

**UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
FRAMEWORK
2005-2010**

EVALUATION

AZERBAIJAN

**Prepared by:
Fuat Andic, Ph.D.
International Consultant
&
Elshad Mikayilov
National M&E Specialist**

Acknowledgements

The report is the final product of the field visit to Baku (April 5-11, 2009) as well as the work started and completed in the home base upon comments received following the presentation of the draft report on April 9, 2009. Many people contributed to its preparation; their names are listed in Annex 2 with heartfelt thanks. However, special and separate thanks are due to two persons: Mr. Bruno Pouezat, UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP Resident Representative, who took special interest in the preparation of the report and guided me on all-important matters, and Ms. Irada Ahmedova, UN Coordination Analyst, Office of the Resident Coordinator, assisted me in every step of my work well beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Elshad Mikayilov, as a national M&E specialist, collaborated and cooperated with me throughout the preparation of the report. His technical knowledge and dedication to the evaluation process proved to be invaluable. Special recognition of his work is well deserved.

I am solely responsible for the content of the report and the opinions put forward therein. However, without the cooperation of all the persons listed in Annex 2, errors and omissions would have been more serious and grievous.

F. A

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	5
1. Introduction	8
1.1. Setting.....	8
1.2. Methodology.....	8
1.3. Main Objectives of the Report and its Organization.....	9
2. Outcomes and Impacts	10
2.1. Objectives.....	10
2.2. Findings.....	11
2.3. Partners and Resources of UNDAF.....	15
3. Assessment of UNDAF	17
3.1. The Design and Use of UNDAF.....	17
3.2. Relevance.....	18
3.3. Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	18
3.4. Sustainability.....	19
3.5. Perceptions.....	20
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	20
4.1 Conclusions.....	20
4.2 Recommendations.....	21
5. Lessons Learned and a Glimpse of the Future	25
5.1 Lessons Learned.....	25
5.2 New Equations for the Next UNDAF.....	26
5.3 Implications of the NCC Status for UN.....	26
5.4 Implications for Azerbaijan.....	27
5.5 Azerbaijan as a Donor Country.....	27
6. Recapitulation	28

Annexes

1. Terms of Reference
2. UNDAF M&E Framework
3. Outcome Indicators
4. Azerbaijan and Other NCC Countries
5. Public Spending on Health and Education in Selected Countries
6. Key Questions for a Good UNDAF Document
7. Persons Interviewed
8. Bibliographical Note

Combating poverty is one of the priorities for us. Policies are carried out in this direction and the level of poverty decreases year by year in Azerbaijan. From this viewpoint we should work with international organizations. There should not be any poor people in Azerbaijan.

Ilham Aliev
President of the
Republic of Azerbaijan

Our efforts to eradicate poverty must pay close attention to respect for human rights and the dignity of all. They must go beyond basic material needs and address discrimination and inequality. That means ensuring that all poor people have access to the resources they need - land, capital, knowledge and skills - to escape poverty. It means empowering the poor to effectively participate in decision-making and other activities that directly affect their lives.

Ban Ki-Moon
Secretary-General of
the United Nations

Executive Summary

- *The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) appears to have been prepared thoroughly and with great detail. All requisite documents have been reