to funding difficulties. Following the UNDS reform, a separate budget could be allocated for gender issues by the UNRCO. To better integrate gender-

based approaches in the next UNSDCF an internationally validated methodology such as the Gender Scorecard could be used for baseline and target data on UNCT performance regarding gender mainstreaming and synergies between organizations and partners in the field.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation offers these recommendations together with suggested actions to help implement them. Evaluators are aware, however, that the implementation of some actions may be on-going. In addition, they bear in mind that all capacities (technical, human, financial) may not be in place to fully respond to recommendations.

Similarly, while some of recommendations are inspired by the UN Reform and “Delivering as One,” the evaluators recognize the challenges in implementing the UNAPF to enhance the relevance, coherence, and effectiveness of the Framework. These recommendations are offered to stimulate thinking and concrete action around UNAPF implementation in the context of SDGs and UNDS reform.

Key Recommendations	Suggested actions
<p>Recommendation 1: The UNCT and government should improve the design and usefulness of the next UNSDCF as an instrument to capture a shared vision and mission in the context of the SDGs</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The UNCT and government should use the latest edition of new guidelines for developing the new Cooperation Framework, especially guiding principles, recommendations for design and preparation, a Theory of Change, and the definition of strategic priorities, outcomes, outputs and indicators. ● UNAPF including outcomes without the corresponding outputs has shown its limits in the monitoring and reporting. It is strongly recommended the UNCT and government develop a Results Matrix with outcomes, outputs and an M&E Framework that monitor progress of outcomes and outputs. ● To avoid long list of outputs (47 in the current JWPs), the new UNAPFSDCF should encompass several inputs from different organizations. It is important to avoid having outputs that only represent the work of a single agency. This would make it easier to monitor and evaluate achievements at the highest level of the hierarchy of results, render the UNAPFSDCF a more strategic document and process, and also enhance the contribution of the UNAPFSDCF to the SDGs. ● In the context of the UNDS reform and its emphasis on accountability, there is a need to make sure that outputs can be directly attributed to the UN Development System and the next UNSDCF should be designed in a way that contributions can be shown more accurately through well-formulated outcomes and indicators. See the recommendation below on RBM and M&E. ● When designing the next UNSDCF, all key partners would need to be consulted and involved in a participatory way when developing expected results and indicators.
<p>Recommendation 2: The government should strengthen ownership and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The government should continue efforts to strengthen its participation in, and ownership of, the UNAPF. The Steering Committee should continue to provide strategic guidance to, and undertake, coordinated implementation of the UNAPF, taking into consideration the nationalization process of the SDGs and the establishment of the National Council for Sustainable Development.

<p>coordination of the UNAPF</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Considering that NCCSD Secretariat has supported UNAPF coordination and implementation under the Ministry of Economy, the shift to the Cabinet of Ministers with the Deputy Prime Minister, who also chairs the National Coordination Council Sustainable Development, as the government counterpart would strengthen the enforcement and accountability of mechanisms. ● Government ownership of the next UNSDCF and its work toward implementing the 2030 Agenda would likely be strengthened if the government develops a unified National Development Plan. ● To strengthen “national” ownership of the UNAPF (not only government ownership) it is important to involve NGOs and CSOs at a more strategic level in UNAPF design and implementation.
<p>Recommendation 3: The UNCT should promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around outcome areas and with a variety of stakeholders in order to enhance UNAPF effectiveness</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The UNCT should promote, strengthen, and develop partnerships and strategic alliances with different stakeholders to support its work on sustainable development. This includes government, Parliament, local government, national human rights institutions, development partners, IFIs, academic institutes and experts, and the private sector.
<p>Recommendation 4: The UNCT and government should encourage the involvement of NGOs and CSOs at a more strategic level in the current and next UNSDCF</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The UNCT is called to strengthen its partnerships and strategic alliances with NGOs and CSOs, including youth organizations. ● The government should address difficulties in financial management with NGO/CSO partners, which limits direct support to community level interventions and reduces the effectiveness of interventions. Doing so will open a window for more active and wide-ranging support to NGOs and create space for CSOs to operate more freely. ● When selecting NGOs as implementing partners the UNCT should deliberately consider their accountability, transparency, and independence.
<p>Recommendation 5: The UNCT is invited to strengthen joint programming and implement targeted joint programmes</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The UNAPF should continue to be implemented, in part, with some targeted joint programmes that are carefully chosen after a cost-benefit analysis, reflecting complementarities amongst UN agencies to collectively work together on common national development priorities, and where there is the possibility for higher-level results in areas such as gender. ● The UNCT should continue to implement and further develop targeted joint programme activities where the possibility of higher-level results exists and reduced duplication of efforts, in particularly strategic areas.

<p>Recommendation 6: The UNCT and government should increase cooperation through the results and thematic groups, and use them to manage the UNAPF strategically.</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cooperation and synergies between agencies involved in the implementation of activities needs to be strengthened to reach higher-level results. ● Results groups should meet regularly to ensure proper monitoring and to support the UNCT in strategically managing the UNAPF while keeping their functioning light with the continued use of the (now two year) Joint Work Plans; and for the next UNSDCF the use of a M&E Framework. ● Results groups should strengthen their efforts to ensure strong mainstreaming of programming principles in their JWPs and strategies (especially <i>leaving no one behind</i>, human rights-based approach and gender). ● Ministries and other state entities should appoint stable focal points to attend result group meetings and ensure efficient institutional memory throughout the planning and implementation of the UNAPF. Names of these specific focal points could be mentioned in invitation letters to the meetings to facilitate internal communication.
---	--

<p>Recommendation 7: The UNCT and government should strengthen their use of effective RBM and M&E systems to strategically monitor and manage the UNAPF</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RBM and M&E systems should be strengthened to better capture results in the future and demonstrate UN comparative advantage in contributing to national priorities by building on a robust Results Matrix and M&E Framework. ● Expected results need to be attributable to the UNDS to ensure accountability and show results. The UNAPF should include a robust set of results that are measurable and realistic, and for which agencies can be held accountable. Accountability is one of the guiding principles for the new UNSDCF. ● It is essential the Results Matrix lists expected results (outcomes and outputs), indicators, baselines and targets that are in line with specific, measurable, achievable, result-oriented and time-bound (SMART) criteria, and allow for effective monitoring and evaluation. This requires special attention for an upstream UNAPF, as difficulties arise in monitoring and evaluating advocacy and policy development results. Instead of having general indicators it is better to concentrate on a limited number the UN, together with partners, could influence and focus their attention on. ● The Results Matrix of the next UNSDCF could have a column for UN expected contributions and another with partner contributions. Instead of including a long list of partners only key partners could be mentioned, but with a short explanation on their role. A good example is the current UNPSD from Georgia (2016-2020). ● The Results Matrix should be implemented and monitored through a proper M&E Framework and not only Joint Work Plans, which are too detailed to keep the strategic vision and are meant to plan activities (inputs) than measure progress on outcomes and outputs. It would be useful to develop more understandable Joint Work Plans in terms of structure and design. ● The M&E Framework should be revised during UNAPF implementation to ensure that expected results, indicators, baselines and targets, remain valid and in line with SMART criteria. ● The M&E Group should continue supporting and guiding UNAPF monitoring and implementation and contribute to results group work with support from the UNRCO. ● All of this may require the need to strengthen M&E capacities within organizations, and to develop a culture of results of staff so monitoring and measuring achievements and progress would become an appreciated and valued exercise that can be undertaken without major difficulties.
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should be developed in line with SDGs indicators. ● If high level indicators are used in the next UNSDCF all baselines and targets should be aligned to the SDGs and tailored to those localized to the Azerbaijani context. ● It is important to intensify efforts to build national capacities in evaluation to strengthen results-based management, evaluation culture, evidence-based learning, and accountability for development results.
<p>Recommendation 8: The UNCT, the State Statistics Committee, and ministries should strengthen collaboration in view of improving national capacities for data collection and analysis, especially given their importance for measuring progress on the SDGs and next UNSDCF implementation.</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To strengthen national capacities for data collection and analysis it is necessary for all UNAPF stakeholders to have the best possible data to conduct extensive analyses and avoid discrepancies between statistical data produced by different sources. This will help in getting a better understanding of the current situation and deprivations, properly designing interventions, effectively measuring results, and using evidence for policy development and decision-making. ● The UNCT should continue to provide capacity building support in developing methodologies for data collection and analysis, and to apply best practices from other countries and UNDESA methodologies but tailor them to the national context for both the UNAPF and SDGs. ● A recent guide, “Human Rights-Based Approach to Data, Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” from OHCHR could be useful for the preparation of the next UNSDCF with respect to data collection, analysis and usage. .
<p>Recommendation 9: The UNCT should ensure greater mainstreaming of the UNSDCF guiding principle <i>leave no one behind</i> and the Human Rights-Based Approach, as recommended in June 2019 Guidelines</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Leaving no one behind</i>, the central objective of the SDGs, is also an overarching UNSDPFC principle along with the HRBA approach to development and gender equality and women’s empowerment. These principles should be at the center of the next UNSDCF as cross-cutting, essential for achieving all outcomes together with other guiding principles specified in the revised June 2019 UNSDCF Guidelines. This would help achieve better links between operational activities and normative work. ● The recent guidance on <i>leaving no one behind</i> should be used to guide the preparation of the next UNSDCF. The guide presents a methodology on operationalizing LNOB with a set of five steps for analysis, action, monitoring, accountability and meaningful participation. A gender perspective should be applied at all steps because women and girls are some of the most deprived and disadvantaged within marginalized groups. ● In line with new guidelines, the UNCT is invited to conduct a CCA that identifies who the vulnerable are, where they are situated, what their needs are, and elaborate on how the UN can contribute. It is also critical to continuously develop the capacity of government counterparts on the needs of vulnerable groups and the importance of disaggregated data. This will provide necessary reliable baseline data and analysis at the beginning of the UNAPF. ● The UNCT should use the entire UNAPF process to place human rights at the centre of UNDS activities and continue to apply the HRBA, from the analysis to programming and implementation. A HRBA has the potential to ensure the high-quality assessment and analysis of development challenges. For instance, a regular analysis that reflects the

	<p>institutional changes and behaviours required for rights-holders to claim their rights and duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations, would contribute to making the UNAPF more strategic and achieve better results. It would also be useful to analyze selected development problems and challenges with the human rights-based approach to identify root causes (causal analysis and causal trees), roles of duty-bearers, and capacity gaps, and to assess the enabling environment in order to guide the prioritization and implementation of the next UNSDCF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRBA should be reflected in a systematic, sustained, and purposive way in UNAPF implementation and in preparation of the next UNSDCF. This can be done through the following analyses: 1) causality, 2) role-pattern, and 3) capacity gap. Similarly, UNAPF and UNSDCF strategies, results, indicators and implementation should be informed by the key operational human rights principles of 1) non-discrimination and equality, 2) participation and inclusion, and 3) accountability and rule of law. • United Nations programming staff, government officials, and other partners would need to be continuously trained and have their capacities built on HRBA. • The UNCT should continue to provide technical support through the UNAPF Human Rights Thematic Group on reporting to human rights committees and in strengthening the human rights component in the next UNSDCF document. • The UNCT should dedicate some meetings to discussing the improvement of cooperation on human rights with the government, Ombudsman, and civil society institutions. The UNCT and the Resident Coordinator need to pay more attention to human rights (economic, social, cultural, civil and political) and further strengthen dialogue and advocacy between the UN and government. A specific budget could be earmarked for the Human Rights Theme Group by the UNRCO. • Enhanced mainstreaming of UNSDCF guiding principles on <i>leaving no one behind</i> and HRBA could be ensured through existing theme groups that could develop specific checklists and indicators with clear baselines and targets to ensure coordinated and regular monitoring and use of principles, as well as reporting on their implementation in annual reviews and progress reports. • Other emerging crosscutting issues, such as youth and women, people with disabilities and aging, should be reflected in the next UNSDCF.
<p>Recommendation 10: The UNCT should ensure a greater mainstreaming of the UNSDCF guiding principle on gender equality and women’s empowerment, as recommended in the June 2019 Guidelines</p> <p>High priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested to have a gender specific outcome on gender equality and women’s empowerment in line with findings from the assessment done by UN Women for the EECA region. • Gender quality and women’s empowerment should be better reflected in UNSDCF design; as a cross-cutting principle (in terms of specific goals and targets set, sex-disaggregated data and indicators). To better integrate gender-based approaches in the next UNSDCF, gender equality, gender equity and women’s empowerment should be considered and an expert could be involved to properly address key aspects during UNAPFSDCF preparation. • For the next cycle, United Nations organizations should look at having a substantial joint programme on gender, without double charging in administrative costs. • Meanwhile, synergies among agencies should increase for projects or activities on gender that are implemented individually.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, following the UNDS reform, a separate budget should be allocated to gender by the UNRCO in support strengthening the capacity of the UN Gender Group and UN organizations, and in preparation of a gender strategy, as well as implementation of other recommendations from the Participatory Gender Audit that are directly related to the UNAPF. • The GTG could use performance indicators for gender equality and empowerment of women for UNCTs as part of the Gender Scorecard mechanism to ensure a more coordinated and regular monitoring, use of the guiding principles on gender equality and women’s empowerment, and reporting on its implementation. The Gender Scorecard is an internationally validated methodology that could be used for baseline and target data on UNCT performance regarding gender mainstreaming and synergies between agencies. • Finally, to strengthen gender equality and women’s empowerment in the current UNAPF implementation and upcoming UNSDCF strategies and results frameworks, a number of recent guidelines are available: the UNEG guidance on “UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator,” the UNDG “Resource Book for Mainstreaming Gender in UN Common Programming at the Country Level,” and the UNDG “Resource Guide for UN Gender Theme Groups,” which can be used to further articulate both the gender equality and women’s empowerment and LNOB focus. Furthermore, UNEG “Guidelines for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation” can provide complementary insights.
<p>Recommendation 11: The UNCT should pursue an integrated approach and create cross-sector synergies to deliver linked results, strengthen equity-focused and upstream-downstream links, and develop and pilot integrated and convergent intervention models.</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SDGs require a development system and government able to pursue integrated approaches and create cross-sector synergies to deliver linked results at all levels. The individual and collective comparative advantages and added value of the UNDS needs to be maximized by national partners thanks to the UNAPF. • The UNCT should strengthen equity-focused and upstream-downstream links. The current and next UNAPF should continue to focus on equal opportunities for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged. • Efforts should be made by the UNCT to provide sound evidence with disaggregated data and support the government on policy and legislation development, planning, budgeting, and programming. • Through developing and piloting integrated and convergent intervention models the UNAPF will generate strong evidence and demonstrate good practices and support scaling-up interventions.
<p>Recommendation 12: The UNCT should create a more inclusive and enabling environment for the participation and involvement of non-resident UN organizations in CCA,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that the UNCT create a more inclusive and enabling environment for the participation and involvement of non-resident UN organizations in the CCA, UNAPF, and UNSDCF processes, through effective coordination mechanisms. • The UNCT should enable the next UNAPF to be more inclusive of the expertise of different non-resident organizations and allow the government to take full advantage of their unique expertise when working toward achieving national priorities. The UNCT could institutionalize reaching out and facilitating or brokering new partnerships with relevant stakeholders in areas of common interest.

<p>UNAPF, and UNSDCF processes</p> <p>Medium priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● A mapping of the available UN expertise existing at the country level, including non-resident organizations, could positively lead to better coordination and effectiveness of United Nations interventions at the country level.● Other possible actions are made in the “Involvement of non-resident organizations” section of this report.
--	--

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: UNAPF EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of the UNAPF (United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework) (2016-2020)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND

Country context

Azerbaijan has undergone significant economic development since gaining its independence in 1991, transitioning from a planned, to a market-based economy and transforming itself into an upper middle-income country. It has enjoyed an energy-fueled boom over the last two decades, remaining one of the world's fastest-growing economies and transforming in a few years into an increasingly assertive presence on the regional arena. Economic growth was spurred by the exploration of oil and gas reserves, high levels of public expenditure, and reforms to support a market-based economy.

Azerbaijan enjoys the status of upper-middle income economy. GDP growth rates averaged at 12.4% from 2004 to 2013 with steadily increasing contributions of the non-oil sector to economic growth due to targeted efforts of the Government. Still, economic growth remains highly dependent on the growth in the oil sector. The volatility of oil prices is only one of many externalities which the country is exposed to and which re-emphasizes the importance of systemic transformational changes securing more sustainable and inclusive growth for a longer run.⁴⁶

Azerbaijan created and continues to build on the successful 'ASAN Service Centre' (Azerbaijan Service and Assessment Network) model for service delivery using one-stop shops that have dramatically reduced bureaucracy, waiting times and opportunities for rent-seeking. Another public legal entity, named DOST (Agency for Sustainable and Operational Social Security) was established under the Ministry of Minister of Labour and Social Protection of Population to improve governance in the field of employment, labor and social protection.

Over the last decades, Azerbaijan's life expectancy at birth increased by 7.3 years, mean years of schooling increased by 0.5 years, and expected years of schooling increased by 2.0 years. Azerbaijan ranks 80 out of 189 countries and territories on the 2017 Human Development Index which puts the country in the high human development category.⁴⁷

Azerbaijan is not a major greenhouse gas contributor, however, considering the reliance of Azerbaijan's economy on hydrocarbon production, the government should define new pathways to reduce the carbon footprint of economic development, especially in the energy sector, which is responsible for 75.9% of GHG emissions. On the other hand, Azerbaijan is highly vulnerable to climate change, particularly given the

⁴⁶ "Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals", Mission Report, Azerbaijan, 2017.

⁴⁷ United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update, Briefing note for countries on the 2018 Statistical Update: Azerbaijan.

scarcity of freshwater resources and location on the coast of the Caspian Sea,⁴⁸ and needs to strengthen its coping mechanisms and adaptive capacities. The country is part of all major UN conventions in the sphere of environmental protection, including three of the most important on Climate Change, on Biodiversity and on Land Degradation. Azerbaijan ratified the UNFCCC in 1995 and it acceded to the Paris Agreement and ratified it in January 2017.

At an early stage of independence, the Republic of Azerbaijan experienced a massive displacement crisis as a result of the Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict in and around the Nagorno Karabakh Region of Azerbaijan. As a result of the conflict, over one million people fled their homes becoming refugees or IDPs. Over two decades later, an estimated 620,000 people (as of 31 December 2018) from the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan and seven surrounding occupied districts are internally displaced (IDP), according to government statistics. Despite a fragile ceasefire of 1994, displacement still remains a major challenge for the country – no political solution has been reached between the two sides, and a durable solution is yet to be achieved.⁴⁹

Azerbaijan faces challenges to sustain progress through resilient and sustainable sources of growth to avoid the ‘middle-income trap’, given that a substantial group of households graduated from poverty, but did not reach the ranks of the middle class.⁵⁰ The country’s rising HDI propelled Azerbaijan to the High Human Development category, however, when this value takes into account inequality, the country’s ranking drops by 10 percent.

The evidence from the most recent overview of the demographic situation in the country highlights several areas of progress on gender equality that include longer life expectancy for both men and women as well as higher literacy rates among women. The research also suggests that the women are now more likely to marry at an older age, have fewer children, have nearly equal chances of residing in either rural or urban areas are more engaged in income-generating activities outside of the household⁵¹. Nevertheless, despite the available normative frameworks, series of individual, institutional and structural barriers continue severely affecting the effectiveness and sustainability of gender equality reforms. In addition, the lack of effective implementation and accountability mechanisms repeatedly undermines the above-stated commitments.

Labour markets in Azerbaijan are characterized by such structural challenges as supply-demand mismatches, underemployment, high youth unemployment, high levels of vulnerable and informal work, and regional labor market disparities. Because of Azerbaijan’s “youth bulge,” young people constitute the majority of the unemployed in many parts of the country.⁵² There is also a small, but growing, refugee population from third countries that are tolerated but lack a clear legal status.

The Government of Azerbaijan clearly understands the challenges ahead and the need for holistic approaches in addressing these challenges. It initiated a reshuffle of the government and macroprudential risk mitigating measures, starting fundamental reforms of its financial sector, and shifted focus to promoting entrepreneurship and sustainable non-oil economy expansion (particularly, in agricultural,

⁴⁸ Azerbaijan’s Second National Communication to the UNFCCC.

⁴⁹ United Nations Azerbaijan Partnership Framework 2016-2020, p. 13.

⁵⁰ MAPS report.

⁵¹ “Population Situation Analysis: Beyond the Demographic Transition in Azerbaijan”, UNFPA/UNDP, Baku, Azerbaijan 2015.

⁵² MAPS report.

tourism and IT sectors, which will receive targeted state support) and export-oriented growth. The government also continues to make considerable efforts to improve the overall living conditions of the vulnerable groups and assumes full responsibility for the protection of, and assistance to, the IDPs and refugees. “Azerbaijan - 2020: The Vision of the Future,” launched in 2012, consolidated medium and long-term strategic national aspirations and provided an overall framework both for a number of national sectoral strategies and Strategic Road Maps, as well as for expanding cooperation with international development partners. The Vision-2020 served particularly as a solid foundation for the formulation of the United Nations–Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) for the period 2016-2020.

United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (2016-2020)

The UNAPF 2016-2020, which was formulated via inclusive and participatory processes, is aligned with the national aspirations and priorities of Vision 2020. Based on the findings of an evaluation of the previous UNAPF (2011-2015), the current partnership framework focuses on **three strategic priority areas**: (1) promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work; (2) strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services; and (3) improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters. Within these priorities, cross-cutting issues of a human rights-based approach; gender equality; youth; specific capacity development for monitoring and evaluation (e.g., institutional, technical, managerial); and improving the overall evidence base are all present. The interventions under the three strategic priority areas include but are not limited to the following:

- Under the first strategic priority area, UN Agencies provide support to the Government of Azerbaijan and implement a range of activities in: boosting employment and decent work for youth, women, refugees, and stateless persons; promoting entrepreneurship and small businesses; skills development and education of workforce for non-oil sectors; fostering agricultural and rural development, and demining.
- Interventions under the second strategic priority area focuses on: building capacity of the national actors to formulate and implement evidence-based equitable state policies, programmes and budgets with a particular focus on populations dynamics, women, youth and vulnerable groups and to independently monitor and report the situation of vulnerable groups in line with the international recommendations and to ensure that their situation conform to international standards and state international obligations; on improving access of vulnerable groups to the national protection systems and build their awareness of their rights and of how to redress violations effectively; to ensure that protection, education, health, and nutrition services are of high quality and are accessible to all, especially the most vulnerable, refugees, IDPs, stateless persons and victims of trafficking.
- Interventions under the third strategic priority area focuses on strengthening institutions and mechanisms for better monitoring, analysis and reporting on GHG emissions ; promoting the application of climate change mitigation measures and green practices to reduce GHG emissions from the energy sector; ensuring better planning, management and sustainability of the coastal and marine ecosystems; developing policies and supporting institutions and local farmers to conserve and sustainably use land and forest resources; strengthening capacities in the field of plant diagnostics and inspection with a

particular focus on imported and exported products and strengthening capacities for programming and implementation in the areas of public health.

The results framework of the UNAPF 2016-2020 outlines **five outcomes** which are made operational through the development of Joint Work plans (JWPs). Those are:

- Outcome 1.1: By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups;
- Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation;
- Outcome 2.2: By 2020, Azerbaijan has made progress in line with international human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review, and other treaty obligations, and has strengthened capacities for implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with international standards;
- Outcome 2.3: By 2020, quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results.
- Outcome 3.1: By 2020, sustainable development policies and legislation are in place, are better implemented and coordinated in compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, recognize social and health linkages, and address issues of environment and natural resource management, energy efficiency and renewable energy, climate change, and resilience to hazards and disasters.

The JWPs form an agreement between UN agencies and implementing partners on the use of resources. They identify the exact deliverables, responsible parties as well as the exact costs and the available resources. The design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of Joint Work Plans are coordinated by the three Result Groups, which are co-chaired by the Government and the United Nations. Joint Annual Reviews are convened that allow for timely measurement of progress and performance thereby allowing for adjustment of implementation. Annual Progress Reports are produced toward UNAPF implementation.

In terms of governance structures, a high-level UNAPF Steering Committee comprising senior Government officials, as well as representatives of the United Nations System and key development partners, provides strategic direction and oversight to the implementation of the UNAPF. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Minister of Economy and the United Nations Resident Coordinator (RC).

The UN Country Team (the UNCT), encompassing Representatives of the UN Funds and Programmes, and other UN entities accredited to Azerbaijan, under the leadership of the RC, is responsible for the effectiveness of UN System development activities in the country.

In addition, the UN Gender Theme Group, the UN Human Rights Thematic Group, the UN Communications Group, and Operations Management Team are contributing to the UNAPF implementation as well as joint policy development and normative activities. Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group provides technical assistance to the three RGs to sustain a robust and effective M&E system to monitor, evaluate and report on the results stipulated in the UNAPF.

The UNCT has made much progress about the implementation of the UN-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) 2016-2020 through a collaborative and joined up work which was captured in the Annual Progress Reports.

During the second half of 2018, UNCT in partnership with the Government conducted the Mid Term Review of UNAPF implementation through two exercises: 1) Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) of UNAPF was carried out against global SDG targets which showed 59 % of alignment; 2) Review of the UNAPF Results and Resources Framework was carried out and proposed changes were discussed and agreed with the Government.

Evaluation rationale

An evaluation of the UNAPF is mandatory as per the UNDAF guidelines provided by the UNDG. UNAPF 2016-2020 document foresees the final evaluation in the penultimate year of the UNAPF cycle. It notes that the evaluation will assess, in particular, the contribution made to national development priorities and goals; relevance of UNAPF Outcomes; effectiveness and efficiency by which results have been achieved; and sustainability of results. A particular focus will be on the extent to which the United Nations System has been able to effectively contribute to substantive strengthening national institutional and human capacities, as the heart of this UNAPF. As appropriate, the evaluation will inform the design of the next UNAPF and its ensuing Country Programmes and projects by individual Agencies.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The purpose of the present UNAPF evaluation is, on the one hand, to gather key findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle and to improve UN coordination in Azerbaijan and, on the other hand, to support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in the country.

UNAPF Evaluation **objectives** are:

- To assess the contribution of the UN system to national development priorities through the UNAPF outcomes and making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability).
- To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning).
- To draw lessons on past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNAPF cycle.

Scope

This is the final evaluation of the current cycle of UNAPF (2016-2020) and will cover the implementation period from 2016 up to present. Evidence and findings of the evaluation will embrace the views of key stakeholders.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The contribution of the UNCT to the development outcomes will be assessed according to the below set of evaluation criteria.

Relevance: the extent to which the objectives of UNAPF are consistent with country needs, national priorities, the country's international and regional commitments, including on human rights, sustainable development and environment.

- Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in relation to the issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified at the beginning of the current programme cycle and in the context of national policies and strategies?
- To what extent is the current UNAPF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework? Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNAPF timeframe, resources and the planned Country Programmes, projects and programme strategies?
- Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and commitments, norms and standards guiding the work of agencies of the UN system (including CEDAW, CPRD, CRC, etc. all international environmental and human rights treaties binding on Azerbaijan, and other relevant human rights standards and evaluations)
- To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNAPF? To what extent and in what ways has a human rights approach been reflected as one possible method for integrating human rights concerns into the UNAPF?
- To what extent and in what ways the concepts of gender equity and equality were reflected in UNAPF (in terms of specific goals and targets set, sex-disaggregated data and indicators, etc.)
- Did the UNAPF effectively use the principles of environmental sustainability to strengthen its contribution to national development results?
- Did the UNAPF adequately use Result Based Management to ensure a logical chain of results and establish a monitoring and evaluation framework? Was the UNAPF results matrix sufficiently flexible and relevant to respond to new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNAPF cycle?
- Did the UNAPF adequately focus on national capacity development?
- Has the UNAPF document been used by UN agencies and Government institutions in planning their activities, setting goals, and in cooperation?

Effectiveness: the extent to which the UNCT contributed to the outcomes defined in the UNAPF.

- What progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of national priorities and in terms of indicators as reflected in the UNAPF framework?
- Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes and national development goals? How the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed?
- To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening national capacities (including national execution, and institution building), policy and legal frameworks and building partnerships?
- To what extent did the UNAPF make use of and promote human rights and gender equality standards and principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.) to achieve its goal?
- To what extent did the UNAPF had any impact on policy formulation and implementation related to the three UNAPF results areas?
- To what extent did UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of sex, age, geographic location, etc. and did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention?

- How well did the UNCT use its partnerships (with civil society/private sector/local government/parliament/national human rights institutions/international development partners) to improve its performance?

Efficiency: the extent to which outcomes are achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

- To what extent and in what way has the UNAPF contributed to a reduction of transaction costs for the government and for each of the UN agencies? In what ways could transaction costs be further reduced?
- Were the results achieved at reasonably low/lowest possible cost?
- To what extent have the organizations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction cost and to enhance results?
- Did UN coordination reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of UNAPF implementation?
- To what extent did the UNAPF create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication?

Sustainability: the extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue after it has been completed.

- To what extent results achieved and strategies used in the frame of the UNAPF are sustainable: i) as a contribution to national development, and (ii) in terms of the added value of UNAPF to cooperation among individual UN agencies?
- Have complementarities, collaboration and /or synergies fostered by UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results?
- To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?
- To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?
- Did the UNCT undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost? To what extent are the benefits being, or are likely to be, maintained over time.
- Did the UNAPF promote ownership of programmes by national partners?

Coordination: To assess the validity of the stated collective added value of the UN System in Azerbaijan.

- To what extent and in what way have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context specifically in relation to the special mandates of UN agencies and other Development Partners active in the country (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism)?
- To what extent and in what way has the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies with an effect on the progress towards the National Development priorities? Has the UNAPF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes?
- Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main national development agenda and UNAPF outcomes areas (e.g. within Government, with national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?
- Have agency supported programmes been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNAPF outcomes? Has the effectiveness or programme support by individual agencies been enhanced as a result of joint programming?

- Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNAPF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievements of results and have the arrangements largely been respected in the course of implementation?

In addition to these core questions, the evaluation consultant will develop context-specific sub-questions during the inception phase of the evaluation.

4. **PROPOSED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH FOR THE UNAPF EVALUATION**

Evaluability

Referring to the logical framework, disaggregated data on output and outcome indicators are available through the established UNAPF M&E mechanisms: The UN Country Team and the Government jointly monitor the UNAPF through 24 indicators that measure the progress towards five Outcomes clustered around three Strategic Priority Areas. Joint Work Plans are the instruments that the UN Country Team, via the UNAPF Results Groups, operationalize the UNAPF by translating its Outcomes into concrete, measurable, time-bound and costed outputs and report against the output indicators and budgetary framework on an annual basis. The high-level UNAPF Steering Committee each year organizes a Joint UNAPF Annual Review which assesses progress in implementation, identify achievements and reflect on the lessons and priorities for the upcoming year. The results are summarized in the Annual Progress Reports which present the key achievements, lessons learned and challenges in the implementation.

Methodology

The evaluation will use mixed-method analysis, employing the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative approaches, data types and methods of data analysis. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and to promote use, the evaluation consultant will ensure triangulation of the various data sources. In addition, a participatory and utilization-focused approach to involve key stakeholders and boost ownership of the evaluation shall be adopted.

The evaluation consultant will be guided by the major analytical frameworks (namely, the evaluation criteria, the UNAPF 2016-2020 results framework, the Vision 2020, etc.) that form the basis for drawing final conclusions and generating forward-looking recommendations, to assess the overall UNCT's performance, and to understand whether the UNAPF's objectives have been met and what results have been achieved⁵³.

While assessing performance using the above criteria the evaluator will identify the various factors that can explain the performance. This will allow lessons to be learned about why the UNCT performed as it did. Where these factors have been identified as UNAPF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered both results and enabling factors.

Once the Evaluation Consultant for the UNAPF evaluation has been selected, a thorough preparatory work should be conducted to define the specific evaluation strategies, data collection methods, and required evaluation tools. An Evaluation Plan will be developed accordingly. During the inception phase, the

⁵³ Evaluator analyzed and made references to the Strategic Roadmaps in several sections.

evaluation consultant will propose a detailed methodology designed to provide evidence around the result areas of the UNAPF 2016-2020. The inception report should include a description of data sources, data collection and analysis methods, indicators, triangulation plan, factors for comparative analysis, and validation strategy, as well as how she/he intends to incorporate the views, various stakeholders. The advantages and limitations of the use of these methods should also be clearly explained.

Data collection: The UNAPF evaluation will use a mixed methods approach, which could include the following: desk reviews of reference material (sources of information will include, but not limited to: UNAPF planning, review and reporting documents, evaluation reports (including those on projects and those issued by national counterparts), strategy papers, national plans and policies, and related programme and project documents)), interviews with relevant stakeholder groups (e.g. government officials, donors, civil society organizations, the private sector and beneficiaries where relevant), site visits and surveys.

Stakeholder participation: The UNAPF evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner, ensuring the involvement of key stakeholders (e.g. government, civil society organizations, beneficiary groups, and donors) in the phases of the evaluation.

Validation and data analysis: All findings should be supported with evidence. Triangulation will be used to ensure that the information and data collected are valid. A report will be prepared including identified constraints, lessons and challenges in relations to the priority interventions as well as specific recommendations made both to the UNCT and to individual agencies.

In general, the evaluation approach should follow the UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality, UNEG norms and standards and international principles for development evaluation. In particular, in line with the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on gender equality, data collection methods and the process should consider gender sensitivity. The final report should be compliant with UNEG quality checklist of evaluation reports and acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder participation was ensured during the evaluation process and any challenges to obtaining the gender equality information or to addressing these issues appropriately. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex and age and, to the extent possible and other contextually-relevant markers of equity. Adherence to a code of ethics and a human right based and gender-sensitive approach in the gathering, treatment, and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report.

Processes

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases.

Phase 1- Preparation

- i. Identification and selection of an Evaluation Consultant: The UNCT will jointly identify and select the appropriate consultant in close coordination and consultation with the Government, for the UNAPF evaluation. The UN RC Office will take the lead, jointly with UNCT, in soliciting CVs of consultants available in the country or region.
- ii. Collection of reference material: The UN RC Office in close consultation with UNCT members will compile a list of background material, documents, and reports relevant to the UNAPF evaluation.

Phase 2 – Conduct of data collection activities and the preparation of the evaluation reports

- i. Development of an inception report: The evaluation consultant will produce an inception report not to exceed 25 pages, 20,000 words, excluding annexes.
- ii. Desk review of reference material: The evaluation consultant will review the reference documents, reports and any other data and information provided.
- iii. Main data collection: The evaluation consultant will conduct data collection activities as guided by the evaluation plan. She/he will conduct agreed-upon interviews with stakeholders and site visits. At the end of the data collection activities, a meeting will be organized led by the evaluation consultant, participated by key stakeholder representatives, to present preliminary findings and obtain feedback from the stakeholders.
- iv. Data analysis and reporting: The consultant will conduct further data analysis based on all information collected and prepare a draft evaluation report for the UNAPF Evaluation upon completion of the main data collection and analysis activities.
- v. Review of the draft report and finalization of the report: the draft UNAPF Report will be submitted for factual correction and feedback to key stakeholders. The consultant will prepare an audit trail to indicate how the comments were taken into account and will finalize the UNAPF evaluation report.

Phase 3 - Follow-up

The UNCT together with the UN RC Office will conduct follow-up activities, as guided by their respective processes and mandates.

In the context of the UNAPF Evaluation:

1. Dissemination of the evaluation findings and recommendations;
2. Endorsing a management response to the evaluation recommendations. This includes committing follow-up actions to the recommendations as well as establishing responsibilities for the follow-up.
3. The lessons learned from UNAPF evaluation will be extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels; they will be applied in the design of the following UNAPF cycle and will be shared publicly and within the UN system as appropriate.

The consultancy is expected to take 35 working days (10 working days onsite and 25 working days offsite;). The consultancy will start on June 3, 2019, and must be completed by August 10, 2019, with submitting a final report.

MANAGEMENT PROCESS

An **Evaluation Management and Oversight Board** consisting of the UNCT and Government representatives will be established to guide the evaluation process. The Evaluation Consultant will have overall responsibility for producing the UNAPF Evaluation Report and for quality and timely submission of the Report to the Evaluation Board.

The Evaluation Board needs to ensure that 1) the evaluation process meets UNEG Norms, Standards, and Ethical Guidelines and that 2) the evaluation findings are relevant, and recommendations are implementable and that 3) the evaluation findings are disseminated and available for use and learning from the evaluation.

An **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** will be established under the leadership and supervision of the Evaluation Board comprising UNCT members and key stakeholders (national governmental and non-governmental counterparts). The ERG will review and provide inputs and feedback to the evaluation design report, facilitate access of evaluator to information sources, and provide comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, in particular, the evaluation report.

While the UNAPF Evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the Evaluation Board, its day-to-day management will be ensured through the RC Office.

BUDGET

The costs of the UNAPF evaluation will be shared among all involved parties including UN Agencies present in Azerbaijan and RC Office, based on the agreement reached within the UNCT. The Coordination Fund will provide seed money to support the Evaluation.

The Consultant will be paid a lump sum amount including fee and per diem (not exceeding the UN rate). The consultant should indicate the lump sum and breakdown in the financial proposal.

The Consultant's payment shall be made in two installments of:

- 20% upon submission of Evaluation Plan and inception report, incorporating inputs received from UN agencies and stakeholders, and;
- 80% upon submission of the Final Report.

4. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant is expected to produce the following deliverables:

- An inception report not exceeding 25 pages, 20,000 words, excluding annexes which sets out: consultant's understanding of the issues to be evaluated (scope), questions that the UNAPF evaluation intends to answer, and his/her understanding of the context in which the evaluation takes place; including of a comprehensive stakeholder analysis; any suggested deviations from the ToR; an evaluation matrix showing selected criteria of analysis, questions and sub-questions, the indicators; proposed and sources of information; methodology, including details of gender analysis and triangulation strategy; data collection and analysis tools that will be used to conduct the evaluation; any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis and how they will be addressed; explanation of how the views of various stakeholders, including vulnerable and marginalized groups, will be addressed during the evaluation; fieldwork plan, timeline for the evaluation, draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation results. The consultant needs clearly identify any potential

ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process.

- A presentation with preliminary findings to be shared in a meeting with key stakeholders;
- A first draft report for circulation and identification of factual corrections from stakeholders;
- A final report. The following template serves as a standard outline for the UNAPF evaluation. This should be considered during the inception phase and taking account of the specific scope and focus of the evaluation, a detailed outline of the UNAPF evaluation report should be included in the inception report.
 - Chapter 1: Introduction (objectives, scope, and methodology, limitations)
 - Chapter 2: National development context
 - Chapter 3: Evaluation findings (corresponding to the UNAPF outcomes with each analyzed by evaluation criteria)
 - Chapter 4: Conclusions and recommendations

The final report will include an Executive Summary and must be kept short (50-75 pages maximum excluding annexes). More detailed information on the context, the programme or the comprehensive aspects of the methodology and of the analysis will be placed in the annexes. The report will be prepared in accordance with UNEG guidance (Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports).

5. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT

- Advanced university degree (Masters or equivalent) in development studies, economics, international relations, or related field; PhD an asset.
- 10 years of relevant professional experience is highly desirable, including previous substantive involvement in evaluations and/or reviews at the programme and/or outcome levels in related fields with international organizations.
- Excellent knowledge of the UN system and UN common country programming processes;
- Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, particularly in the following areas: understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming; gender considerations; environmental sustainability, RBM principles; logic modelling/logical framework analysis; quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches;
- Knowledge of the development issues in mid-income countries is an asset;
- Excellent written and spoken English. Russian is an asset;
- Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills.

6. EVALUATION TIMELINE

The evaluation should follow the steps and deliverables as presented in the following evaluation calendar:

Phase I – Preparation	Responsible Parties		Estimated Timeframe	
	Lead Party	Other Parties	Begin	End
1. ToR is developed.	UNRCO	UNCT, Government	April 1	April 19

2. Evaluation Management and Oversight Board and An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) is established.	UNRC	UNCT, Government, other stakeholders	May 3	May 17
<u>3. Selection of qualified candidates:</u> Assignment is announced.	Evaluation Board	ERG	May 16	May 26
<u>4. Contracting of Evaluation Consultant:</u> Once the best-qualified candidate is identified, the RC's Office makes all arrangements to commission a contract by UNDP Procurement Unit, in compliance with the procedures and requirements.	UNRCO		May 27	May 31
PHASE II - Conduction of the Study	Responsible Parties		Estimated Time frame	
	Lead party	Other	Begin	End
<u>1. Briefing of the Evaluation Consultant</u> All relevant documentation (including UNEG Norms and Standards, UNEG Code of Conduct for external Evaluations, programme documents, list of key stakeholders, etc.) to be provided to the Consultant.	UNRCO	UNCT, ERG	June 3	June 5
<i>Offsite (5 days)</i> <u>2. Inception report:</u> the Evaluation consultant prepares and submits an inception report that further refines the overall evaluation scope, approach, design, and timeframe, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology.	Evaluation Consultant	UNCT, ERG	June 6	June 10
<i>Evaluation Board and ERG review and provide feedback. Revision and approval of the inception report</i>			June 11	June 17
<i>Offsite (7 days)</i> <u>3. Desk review:</u> The Consultant reviews material provided by UN agencies, findings of the MTR Report, evaluations, mid-term progress reviews to be shared by UN agencies, the recommendations from the UPR, CEDAW, CRC and other treaties' etc.	Evaluation Consultant	UNRCO, UNCT, ERG	June 11	June 21
<i>Onsite (9 days)</i> <u>4. Data Collection:</u> the Evaluation consultant collects data deploying various data collection methods agreed upon in the inception report such as observation, interviews, focus groups and surveys, etc. Relevant stakeholders and the different UN agencies will facilitate access to information and provide all necessary logistical and organizational support.	Evaluation Consultant	Evaluation Board, UNRCO, UNCT, ERG	June 24	July 2
Onsite (1 day) <u>5. Preliminary findings:</u> the Evaluation Consultant delivers a presentation on the evaluation of preliminary findings to the UNCT and RC and other stakeholders and feedback is provided.	Evaluation Consultant	Evaluation Board, UNRCO, UNCT, ERG	July 3	July 3
<i>Offsite (10 days)</i> <u>6. Reporting:</u> the Evaluation Consultant prepares the report in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards. The report	Evaluation Consultant	Evaluation Board, UNRCO, UNCT, ERG	July 4	July 14

has to be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations.				
Evaluation Board and ERG review and provide feedback.			July 15	July 30
<i>Offsite (3 days)</i> 7. Evaluation consultant produces a final report based on the feedback.	Evaluation Consultant	Evaluation Board, UNRCO, UNCT, ERG		August 10
Phase III – Follow-up	Responsible Parties		Estimated Timeframe	
	Lead party	Other	Begin	End
1. <u>Development of the Evaluation Management Response:</u> A management response is issued that outlines agreed upon actions as to how the evaluation findings and recommendations will be addressed by the UNCT. The Evaluation Management Response should be issued within two months after the evaluation findings become available and shared with DOCO and other entities as per the management response guidance.	Evaluation Board	ERG	August 10	August 20
2. <u>Dissemination of Evaluation Findings:</u> The report is disseminated publicly to internal and external stakeholders, partners, donors, and other interested parties. Special efforts should be made to distribute or make the evaluation findings accessible to vulnerable and marginalized groups. The report will also be published on the UN website and shared with DSG.	Evaluation Board	ERG	August	September
3. <u>Follow up of implementation of management response actions:</u> This step is beyond the completion of the normal evaluation process and it is normally done as part of annual planning and review processes by the UNCT and other UNAPF stakeholders.	UNRCO	UNCT, government, other stakeholders		

ANNEX 2: LIST OF QUESTIONS AND AGENDAS FOR UNAPF RESULTS GROUP MEETINGS

United Nations – Azerbaijan Partnership Framework

-

Evaluation

List of questions for UNAPF results groups meetings

Relevance, strategic positioning and design:

1. **To what extent is the UNAPF strategically positioned with respect to the national policies and strategies?**
 - a. Please rate from **1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)** and;
 - b. Explain the reason for the rating.

2. **Have the UNAPF priorities/outcomes remained relevant to national priorities/needs throughout 2016-2019?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please explain how?
 - c. Are there emerging issues?

3. **Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms and standards?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please explain how?

4. **To what extent is the current UNAPF designed as a results-oriented, coherent, realistic and focused framework (are the outcomes and indicators SMART)?**
 - a. Please rate from **1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)** and;
 - b. Explain the reason for the rating.

5. **Are the UNAPF Outcomes designed in a way to capture UN's contribution?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please explain how?

6. **What could be improved for the next UNAPF?**

7. **How could the SDGs be incorporated into the next cycle of UNAPF?**

Effectiveness:

1. **What progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of national priorities?**
 - a. Please give concrete examples.
2. **Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes?**
 - a. Please give concrete examples
3. **To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening national capacities, policy and legal frameworks?**
 - a. Please rate from **1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)** and;
 - b. Explain the reason for the rating.
4. **To what extent did UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis?**
5. **Did those prone to vulnerability benefited from priority attention?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please give concrete examples
6. **What are the challenges and opportunities related to budget allocations and resource mobilization, and how these may affect the expected delivery of results?**
7. **How could effectiveness be improved in the next UNAPF?**

Coordination:

1. **Have the comparative advantages and added value of the UN agencies been utilized by national partners thanks to UNAPF?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please give concrete examples
2. **Has the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies? Has the UNAPF enhanced joint programming by UN agencies or resulted in specific joint programmes?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please give concrete examples
3. **Are the existing coordination mechanisms, including the *UNAPF Steering Committee, the Results Groups and the Theme Groups (Human Rights, Gender, Communication, M&E)* adequate to enhance effectiveness in delivering results, monitoring, reporting and joint work planning?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please explain how?

4. **Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the outcome areas (e.g., with Government, Parliament, local government, civil society, National Human Rights Institutions, development partners, International Financial Institutions and private sector)?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please give concrete examples
5. **How could coordination be improved in the next UNAPF?**

Sustainability:

1. **How are the UNAPF benefits likely to be maintained over time by the national partners and counterparts?**
 - a. Please rate from **1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)** and;
 - b. Explain the reason for the rating.
2. **Are there good practices/programs within the UNAPF that have been scaled up/replicated by the national partners?**
 - a. Please give concrete examples
3. **Have complementarities, collaboration and synergies among UNAPF partners contributed to greater sustainability of results?**
 - a. Yes/No
 - b. Please give concrete examples
4. **To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?**
 - a. Please rate from **1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)** and;
 - b. Please give concrete examples for the rating.

United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework Evaluation

Results Group One

Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by
increased diversification and decent work

Thursday, 11 July 2019

10:00-12:00

[JW Marriott Absheron Hotel, Khirdalan Room](#)

(Address: 674 Azadliq Square, Baku 1000, Phone: (012) 499 88 88)

Agenda

Lead facilitator: Mr. Christian Privat (International Consultant)

Assisting facilitators: Mr. Rahim Saatov (National Expert)

Ms. Gular Fatali (Data Management, Results Monitoring/Reporting Officer, RCO)

#	Time	Agenda Item
1	9:30-10:00	Registration and welcome tea/coffee
2	10:00-10:15	Introduction (15 minutes) Welcome Remarks (UN) Brief on the UNAPF Evaluation (RCO) Introduction of participants
3	10:15-10:20	Introduction of Methodology (5 minutes)
4	10:20-11:10	Individual (10 min) and Group work (40 minutes) 4 Evaluation Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Relevance, strategic positioning and design<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Effectiveness● Sustainability● Coordination
5	11:10-11:45	Presentation and discussions (35 minutes)
7	11:45-12:00	Wrap up and next steps (15 minutes)

This presents the agenda for the three meetings with the UNAPF Results Groups, to feed into the UNAPF evaluation.

The purpose of the UNAPF evaluation is, on one hand, to gather key findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle and to improve UN coordination in Azerbaijan and, on the other hand, to support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in the country.

The UNAPF Evaluation objectives are:

- To assess the contribution of the UN system to national development priorities through the UNAPF outcomes, and making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability);
- To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is, and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning); and
- To draw lessons from past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNAPF cycle.

As such, the evaluation is considered a stepping stone, which will serve as an analytical tool, in preparation for the next UNAPF cycle. It will suggest ways in which the next UNAPF could be even more useful in the future.

The evaluation, which covers the period 2016 – June 2019, will assess the UNAPF: a) relevance, strategic positioning and design; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability; e) five programming principles; and f) coordination.

The UNAPF focuses on three core results areas through which the UN is contributing to the national development agenda. These correspond to 3 Results Groups.

Priority area 1: Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work
Priority area 2: Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services
Priority area 3: Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters

These three meetings will provide UN Partners and UN agencies an opportunity to reflect collectively on the contribution of the UN System to the development change, on the basis of the expected UNAPF outcomes, identifying specific UN interventions that may have contributed to any observable result change.

United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework Evaluation

Results Group Two

Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services

Thursday, 11 July 2019

15:00-17:00

[JW Marriott Absheron Hotel, Khirdalan Room,](#)

(Address: 674 Azadliq Square, Baku 1000, Phone: (012) 499 88 88)

Agenda

Lead facilitator: Mr. Christian Privat (International Consultant)

Assisting facilitators: Mr. Rahim Saatov (National Expert)

Ms. Gular Fatali (Data Management, Results Monitoring/Reporting Officer, RCO)

#	Time	Agenda Item
1	14:30-15:00	Registration and welcome tea/coffee
2	15:00-15:15	Introduction (15 minutes) Welcome Remarks (UN) Brief on the UNAPF Evaluation (RCO) Introduction of participants
3	15:15-15:20	Introduction of Methodology (5 minutes)
4	15:20-16:10	Individual (10 min) and Group work (40 minutes) 4 Evaluation Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Relevance, strategic positioning and design<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Effectiveness● Sustainability● Coordination
5	16:10-16:45	Presentation and discussions (35 minutes)
6	16:45-17:00	Wrap up and next steps (15 minutes)

This presents the agenda for the three meetings with the UNAPF Results Groups, to feed into the UNAPF evaluation.

The purpose of the UNAPF evaluation is, on one hand, to gather key findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle and to improve UN coordination in Azerbaijan and, on the other hand, to support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in the country.

The UNAPF Evaluation objectives are:

- To assess the contribution of the UN system to national development priorities through the UNAPF outcomes, and making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability);
- To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is, and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning); and
- To draw lessons from past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNAPF cycle.

As such, the evaluation is considered a stepping stone, which will serve as an analytical tool, in preparation for the next UNAPF cycle. It will suggest ways in which the next UNAPF could be even more useful in the future.

The evaluation, which covers the period 2016 – June 2019, will assess the UNAPF: a) relevance, strategic positioning and design; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability; e) five programming principles; and f) coordination.

The UNAPF focuses on three core results areas through which the UN is contributing to the national development agenda. These correspond to 3 Results Groups.

Priority area 1: Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work
Priority area 2: Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services
Priority area 3: Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters

These three meetings will provide UN Partners and UN agencies an opportunity to reflect collectively on the contribution of the UN System to the development change, on the basis of the expected UNAPF outcomes, identifying specific UN interventions that may have contributed to any observable result change.

These meetings are organized by the Resident Coordinator Office, with the support of UN Agencies and the Government counterpart (Ministry of Economy), an International Consultant and a National Consultant.

The facilitation method that will be used, focuses on stimulating participation and consensus building, and have been developed by the Institute of Cultural affairs in the UK, and adapted by the consultant for evaluation workshops.

The method is very participatory and dynamic. For each evaluation criteria it asks participants to brainstorm individually on a key evaluation question and on a few sub-questions, then to exchange their views with their group. Participants are then asked to write on some cards their main ideas and put/cluster on the flipcharts. They present it in plenary through an interaction with all the participants. The final result is a comprehensive picture of all the answers generated in the workshop to the evaluation questions.

United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework Evaluation

Results Group Three Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human- induced disasters

Friday, 12 July 2019

10:00-12:00

JW Marriott Absheron Hotel, Khirdalan Room

(Address: 674 Azadliq Square, Baku 1000, Phone: (012) 499 88 88)

Agenda

Lead facilitator: Mr. Christian Privat (International Consultant)

Assisting facilitators: Mr. Rahim Saatov (National Expert)

Ms. Gular Fatali (Data Management, Results Monitoring/Reporting Officer, RCO)

#	Time	Agenda Item
1	9:30-10:00	Registration and welcome tea/coffee
2	10:00-10:15	Introduction (15 minutes) Welcome Remarks (UN) Brief on the UNAPF Evaluation (RCO) Introduction of participants
3	10:15-10:20	Introduction of Methodology (5 minutes)
4	10:20-11:10	Individual (10 min) and Group work (40 minutes) 4 Evaluation Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Relevance, strategic positioning and design<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Effectiveness● Sustainability● Coordination
5	11:10-11:45	Presentation and discussions (35 minutes)
7	11:45-12:00	Wrap up and next steps (15 minutes)

This presents the agenda for the three meetings with the UNAPF Results Groups, to feed into the UNAPF evaluation.

The purpose of the UNAPF evaluation is, on one hand, to gather key findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNAPF planning cycle and to improve UN coordination in Azerbaijan and, on the other hand, to support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in the country.

The UNAPF Evaluation objectives are:

- To assess the contribution of the UN system to national development priorities through the UNAPF outcomes, and making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability);
- To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is, and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning); and
- To draw lessons from past and current cooperation to provide specific and action-oriented strategic recommendations for the next UNAPF cycle.

As such, the evaluation is considered a stepping stone, which will serve as an analytical tool, in preparation for the next UNAPF cycle. It will suggest ways in which the next UNAPF could be even more useful in the future.

The evaluation, which covers the period 2016 – June 2019, will assess the UNAPF: a) relevance, strategic positioning and design; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; d) sustainability; e) five programming principles ; and f) coordination.

The UNAPF focuses on three core results areas through which the UN is contributing to the national development agenda. These correspond to 3 Results Groups.

Priority area 1: Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work
Priority area 2: Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services
Priority area 3: Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters

These three meetings will provide UN Partners and UN agencies an opportunity to reflect collectively on the contribution of the UN System to the development change, on the basis of the expected UNAPF outcomes, identifying specific UN interventions that may have contributed to any observable result change.

These meetings are organized by the Resident Coordinator Office, with the support of UN Agencies and the Government counterpart (Ministry of Economy), an International Consultant and a National Consultant.

The facilitation method that will be used, focuses on stimulating participation and consensus building, and have been developed by the Institute of Cultural affairs in the UK, and adapted by the consultant for evaluation workshops.

The method is very participatory and dynamic. For each evaluation criteria it asks participants to brainstorm individually on a key evaluation question and on a few sub-questions, then to exchange their

views with their group. Participants are then asked to write on some cards their main ideas and put/cluster on the flipcharts. They present it in plenary through an interaction with all the participants. The final result is a comprehensive picture of all the answers generated in the workshop to the evaluation questions.

ANNEX 3: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR SPECIFIC MEETINGS

Guiding list of questions for meetings with UN heads of agencies and government partners

Relevance, strategic positioning and design

1. To what extent is the UNAPF strategically positioned with respect to the Government's and other stakeholders' strategies?
2. Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in relation to the issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified at the beginning of the current programme cycle and in the context of national policies and strategies?
3. Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, norms and standards?
4. To what extent is the current UNAPF designed as a results-oriented, coherent, realistic and focused framework? Does the chain of results show results that can be attributed to the UN or to which the UN contributed? What could be improved for the next UNAPF?

Effectiveness

1. What progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of national priorities, based on the UNAPF indicators framework?
2. Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes?
3. To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening national capacities (including national execution and institution building), policy and legal frameworks, and building partnerships?
4. To what extent did UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of sex, age, geographic location, etc. and did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefit from priority attention?
5. How could effectiveness be improved in the next UNAPF?

Coordination

1. In what way have the comparative advantages and added value of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, multilateralism)?
2. How has the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies? Has the UNAPF enhanced joint programming by UN agencies or resulted in specific joint programmes?
3. Are the existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee, the Results Groups and the Theme Groups (HR, Gender, Communication, M&E) adequate to enhance effectiveness in delivering results, monitoring, reporting and joint work planning?
4. Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the outcome areas (e.g., with Government, Parliament, local government, civil society, National Human Rights Institutions, development partners, International Financial Institutions and private sector)?
5. How could coordination be improved in the next UNAPF?

Efficiency

1. In what way has the UNAPF contributed to a reduction of transaction costs for UN agencies and their partners? In what ways could transaction costs be further reduced?
2. To what extent have the organizations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction cost and to enhance results?
3. To what extent did the UNAPF create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication?

Sustainability

1. Have complementarities, collaboration and synergies fostered by UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results?
2. To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?
3. How are the UNAPF benefits likely to be maintained over time?
4. To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?

Guiding list of questions for meeting with thematic groups (gender, human rights and SDGs)

Five programming principles: the use of the five programming principles in a cross-cutting way in the UNAPF

Relevance, strategic positioning and design

1. Have the UNAPF document and its outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and human rights commitments, principles, norms and standards?
2. To what extent have the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) and gender equality and empowerment of women been reflected in the UNAPF document and its results matrix (specific gender sex-disaggregated results, indicators and targets)?

Effectiveness

1. To what extent and in what ways did the UNAPF make use of, and promote HRBA and human rights principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.) during its implementation?
2. To what extent and in what ways were the UNAPF principle of gender equality and empowerment of women reflected in UNAPF implementation?
3. To what extent did UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis, to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of sex, age, geographic location, etc.?
4. Did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefit from priority attention in UNAPF implementation?
5. How have the recommendations plan of the UNCT's Participatory Gender Audit been implemented, including the following that are related to the UNAPF?
 - a. Implement a joint and integrated gender mainstreaming strategy and work plan for the UNCT Azerbaijan in 2018, with pooled resources, and to be supported by the Gender Theme Group, and linked to the UNAPF and the national indicator development efforts for the SDGs. Build on the synergies already established for the GTG to go beyond an addition of individual agency activities, and agree on a more integrated and coordinated implementation plan with joint activities and pooled resources for 2018 onwards. This can be linked to the UNAPF's three strategic objectives, the SDGs coordination committees (not just SDG 5) and the CEDAW concluding comments (Coordination No 3).
 - b. Develop an interagency work plan (not just a strategy) on gender sensitive communication products for the UNAPF using the SDG platform UNCT agencies (Coordination No 5).
 - c. Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems and capacity on gender mainstreaming, including budget tracking on allocations and expenditure on gender equality (M&E No 1).
 - d. Consider implementing a joint project of the GTG on the design and monitoring of gender indicators in relation to UNAPF, but more particularly with government partners for the SDGs, with assistance of expertise within UNCT and the various regional/HQ offices of the UNCT agencies (M&E No 5).

Coordination

1. Are your existing Theme Groups (HR, Gender, SDGs) adequate to enhance effectiveness in delivering results, monitoring, reporting and joint work planning in the cross-cutting areas and in the 5 outcomes? Have your groups been influential in Results Groups' work? Have programming principles been reflected in UNAPF Annual Reports?

Sustainability

1. To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?
2. Did the UNAPF implementation adequately focus on national capacity development in the area of gender and HRBA?
5. Have your groups contributed to a greater sustainability of the results reached under the UNAPF outcomes?

Next United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework

1. How can the HRBA and gender equality and empowerment of women principles be better integrated in the next UNAPF priorities, outcomes, and results matrix?
2. How can the "Leave no one behind" considered as an overarching principle of the latest UNDAF Guidelines (2017) be reflected in the next UNAPF?
3. How can the preparation of the UN Common Country Analysis for the Cooperation Framework and the 2030 Agenda (planned in the UNCT Roadmap) provide the suggested information?
 - a. An analysis of the specific groups that have been left behind or are at risk of being left behind, analyzing the interplay of various factors causing and reinforcing inequality and discrimination.
 - b. An analysis of the country's implementation of its commitments under all relevant internationally agreed norms and standards and UN Charter values, as instrumental to achieving the 2030 Agenda.

Guiding list of questions for meeting with Non-Governmental Actors

The consultant will open the meeting mentioning that the UNAPF 2016-2020 outlines 5 outcomes

1. Outcome 1.1: By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups;
2. Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation;
3. Outcome 2.2: By 2020, Azerbaijan has made progress in line with international human rights mechanisms, including the Universal Periodic Review, and other treaty obligations, and has strengthened capacities for implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with international standards;
4. Outcome 2.3: By 2020, quality public and social services are accessible to all and help achieve more socially inclusive and equitable development results.
5. Outcome 3.1: By 2020, sustainable development policies and legislation are in place, are better implemented and coordinated in compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, recognize social and health linkages, and address issues of environment and natural resource management, energy efficiency and renewable energy, climate change, and resilience to hazards and disasters.

Relevance, strategic positioning and design

1. To what extent is the UNAPF has been relevant in the context of the past three and a half years (with respect to key development issues, their underlying causes, challenges, national policies and strategies)?
2. Has the UN's work been strategically positioned with respect to Non-Governmental Actors' and youth organizations' own strategies?

Effectiveness

1. What progress has been made by UN agencies as a contribution to the achievement of the UNAPF outcomes?
2. Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes?
3. To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening Non-Governmental Actors' and youth organizations' work and capacities?
4. Did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefit from priority attention?
5. How could effectiveness be improved in the next UNAPF?

Coordination

1. Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the outcome areas with civil society and youth organizations?
2. How could these partnerships and alliances be improved in the next UNAPF?

Sustainability

1. Have complementarities, collaboration and synergies fostered by the UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results?
2. To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?
3. How are the UNAPF benefits likely to be maintained over time?
4. To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?

Guiding list of questions for meeting with Development Partners: European Union, USAID, Swiss Cooperation Office

Relevance, strategic positioning and design

1. To what extent is the UNAPF strategically positioned with respect to the Government's and other stakeholders' strategies?
2. Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in relation to the issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified at the beginning of the current programme cycle and in the context of national policies and strategies?

Effectiveness

1. What progress has been made by UN agencies as a contribution to the achievement of the UNAPF outcomes?
2. Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes?
3. To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening national capacities (including national execution and institution building), policy and legal frameworks, and building partnerships?
4. To what extent did the UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of sex, age, geographic location, etc.?
5. Did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefit from priority attention?
6. What could effectiveness be improved in the next UNAPF?

Coordination

1. In what way have the comparative advantages and added value of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context?
2. How has the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies and with national partners?
3. Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the outcome areas (e.g., with Government, Parliament, local government, civil society, National Human Rights Institutions, development partners, International Financial Institutions and private sector)?
4. How could coordination, partnerships and strategic alliances be improved in the next UNAPF?

Sustainability

1. Have complementarities, collaboration and synergies fostered by the UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results?
2. To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?
3. How are the UNAPF benefits likely to be maintained over time?
4. To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?

ANNEX 4: UNAPF EVALUATION MISSION AGENDA

UNAPF Evaluation Mission Programme 9-18 July 2019 Baku, Azerbaijan

Date & Time	Activity	Venue	Logistics
MONDAY 8 July 2019			
Arrival at 20.25 Frankfurt LH612	Flight from Geneva to Baku	GYD airport	<i>Pick up arrangement</i>
	Transfer from Baku International Airport to hotel		
TUESDAY 9 July 2019			
10:00-11:30	Meeting with M&E Officer and National Expert	UN House, UNFPA meeting room	<i>Coffee break List to submit to guards</i>
12:00-12:45	Meeting with OMT	UN House, UNFPA meeting room	<i>Coffee break List to submit to guards</i>
Lunch			
15:00-16:00	Meeting with Mr. Matin Karimli , Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Protection, co-chair for Result Group 2	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Salatin Asgarova str. 85	Contacts: Ms. Irada Usubova 0506721707 Elnara: 5965022; 0503469242 Vehicle arrangement
WEDNESDAY 10 July 2019			
10:00-11:00	Briefing with UN Resident Coordinator, Mr. Ghulam Isaczai	RC Office	
12:00-13:00	Meeting with UNICEF representative, Mr. Edward Carwardine	UNICEF Office 24, Neftchilar avenue, Dalga Plaza	Contact: <i>Mina 0503331474</i> Vehicle arrangement
Lunch			
14:00-15:00	Meeting with Ms. Sevinj Hasanova , Deputy Minister of Economy, co-chair for Result Group 1	Minister of Economy, U.Hajibeyov str. 84, (Government House)	Contact: Khayala 0124925894; 0706432984; Khadija 0553821777 Vehicle arrangement

16:30-17:30	Meeting with Farid Babayev , UNFPA Officer in Charge	UN House, UNFPA meeting room	
THURSDAY 11 July 2019			
10:00-12:00	Result Group 1 Workshop	JW Marriott Absheron Hotel , Khirdalan hall	Vehicle arrangement
Lunch			
15:00-17:00	Result Group 2 Workshop	JW Marriott Absheron Hotel , Khirdalan hall	Vehicle arrangement
FRIDAY 12 July 2019			
10:00-12:00	Result Group 3 Workshop	JW Marriott Absheron Hotel , Khirdalan hall	Vehicle arrangement
Lunch			
15:00-16:00	Meeting with Mr. Rauf Hajiyev , deputy Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources, co-chair of the Result Group 3	Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources B Aghayev str. 100 (A)	Contact: Emin Garabaghli 050 386 52 58 Vehicle arrangement
16:30-17:30	Meeting with UNDP Resident Representative, Mr. Alessandro Fracassetti , co-chair of Result Group 1 and 3	UN House, RR Office	
MONDAY 15 July			
10:00-11:30	Meeting with non-governmental actors	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break</i> <i>List to submit to guards</i>
12:00-13:00	Meeting with Head of FAO Office, Melek Cakmak , co-chair of the Result Group 3	FAO Office State Veterinary Service under the Ministry of Agriculture Binagadi District, 8th Residential Area, Quarter3123	Contact: Gullu Huseynova 070 200 32 27; 563 56 28/101 Vehicle arrangement
Lunch			
14:00-15:00	Meeting with heads of UN agencies (WHO, Ms. Hande Harmanci, IOM, Mr. Vladimir Grigorjev, OHCHR, Kamran Baghirov)	UN Office in Azerbaijan	<i>Coffee break</i> <i>List to submit to guards</i>
15:00-16:00	Meeting with development partners (European Union, USAID, Swiss Cooperation Office)	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break</i> <i>List to submit to guards</i>
TUESDAY 16 July			
10:00-11:00	Meeting with Mr. Guido Ambroso , UNHCR Representative	UNHCR Office Winter Park Plaza,210 Mirzaagha	Contact: Naila Miraliyeva: 0505870247 Vehicle arrangement

12:00-13:00	Meeting with Communication Group	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break List to submit to guards</i>
Lunch			
14:00-15:00	Meeting with M&E Group	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break List to submit to guards</i>
15:00-16:30	Meeting with Thematic Groups (GTG, Human Rights, SDG)	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break List to submit to guards</i>
WEDNESDAY 17 JULY			
10:00-11:00	Meeting with Mr. Tahir Budagov , Chairman of State Statistics Committee	State Statistics Committee 136 Inshaatchilar avenue	<i>Contact: Elnure khanim 050 519 40 22</i>
12:00-13:00	Meeting with Ms. Sadagat Gahramanova and Ms. Aynur Sofiyeva deputy Chairwoman of the State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs	State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs U. Hajibayli 80, Government House, Fourth Door	<i>Contact: Gulzaman khanim 012 498 57 65 Int. Relations Department 050 205 85 54</i> Vehicle arrangement
Lunch			
14:00-18:00	Wrap up with National expert and M&E Officer	UN House, Conference room	<i>Coffee break</i>
THURSDAY 18 JULY			
02:00	Transfer to Baku International Airport		
Departure time 04:30	Flight from Baku to Geneva		

ANNEX 5: LIST OF REFERENCES AND BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

UNCT

- UNAPF document 2016-2020
- UNAPF Annual Progress Reports, 2017 and 2018
- Joint Annual Review Meetings Reports, 2017, 2018 and 2019
- UNAPF Result Groups co-chairs' meeting, Meeting Notes, 7 December 2018, on internal UNAPF
- Mid-term review process: Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) of UNAPF against global SDG targets, UNAPF RRF Review Workshop, and annex with Proposed Changes to UNAPF Results and Resources Framework
- UNAPF Joint Work Plans 2017, 2018 and 2019
- Steering Committee minutes
- UNAPF updated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
- Updated UNAPF M&E Plan
- Key UNCT Retreat notes
- Minutes of key UNCT meetings dealing with strategic issues or deemed relevant for the evaluation, where the UNAPF, DaO, and the SDGs may have been discussed
- Conceptual documents and presentations about DAO
- UN Business Operations Strategy 2018-2020, July 2018
- Participatory Gender Audit
- Gender Theme Group 2017 and 2018 Annual Reports
- UN System-Wide Action Plan (SWAP) for Gender equality and empowerment of women (GEWE) (if available)
- Reports of Results Groups on cross cutting issues (HR, SDGs, Communication)
- Evaluations and MTRs conducted by UN Agencies, i.e. UNDP CPE draft, UNICEF MTR
- Resident Coordinator's Annual reports, covering the period 2016-2018
- UNCT/Resident Coordinator's Office Workplans
- Communication materials
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Azerbaijan (2011-2015), Mid-Term Review, Christian Privat, Evaluation Consultant, 16 January 2014
- Other relevant documentation.

Guidance material related to UNDAF evaluations and UNDAF

- United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, Internal Guidance, UNDG, 3 June 2019
- Leaving No One behind, A UNSDG Operational Guide for UN Country Teams, Interim Draft, 18 March 2019

- Human Rights-Based Approach to Data, Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2018.
- UNDAF Guidance, UNDG, 2017 -- <https://undg.org/document/2017-UNDAF-guidance/>
- UNDAF Companion Guidance -- <https://undg.org/programme/undaf-companion-guidances/>
- Theory of Change, UNDAF Companion Guide, UNDG, 2017
- UNDG Guidance and Policies on Programme, UNDG, 2017 -- <https://undg.org/programme/undg-guidance-on-programing/>
- Programming principles, UNDAF companion Guide, UNDG, 2017
- UNDG Guidance and Policies on Human Rights -- <https://undg.org/human-rights/>
- UNDG Guidance and Policies on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, and the Gender scorecard -- <https://undg.org/programme/gender-equality-and-empowerment-of-women/>
- Revised UNDAF Interim Guidelines 2016, and UNDAF Guidelines 2010, and other guidance material on strategic positioning, 2010-2016
- Progress report guidance (2010)
- UNDG Toolkit
- Key Messages on DaO (March 2014)
- Standard Operating Procedures for Countries Wishing to Adopt the “Delivering as one” Approach, UNDG (August 2013)
- UNDG Plan of Action for headquarters (February 2014), with 55 ideas for action.
- New DaO Guidance on One Programme, Operations, Communication, etc. (Integrated package of support, and concrete examples which could be useful)
- UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation, 2016
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, 2008
- Frequently Asked Questions for UNDAF Evaluations, UNEG, 2010
- Quality Checklist for Evaluation ToR and inception reports, UNEG, 2010
- Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, UNEG, 2010
- UNEG Guidance on Preparing TORs for UNDAF Evaluations, 2012
- Guidance Note on the Application of the Programming Principles to the UNDAF, 2010
- Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014 -- <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>
- Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance, 2011
- Good practices for Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation, UNEG, Working Group on Gender Equality and Human Rights, 2017
- UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note, UNEG, 2018
- A Manager’s Guide to Gender Equality and Human Rights Responsive Evaluation, Identifying Stakeholders and Reference Groups, UN Women
- Resource Book for Mainstreaming Gender in UN Common Programming at the Country Level, UNDG, 2018 -- <https://undg.org/document/resource-book-for-mainstreaming-gender-in-un-common-programming-at-the-country-level/>
- Resource Guide for UN Gender Theme Groups, UNDG, 2018 -- <https://undg.org/document/resource-guide-for-gender-theme-groups/>

- Gender Equality Marker, Guidance Note, UNDG, September 2013
- UNEG Guidance on Preparing Management responses to UNDAF Evaluations, 2012
- Outcome-Level Evaluation, A companion Guide to the Handbook on Planning and Evaluating for Development Results, for Programme Units and Evaluators, UNDP, 2011 (especially Sections 5, 6 and 7)
- Handbook on Planning and Evaluating for Development Results, UNDP, 2009 (in particular Chapter 7)
- Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect, ILAC Brief No 16, John Mayne, May 2008
- Planning Evaluability Assessments, A Synthesis of the Literature with Recommendations, Report of a study commissioned by the Department for International Development (DFID), Working Paper 40, Dr Rick Davies, October 2013.
- How to Design and Manage Equity-focused Evaluation, UNICEF (especially Sections 4, 5 and 7)
- Evaluation for Equitable Development Results, UNICEF (in particular Part 2)
- Non-resident agencies material on UNDG Website.

UN Reform

- Repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda: our promise for dignity, prosperity and peace on a healthy planet, Report of the Secretary-General, 21 January 2017, A/72/684–E/2018/7, (pages 12-13 among others)
- 2016 JIU Study on the UNDAF and Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) study on RBM
- 2012 QCPR studies on UNDAF, RBM, RC System, Business practices, Emerging issues
- Replies from Azerbaijan to 2016 QCPR survey
- QCPR Secretary-general's Reports, and General Assembly Resolution
- Independent Evaluation of Delivering as One

ANNEX 6: LIST OF PEOPLE MET AND INTERVIEWED

UN ORGANISATIONS-resident

- Mr. Ghulam Isaczai, UN Resident Coordinator
- Mr. Edward Carwardine, UNICEF Representative
- Mr. Farid Babayev, Officer in Charge, UNFPA
- Mr. Alessandro Fracassetti, Resident Representative, UNDP, co-chair of results groups 1 and 3
- Ms. Melek Cakmak, Head of Office, FAO, co-chair of the Result Group 3
- Ms. Hande Harmanci, Head of Country Office, WHO
- Mr. Vladimir Grigorjev, Chief of Mission, IOM
- Mr. Kamran Baghirov, Human Rights Officer, Head of Office, OHCHR
- Mr. Guido Ambroso, UNHCR Representative
- Ms. Saida Bagirli, Senior Operations Officer, the World Bank, Azerbaijan (phone interview)
-

UN ORGANISATIONS-non-resident (through email/skype):

- Ms. Katja Schäfer, Inter-Regional Advisor, Programme Division, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
- Mr. Jean-Philippe Rodde, Economic Affairs Officer, Technical Cooperation Section, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
- Mr. Raul Javaloyes, Chief, Technical Cooperation Section, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
- Ms. Polina Tarshis, Programme Management Officer, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
- Mr. Mahir Aliyev, Regional Coordinator, Regional Office for Europe, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- Ms. Katherina Deufrains, Programme Management Officer, Division for Europe - TCEU2, Department of Technical Cooperation, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
- Dr. Arno Behrens, Programme Specialist, Regional Division, Europe and Central Asia, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
- Ms. Solomiya Omelyan, Programme Officer, Regional Division, Europe and Central Asia, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

GOVERNMENT

- **Mr. Metin Kerimli, Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Protection of the Population**, co-chair for Results Group 2, accompanied by senior staff members:
 - Ms. Rana Abdullayeva, Deputy Head, Employment Policy and Demography Department
 - Mr. Mustafa Abbasbayli, Advisor to the Minister
 - Ms. Irada Usubova, Head, Department for International Relations
 - Mr. Emil Javadov, Senior Advisor, Unit for Public Relations, Division for Public Relations and Communication
- **Ms. Sevinj Hasanova, Deputy Minister of Economy**, co-chair for Results Group 1, accompanied by senior staff members:

- Mr. Elnur Ibrahimov, Expert on Social-Economic Issues at the Secretariat of National Coordination Council on Sustainable Development
- Mr. Vusal G. Garayev, Head of Division, Sustainable Social-Economic Development Issues Division, Sustainable Development Department
- **Mr. Rauf Hajiyev, Deputy Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources**, co-chair of the Results Group 3, accompanied by senior staff members:
 - Mr. Emin Garabaghli, Head of International Cooperation Unit
 - Mr. Rasim Sattar-Zada, Head of Environmental Policy Division
- **Mr. Tahir Budagov, Chairman of State Statistics Committee**, accompanied by senior staff members.
- **Ms. Sadagat Gahramanova, Deputy Chairwoman of the State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs**, accompanied by senior staff members:
 - Ms. Jeyran Rahmatullayev, Head of the Apparatus
 - Ms. Taliya Ibrahimova, Head of the Legal Support Division
 - Ms. Kamala Hagverdiyeva, Deputy Head, International Relations and Protocol Service Department
 - Ms. Aynur Veysalova, Deputy Head, Information and Analytic Research Division

THEMATIC GROUPS

Communications Group

- Ms. Gular Fatali, Development Coordination Officer on Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting, UNRCO
- Ms. Arzu Jafarli, Communications and External Relations Analyst, UNDP
- Mr. Rashad Huseynov, National Information Officer, United Nations Department of Global Communications (DGC)
- Ms. Rahila Karimova, Programme Assistant, UNICEF
- Mr. Abdul Mustafazada, Communications Specialist, Department of Global Communications
- Ms. Fanara Bunyadzade, Communications Specialist, WHO
- Ms. Ulviyya Huseynli, Intern, Global Communications Department

Gender/ Human rights/SDG Groups

- Mr. Vugar Salmanov, Child Rights Specialist, UNICEF
- Mr. Kaan Basaran, International Programme Specialist, FAO
- Mr. Delawar Barekzai, SDG Policy Advisor, UNRCO
- Ms. Samira Allahverdiyeva, Assistant Protection Officer, UNHCR
- Ms. Natavan Aslanova, SDG Focal Point, Programme and Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, FAO
- Ms. Narmin Osmanli, SDG / M&E Focal Point, Assistant Program Officer, UNHCR
- Ms. Gular Fatali, DCO, Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting, UNRCO
- Mr. Tamerlan Rajabov, Children Rights Monitoring Officer, M&E Specialist, UNICEF
- Ms. Bahija Aliyeva, Programme Analyst (Gender), UNFPA
- Mr. Elgun Taghiyev, Policy Analyst, UNRCO
- Ms. Leyla Ayyvazi, SDG Project Officer, UNDP
- Ms. Leyla Fathi, Programme Analyst, UNDP
- Mr. Rashad Aliyev, Programme Coordinator, OHCHR
- Ms. Nargiz Karimova, Programme Coordinator, IOM

M&E Group

- Ms. Gular Fatali, DCO, Data Management, Results Monitoring and Reporting, UNRCO
- Mr. Tamerlan Rajabov, Children Rights Monitoring Officer, UNICEF
- Ms. Natavan Aslanova, Programme and Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, FAO
- Ms. Narmin Osmanli, Assistant Program Officer, UNHCR
- Ms. Parvin Valiyeva, Project Coordinator, IOM

NGOs/CSOs

- Mr. Yusif Poladov, Director of Aran Regional Office, Education Centre for Youth Public Union
- Mr. Araz Aliyev, Local Projects Officer, National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan (NAYORA)
- Ms. Saadat Abdullazada, National Coordinator, Y-PEER Azerbaijan
- Ms. Jale Rzayeva, Member, UN Youth Advisory Council Azerbaijan (UNYAC)
- Mr. Elniz Isayev, Member, UN Youth Advisory Council Azerbaijan (UNYAC)
- Ms. Narmin Amirova, Member, UN Youth Advisory Council Azerbaijan (UNYAC)
- Ms. Jamila Mammadli, Coordinator, UN Youth Advisory Council Azerbaijan (UNYAC)
- Mr. Rashad Huseynov, National Director, SOS Children's Villages
- Ms. Kamala Ashumova, Executive Director, "Reliable Future" Youth Public Union
- Ms. Gulshan Akhundova, Coordinator, Children Hotline Service, "Reliable Future" Youth Public Union
- Ms. Mehriban Zeynalova, Chairwoman, Clean World, Aid to Women Public Union
- Mr. Umud Mirzayev, President, International Eurasia Press Fund
- Mr. Zaur Ibrahimli, Expert, "Constitution" Research Foundation (CRF)
- Mr. Ilyas Safarli, Executive Director, "Uluchay" Social-Economic Innovation Center, Sheki region (Skype call)

DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

- Ms. Simona Qatti, Head of Development Unit, Ambassador Advisor, Delegation of the European Union in Azerbaijan
- Dr. Simone Haerberli, Swiss Cooperation Office for the South Caucasus, Embassy of Switzerland
- Ms. Elnara Vazirova, Specialist on Development Programs (Budget), USAID

UN OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT TEAM (OMT)

- Mr. Subhan Ahmadov, Operations Manager, UNDP
- Mr. Ilham Kazimov, Procurement / Logistics Coordinator, IOM
- Ms. Naila Shahbazova, Admin/Program Associate, UNHCR
- Ms. Sevil Gasimova, Administrative and Finance Officer, FAO
- Ms. Eskinaz Guliyeva, Admin Assistant, FAO
- Mr. Elkhan Khalilov, Admin/Finance Associate, UNFPA
- Mr. Jeyhun Mirzayev, Operations Manager, UNICEF
- Ms. Aynur Azimova, Local Security Assistant, UNDSS

WORKSHOPS WITH RESULTS GROUPS

Results Group One: Promoting sustainable and inclusive economic development, underpinned by increased diversification and decent work (11 July 2019)

- Mr. Rasim Safarov, Head of Division, State Statistics Committee
- Mr. Amin Abdullayev, Senior Specialist on Risk Management, the State Agency for Mandatory Health Insurance
- Mr. Elnur Ibrahimov, Expert on Social-Economic Issues at the Secretariat of National Coordination Council on Sustainable Development, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Rustam Imanov, Specialist (Marketing), Institute for Scientific Research on Economic Reforms under the Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Ziyaddin Karimov, Head of Division, Ministry of Health
- Mr. Elvin Mammadov, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Transport, Communications and High Technologies
- Ms. Rana Abdullayeva, Deputy Head of Employment Policy and Demographic Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population
- Mr. Anar Mammadov, Advisor, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Teymur Karimov, Head of Law and HR, ASAN
- Ms. Aliya Shabanova, Senior Specialist, Institute for Scientific Research on Economic Reforms under the Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Emin Mammadov, Head of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr. Fuad Ahmadov, Head of Unit, Ministry of Transport, Communications and High Technologies
- Mr. Rashad Novruzov, Head of the Department of Ombudsman Office
- Ms. Aynur Veysalova, Deputy Head of Division, The State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs
- Mr. Hasil Aliyev, Head of Department, Ministry of Agriculture
- Mr. Elkhan Amraliyev, Advisor, Ministry of Finance
- Mr. Sanan Huseynov, Head of Division, The State Committee for Refugees and IDPs
- Mr. Matin Ghasimov, Senior Advisor, ABAD
- Mr. Toghrul Mammadov, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Economy
- Ms. Natavan Aslanova, Programme and Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, FAO
- Ms. Leyla Fathi, Programme Analyst, UNDP
- Ms. Konul Jafarova, Project Assistant, IOMMs. Dinara Abbas, Deputy Representative, FAOMs. Samira Allahverdiyeva, Assistant Protection Officer, UNHCR
- Ms. Narmin Osmanli, Assistant Program Officer, UNHCR

Results Group 2: Strengthening institutional capacities and effective public and social services (11 July 2019)

- Mr. Vagif Mansurov, Senior Inspector, State Migration Service
- Ms. Bagdagul Aliyeva, Representative, Ministry of Justice
- Mr. Yashar Zeynalov, Head of Unit, Accountability and Monitoring, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Shahin Khasiyev, Head of the Department of Statistics, Ministry of Health
- Ms. Narmin Aslanbayova, Head of Unit, Ministry of Youth and Sports
- Mr. Mustafa Abbasbayli, Advisor to the Minister, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population
- Mr. Toghrul Mammadov, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Economy

- Mr. Elnur Ibrahimov, Expert on Social-Economic Issues at the Secretariat of National Coordination Council on Sustainable Development, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Vusal Arzumanli, Head of Department, ABAD
- Mr. Amin Abdullayev, Senior Specialist, Department of Strategic Analysis, The State Agency for Mandatory Health Insurance
- Ms. Khuraman Ismayilli, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr. Adigozel Adigozelov, Head of Division, Ministry of Interior
- Mr. Asim Safarov, Head of Division, State Statistics Committee
- Mr. Teymur Karimov, Head, Law and HR, ASAN
- Ms. Min Yuan, Deputy Representative, UNICEF
- Ms. Bahija Aliyeva, Programme Analyst, UNFPA
- Mr. Elnur Khalilov, Programme Advisor, UNDP
- Ms. Narmin Osmanli, Assistant Programme Officer, UNHCR
- Ms. Hande Harmanci, Head of Country Office, WHO
- Mr. Rashad Aliyev, Programme Coordinator, OHCHR
- Ms. Konul Jafarova, Project Assistant, IOM

Results Group 3: Improving environmental management and resilience to natural and human-induced disasters (12 July 2019)

- Ms. Najiba Afandiyeva, Head of Division, Member of the Working Group, Ministry for Emergency Situations
- Mr. Parviz Rzayev, Head of Division, Planning and Development, ANAMA
- Mr. Elnur Ibrahimov, Expert on Social-Economic Issues at the Secretariat of National Coordination Council on Sustainable Development, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Anar Mammadov, Advisor, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Mikayil Ismayilov, Senior project management advisor, Ministry for Emergency Situations
- Mr. Rasim Safarov, Head of Division, State Statistics Committee
- Mr. Sahib Khalilov, Head of Division, The State Agency on Alternative and Renewable Energy Sources
- Mr. Faig Mutallimov, Head of Division, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
- Mr. Ziyaddin Kazimov, Head of Division, Ministry of Health
- Mr. Togrul Mammadov, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Economy
- Mr. Abdulrahim Dadashov, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Centre for Agrarian Research
- Ms. Khatira Abbasova, Advisor, Ministry for Energy
- Mr. Tahir Ismayilov, Senior Advisor, Azerbaijan Amelioration and Water Farm JSC
- Mr. Ayaz Salmanov, Vice Head, Department of Environmental Projects, SOCAR
- Mr. Chingiz Mammadov, Senior Programme Advisor, UNDP
- Ms. Dinara Abbas, Deputy Representative, FAO
- Ms. Hande Harmanci, Head of Country Office, WHO
- Ms. Natavan Aslanova, Programme and Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, FAO

ANNEX 7: BIOGRAPHIES OF CONSULTANTS

Mr. Christian Privat, International Consultant
cprivat8@gmail.com

Christian Privat is an International Consultant who specializes in sustainable human development. He has significant experience in conducting evaluations of development programmes for the United Nations. He focuses on the evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), Country programmes, joint programmes, programmes and projects, Delivering as One, and cross cutting issues, especially the Human Rights-based Approach and Gender Equality.

He has 23 years of experience with the UN System, in the development area (13 years in Evaluation, 10 years in other areas). He has significant experience with the UN Development System at field level, and with many UN agencies and Departments (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO, UNDEF, UNDESA, UNOHCHR, and UNOSSC), in addition to his frequent work with UN Country Teams.

He conducted 15 Evaluations and Mid-Term Reviews of the UNDAF, in a variety of countries and regions: Ghana, Peru (2 assignments), Egypt, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Benin, Mexico, Nigeria, Tajikistan, Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean States, Montenegro, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan (2).

He also conducted 6 Mid-Term and Final Evaluations of joint programmes of the MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F): four on Youth, Employment and Migration (Peru, Paraguay and Costa Rica twice), one on Culture and Development (Honduras), and one on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building (Haiti). Moreover, he has conducted the MDG-F Country Evaluation in Mauritania, which was one of the nine Focus Countries of the Fund.

He also conducted, for UNICEF, a Country Programme Evaluation in Egypt, two “Strategic Moment of Reflection” (SMR) in Ghana, Malawi and Turkey, in addition to a Mid-Term Review in Cuba. He also conducted two other Country Programme Evaluations for UNDP (Montenegro) and OHCHR (Mexico). He also prepared a (UNDAF-related) Human Rights-based Country Analysis in Ukraine and Tajikistan, as well as a Country Analysis in Kuwait.

He also undertook a study on ‘Strengthening the presence, coherence and strategic positioning of the UN in Kuwait, and Delivering as One lessons learned.’

He worked with UNDESA for the QCPR (of operational activities in the area of development) of the UN General Assembly, especially on the UNDAF and Results-Based Management studies.

He paid particular attention to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and HRBA, especially in all his UNDAF and joint programme evaluations.

He conducted these assignments in a multitude of countries and regions in the world, especially Latin and Central America, Africa, the Middle East, the CEE/CIS region and Central Asia.

Moreover, he worked as Programme Officer for UNICEF Cuba, and as a Consultant and Programme Officer for UNICEF NYHQ, in the Evaluation Office, the Programme Division, the Division of Policy and Planning, the Programme Funding Office, and the Office of the Executive Director.

Christian Privat has a Masters degree in International Administration and International Law from the University of Paris II, a Bachelors degree (*Laurea*) in Political Science and International Relations from the University of Florence (Italy), and a Bachelor degree in Administration, Economic and Social Sciences from the University of Saint-Etienne (France). He also took 10 courses on Human Rights at Columbia University, at the Law School, School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA), and Center for the Study of Human Rights. Christian received training on leading participatory workshops, which he routinely incorporates into his evaluation and strategic planning work. He is a French native speaker and is fluent in English, Spanish and Italian.

Mr. Rahim Saatov, National Consultant

rahim.saatov@gmail.com

An expert UN facilitator and development coordination professional, Mr. Rahim Saatov has 15 years of experience across the globe in Africa, Europe, Asia, and North America, including in Azerbaijan. He has worked for the UN for over 5.5 years and has been on short-term assignments in over 20 countries, working with UNAIDS, UNFPA and more - as programme officer, programme coordinator, trainer and consultant.

He was a UN internal policy champion for sensitive human rights topics for groups that are often excluded and rolled out a diversity and inclusion policy initiative in 17 countries, including in Azerbaijan in 2017. Mr. Saatov's coordination and capacity building contribution to the work of the UN Cares team in Moscow, the Russian Federation, was recognized by the UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, who awarded this work with the global UN Cares Award for 2016.

His specialties are training/facilitation, designing UN country level change management processes, strategic planning, project management, and evaluation. He works with government, UN and development partners.

Mr. Saatov brings experience in analyzing and managing issues related to advocacy and communication for sustainable development goals, harassment and discrimination, creating accountability systems that foster teamwork development and leadership commitment, building diversity and inclusiveness into performance appraisal planning and assessment, and developing and coordinating collaborative teams in different UN programme management contexts.

Mr. Saatov has a Master of Social Science with specialization in development and international cooperation from Jyvaskyla University in Finland, and a Bachelor of Business Administration from Khazar University in Azerbaijan. He has also completed leadership, corporate social responsibility, social change and management programmes at Harvard Kennedy School of Government and the UN System Staff College. Rahim speaks fluent Azerbaijani (native), English, Russian, Finnish, and basic French.

ANNEX 8: STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

The UNAPF evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner, ensuring participation and involvement of key stakeholders (mainly government officials, a few civil society organizations, and development/UN partners) in different phases of the evaluation. A participatory and utilization-focused approach to involving key stakeholders and boosting ownership of the evaluation was adopted to incorporate the views of various stakeholders; through meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholder groups. Feedback on the UNAPF was also obtained from stakeholders through meetings with the results groups, interviews, and the circulation of the first draft report and identification of factual corrections from stakeholders.

Evaluation stakeholders are individuals with an interest in having the intervention evaluated and/or in evaluation findings. A stakeholder analysis is the most effective tool to help identify the different groups in an intervention and why, how, and when they should be included in the evaluation process. It serves to define a subset of targeted users and aids in the identification of the stakes each has in the evaluation, as well as in prioritizing and balancing the information received from stakeholders. Involving stakeholders directly affected or concerned by an intervention in the design, planning and implementation of its evaluation is a fundamental principle of any evaluation process.

According to UN mandates, ensuring stakeholders' participation, including both men and women, is an obligation of the UN, and it is the right of every beneficiary to have a say on processes and interventions that affects their lives. Evaluation is no exception. In order to make it human rights and gender equality responsive, one needs to ensure that stakeholders identified include duty bearers and rights holders, men and women. UNEG Norms and Standards explicitly mandate transparency and consultation with the intervention's major stakeholders (Norm 10.1; Standard 4.10).

Integrating human rights and gender equality in an evaluation stakeholder analysis involves the consideration of five main types of stakeholders:

- Duty bearers who have decision-making authority over the intervention, such as governing bodies or steering committees;
- Duty bearers who have direct responsibility for the intervention, such as programme managers;
- Secondary duty bearers, such as the private sector or parents;
- Rights holders (individually or through the civil society organizations acting on their behalf) who are the intended and unintended beneficiaries of the intervention; and
- Rights holders (individually or through the civil society organizations acting on their behalf) who should be represented in the intervention but are not, or who are negatively affected by the intervention.

Together with state and governmental entities, civil society organizations (including organizations promoting human rights or representing women or individuals/groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against) and social movements are crucial partners, as they have a deep knowledge of the

intervention context and they represent civil society interests and needs, thus enhancing accountability throughout the evaluation.

Conducting a stakeholder analysis, identifying likely users among various stakeholders helped evaluation managers and evaluators decide the extent to which different groups will be involved in the process. Next, stakeholders were disaggregated into five main categories so managers are sure to include as many key stakeholder groups as possible. This is critical for ensuring inclusiveness by not treating people as a uniform group (e.g. beneficiaries) but understanding and acknowledging that different groups exist and are affected by interventions in different ways.

The degree and level of stakeholder participation in this UNAPF evaluation process varies and the different challenges posed—institutional, budgetary and time—need to be taken into consideration. The evaluator, the evaluation manager, and the evaluation reference group needed to weigh the level of stakeholder participation against the benefits and constraints.

The stakeholder analysis was also a helpful tool to address possible bias in this evaluation. As it was subject to budget and time constraints, the consultants met the most accessible (geographically, linguistically, etc.), those who constituted the interventions direct beneficiaries, or those affiliated with implementing agencies. Besides meetings with NGOs, information was not collected from groups of final beneficiaries who were excluded or whose situation may have deteriorated due to UNAPF interventions. Because of time constraints, unintended outcomes were not examined.

The stakeholder analysis matrix provided in Annex 8 is a tool developed by UNEG in the Guidelines for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation⁵⁴ to assist evaluators in identifying the stakeholders and deciding who should be involved in the evaluation process and in what ways, with the explicit consideration of human rights and gender equality. A matrix was filled by the International Consultant to reflect the specificities of this evaluation. See the [stakeholder analysis matrix below](#).

This exercise helped carefully balance the desire to be inclusive against the challenge of managing the evaluation process efficiently. This analysis of stakeholders included a human rights and gender equality lens, facilitated enhanced participation and inclusiveness throughout the evaluation process—from developing the inception report, selecting appropriate methods for data collection, and conducting the evaluation having in mind all these concerns. A key limitation in the stakeholder analysis is the fact that UNAPF stakeholders are mainly government officials and there was a reduced number of civil society organizations, youth organizations, and other partners involved in UNAPF implementation, unlike in other countries. Furthermore, they are not present and represented in the results groups.

⁵⁴ Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, UNEG Guide, 2014, <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>.

Stakeholder analysis matrix

Who (stakeholders, disaggregated as appropriate)	What (their role in the intervention)	Why (purpose of involvement in the evaluation)	Priority (how important to be part of the evaluation process)	When (stage of the evaluation to engage them)	How (ways and capacities in which stakeholders will participate)
Duty bearers with the authority to make decisions related to the intervention Example: Government organizations, officials and leaders	Members of UNAPF 's Steering Committee Government officials	Consult: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation's progress and findings, listen to them, and provide feedback on how the stakeholder's input influenced the evaluation	High level of relevance to the evaluation	Preparation (e.g., preparation of ToR including setting of scope) Management response	As members of the Steering Committee and as key Government officials
Duty bearers who have direct responsibility for the intervention Example: government and programme managers; civil society organizations; partners (individual and organizations); Development partners (funding agencies)	Duty bearers Implementing partners Funders	Collaborate: Work with the stakeholder to ensure that their concerns are considered when reviewing various evaluation options; make sure that they have the opportunity to review and comment on options and provide feedback on how their input was used in the evaluation. Empower: Transfer power for the evaluation over to the stakeholder: it is their evaluation. The evaluation team will	High level of relevance to the evaluation	Inception and primary research (e.g. development of evaluation design, framing evaluation questions and criteria) Data collection and analysis Report preparation	As an informant

		offer options and advice to inform their decisions. Decision-making power ultimately rests with this stakeholder, whose decisions will be supported, informed and facilitated by the evaluation team			
Secondary duty bearers Example: private sector; other authorities; employers, civil servants and business associations, schools, medical institutions, child and family support centers	Duty bearers	Inform: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation's progress and findings	Low level of relevance to the evaluation	Dissemination	As audience to be informed of the evaluation
Rights holders who one way or another benefit from the intervention Example: women, men, girls, boys, children in institutions, adolescents, vulnerable groups, youth, women, persons with disabilities – particularly those in rural areas, young entrepreneurs, job seekers, workers, IDPs, refugees and migrants,	Secondary beneficiary and rights holders	Collaborate: Incorporate the stakeholder's advice and concerns to the greatest degree possible, and provide opportunities for meaningful involvement in the evaluation process	Medium level of relevance to the evaluation	Data collection and analysis Dissemination	As audience to be informed of the evaluation

Rights holders who are in a position disadvantaged by the intervention Example: women, men, girls, boys, other groups disaggregated	Non-participants possibly affected by the intervention	Inform: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation's progress and findings	Medium level of relevance	Dissemination	As audience to be informed of the evaluation
Other interest groups who are not directly participating in the intervention Example: other development agencies working in the area; civil society organizations; other organizations; private businesses, non-state actors, etc.	Secondary beneficiary and rights holders	Inform: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation's progress and findings	Medium level of relevance	Dissemination	As audience to be informed of the evaluation

ANNEX 9: EVALUATION MATRIX

This matrix is an important tool to guide the evaluation. It is derived from criteria and a list of questions, and assists the evaluation team, the Evaluation Reference Group, and the UNCT in understanding the main evaluative arguments. The matrix shows the evaluation criteria and questions, the indicators or success standards, sources of information, and data collection methods.

Evaluation questions	Indicators / Success standards	Sources of information	Data collection methods
<p>Relevance and strategic positioning:</p> <p>1. To what extent is the UNAPF strategically positioned with respect to the Government’s and other stakeholders’ strategies?</p> <p>2. Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in relation to the issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified at the beginning of the current programme cycle and in the context of national policies and strategies?</p> <p>3. Have the UNAPF outcomes been relevant in terms of Internationally Agreed Goals (IAGs) and commitments, norms and standards guiding the work of agencies of the UN system (including CEDAW, CPRD, CRC, etc. all international environmental and human rights treaties binding on Azerbaijan, and other relevant human rights standards and evaluations)</p> <p>4. Has the UNAPF document been used by UN agencies and Government institutions in planning their activities, setting goals, and in cooperation?</p>	<p>Evidence of consistency between the outcomes and specific interventions of UNAPF and the national priorities and targets i.e. “Vision 2020”</p> <p>Common understanding amongst stakeholders about the links between UNAPF results and selected national priorities</p> <p>Clear identification of IAGs and commitments, norms and standards in UNAPF document and results matrix</p> <p>Stakeholders confirm that UNAPF was used by UN agencies and Government in planning their activities, setting goals and in cooperation</p>	<p>UNAPF document and progress reports</p> <p>Joint Annual Review Meetings Reports, 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Resident Coordinator’s Annual reports, covering the period 2016-2018</p> <p>UNAPF Joint Work Plans 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Steering Committee minutes</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN Agencies’ representatives</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Debriefing to UNCT, RC and other stakeholders</p> <p>Meeting with non-governmental actors</p> <p>Meeting with development partners</p>

<p>Design:</p> <p>1. To what extent is the current UNAPF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?</p> <p>2. Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNAPF timeframe, resources and the planned UN Country Programmes, projects and programme strategies?</p> <p>3. Is the current chain of results designed in a way that shows the contributions of the UN system where results can be attributed to the UN? Are expected results and indicators SMART from this point of view? What could be improved for the next UNAPF?</p> <p>4. Are outcome indicators, targets and baselines frequently collected, reliable and of good quality?</p>	<p>The UNAPF includes clearly identified outcomes and outputs which form a logical chain of results according to RBM methodology</p> <p>Assessment of the UNAPF Results Matrix against UNDG/UNEG guidelines and SMART criteria</p> <p>Intended results are realistic for the UNAPF timeframe, resources and planned country interventions</p> <p>The UNAPF is easy to monitor and it is evaluable. SMART indicators are assigned to each outcome and output</p> <p>Indicators, baselines, and targets are sufficient for assessing progress during implementation</p> <p>Evidence and stakeholder perceptions about the user-friendly nature of the Results Matrix for M&E purposes</p>	<p>UNAPF document</p> <p>UNAPF Result Groups co-chairs' meeting, Meeting Notes, 7 December 2018</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN Agencies' representatives</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Debriefing to UNCT, RC and other stakeholders</p>
<p>Effectiveness:</p> <p>1. What progress has been made towards the realization of UNAPF outcomes as a contribution to the</p>	<p>Comparison of actual outcomes achieved against the UNAPF document, and identification of</p>	<p>UNAPF document and progress reports</p>	<p>Desk review</p>

<p>achievement of national priorities and in terms of indicators as reflected in the UNAPF framework?</p> <p>2. Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the UNAPF outcomes and national development goals? How the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed?</p> <p>3. To what extent did the UNAPF succeed in strengthening national capacities (including national execution and institution building), policy and legal frameworks and building partnerships?</p> <p>4. To what extent did the UNAPF had any impact on policy formulation and implementation related to the three UNAPF results areas?</p> <p>5. To what extent did UNAPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of sex, age, geographic location, etc. and did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention?</p> <p>6. How well did the UNCT use its existing and partnerships (with civil society, private sector, local government, parliament, national human rights institutions, international development partners) to improve its performance?</p> <p>7. What are the challenges and opportunities related to budget allocations, and current and planned</p>	<p>positive trends in the outcome indicators</p> <p>Programme stakeholders can offer concrete examples of outcomes and outputs achieved, as well as opportunities and constraints</p> <p>The actual outputs are likely to make a significant contribution towards the expected outcomes</p> <p>Stakeholders can offer examples of how new skills, abilities, services have led to, or are leading to, changes in institutional performance and/or behaviours</p> <p>Plausible evidence that UN-supported results under the UNAPF have made a contribution to national priorities</p> <p>Evidence of increased capacity on disaggregated data collection and analysis</p> <p>Existence of existing and new partnerships</p> <p>Expected vs. actual performance in resource mobilization and</p>	<p>Joint Annual Review Meetings Reports, 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Resident Coordinator’s Annual reports, covering the period 2016-2018</p> <p>Evaluations and MTRs conducted by UN Agencies, i.e. UNDP CPE draft, UNICEF MTR</p> <p>UNAPF Joint Work Plans 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Steering Committee minutes</p>	<p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings with UN agencies</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Debriefing to UNCT, RC and other stakeholders</p> <p>Meeting with non-governmental actors</p> <p>Meeting with development partners</p>
--	--	--	---

resource mobilization, and how these may affect the expected delivery of results?	consequences on delivery of results		
<p>Efficiency:</p> <p>1. To what extent and in what way has the UNAPF contributed to a reduction of transaction costs for the government and for each of the UN agencies? In what ways could transaction costs be further reduced?</p> <p>2. Were the results achieved at reasonably low/lowest possible cost?</p> <p>3. To what extent have the organizations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction cost and to enhance results?</p> <p>4. Did UN coordination reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of UNAPF implementation?</p> <p>5. To what extent did the UNAPF create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication?</p>	<p>Positive perceptions about costs vs. benefits of UNAPF results and the efficiency of implementing modalities employed</p> <p>Perceptions about costs vs. benefits of UNAPF results and the efficiency of implementation modalities used (avoiding waste and duplication)</p> <p>Evidence and perceptions about how the UNAPF affected transaction costs for UN agencies and Government partners</p> <p>Evidence of progress in Business Operations Strategy (e.g., collaborative procurement, long-term agreements and contracts, common premises)</p> <p>Efficiency gains achieved through synergy (concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication)</p>	United Nations Business Operations Strategy 2018-2020	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN Agencies' representatives</p>
Sustainability:	Evidence of concrete changes in national laws, policies, regulations,		Desk review

<p>1. To what extent results achieved and strategies used in the frame of the UNAPF are sustainable: i) as a contribution to national development, and (ii) in terms of the added value of UNAPF to cooperation among individual UN agencies?</p> <p>2. Have complementarities, collaboration and /or synergies fostered by UNAPF contributed to greater sustainability of results?</p> <p>3. To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced?</p> <p>4. To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?</p> <p>5. Did the UNCT undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost? To what extent are the benefits being, or are likely to be, maintained over time.</p> <p>6. Did the UNAPF promote ownership of programmes by national partners?</p>	<p>strategies or plans that can sustain UNAPF results and strategies</p> <p>Scaling-up of pilot initiatives</p> <p>Additional allocations of national budget and/or other donor resources</p> <p>Institutional capacity in place to sustain levels of achievement</p> <p>Triangulation of perceptions about the sustainability of UNAPF results/benefits</p> <p>Stakeholders at both the strategic and programmatic levels can offer examples of ways the institutions are sustaining programmatic results</p> <p>Evidence that assumptions and risks were considered during programme reviews and for progress reporting</p>	<p>UNAPF document and progress reports</p> <p>Joint Annual Review Meetings Reports, 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Resident Coordinator’s Annual reports, covering the period 2016-2018</p> <p>Evaluations and MTRs conducted by UN Agencies, i.e. UNDP CPE draft, UNICEF MTR</p>	<p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN agencies’ representatives</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Debriefing to UNCT, RC and other stakeholders</p> <p>Meeting with non-governmental actors</p> <p>Meeting with development partners</p>
<p>Five programming principles:</p> <p>1. To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNAPF? To what extent and in what ways has a human</p>	<p>UNAPF strategies, results and indicators address the standards of ratified human rights treaties including international labour standards, and major</p>	<p>UNAPF document and progress reports</p>	<p>Meeting with Theme Groups (HR, Gender, SDGs)</p> <p>Desk review</p>

<p>rights approach been reflected as one possible method for integrating human rights concerns into the UNAPF?</p> <p>2. To what extent did the UNAPF make use of and promote human rights and gender equality standards and principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.) to achieve its goal?</p> <p>3. To what extent and in what ways the concepts of gender equity and equality were reflected in UNAPF (in terms of specific goals and targets set, sex-disaggregated data and indicators, etc.)?</p> <p>4. How have the recommendations/action plan of the UNCT SWAP gender scorecard assessment been implemented, including those on meeting minimum standards on gender disaggregated data and the ability to track allocation of budget under UNAPF for gender mainstreaming?</p> <p>5. How can the gender equality and empowerment of women principle be better integrated in the next UNAPF strategies and results frameworks?</p> <p>6. Did the UNAPF effectively use the principles of environmental sustainability to strengthen its contribution to national development results?</p> <p>7. Did the UNAPF adequately use Result Based Management to ensure a logical chain of results and establish a monitoring and evaluation framework? Was the UNAPF results matrix sufficiently flexible and</p>	<p>recommendations of treaty body reports</p> <p>UNAPF strategies, results and indicators have been informed by gender analysis and some understanding of how women and men experience problems differently</p> <p>Major UNAPF indicators are disaggregated by gender</p> <p>Evidence of (1) Causality analysis, (2) Role-pattern analysis, and (3) Capacity gap analysis in the UNAPF and other documents</p> <p>UNAPF strategies, results and indicators are informed by key operational HR principles: (1) Non-discrimination and equality; (2) Participation and inclusion; (3) Accountability and the rule of law</p> <p>Stakeholders can offer examples on how HRBA and gender equality were applied during the UNAPF implementation</p> <p>Evidence that programme efforts were successfully targeted and delivered to vulnerable groups</p>	<p>Participatory Gender Audit</p> <p>Gender Theme Group 2017 and 2018 Annual Reports</p> <p>Reports of Results Groups on cross cutting issues (HR, SDGs, Communication)</p>	<p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN Agencies' representatives</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Meeting with non-governmental actors</p>
---	---	---	---

<p>relevant to respond to new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNAPF cycle?</p> <p>8. Did the UNAPF adequately focus on national capacity development?</p> <p>9. Are the outcomes and indicators fit to measure results, in a way that would ensure that no-one is left behind in UN interventions?</p>	<p>Evidence that the UNAPF document, JWPs, monitoring and reporting used use Result-Based Management principles</p> <p>Evidence of the reflection of the environmental sustainability principle in the UNAPF document and implementation</p> <p>Evidence of the reflection of the capacity development principle in the UNAPF document and implementation</p>		
<p>Coordination:</p> <p>1. To what extent and in what way have the comparative advantages of UN agencies been utilized in the national context specifically in relation to the special mandates of UN agencies and other development partners active in the country (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism)?</p> <p>2. To what extent and in what way has the UNAPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies with an effect on the progress towards the National Development priorities? Has the UNAPF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions about how well the UN’s comparative advantages were utilized</p> <p>Triangulation of perceptions about the benefits of the UNAPF for greater coherence and collaboration between UN agencies</p> <p>Triangulation of perceptions about the benefits of the UNAPF for improved collaboration between</p>	<p>UNAPF document and progress reports</p> <p>Joint Annual Review Meetings Reports, 2017, 2018 and 2019</p> <p>Resident Coordinator’s Annual reports, covering the period 2016-2018</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Meetings with UNAPF Results Groups</p> <p>Meetings/Interviews with UN Agencies’ representatives</p> <p>Meetings with UNAPF M&E Group, the United Nations Communications Group (UNCG), and the</p>

<p>3. To what extent the existing coordination mechanisms, including the UNAPF Steering Committee, the Results Groups and the Theme Groups Theme Groups (HR, Gender, SDGs, Communication, M&E) are adequate to ensure joint alignment of results, and effectiveness and efficiency in delivering results, monitoring, reporting and planning?</p> <p>4. To what extent have the UN and partners managed to use the joint work planning opportunities to better align their work, for a more effective and efficient results delivery?</p> <p>5. Did the UNAPF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main national development agenda and UNAPF outcomes areas (e.g., within Government, with national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?</p> <p>6. Have agency supported programmes been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNAPF outcomes? Has the effectiveness or programme support by individual agencies been enhanced as a result of joint programming?</p> <p>7. Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNAPF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievements of results and have the arrangements largely been respected in the course of implementation?</p>	<p>UN agencies and Government partners</p> <p>Existence of UNAPF management arrangements (Results Groups, Steering Committee, Thematic Groups) and if they led to a regular, user-friendly stream of information and data on achievements (i.e. annual reports)</p> <p>Positive stakeholders' perceptions about the effectiveness of the UNAPF progress monitoring, learning, and reporting</p> <p>Evidence of new partnerships or alliances related to UNAPF programming and advocacy</p> <p>Evidence of joint programmes and joint programming, and perceptions about their effectiveness among UN agencies</p>	<p>Evaluations and MTRs conducted by UN Agencies, i.e. UNDP CPE draft, UNICEF MTR</p>	<p>Operations Management Team</p> <p>Interviews/Meetings with national stakeholders in charge of Priority Areas 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Debriefing to UNCT, RC and other stakeholders</p> <p>Meeting with non-governmental actors</p>
---	---	---	---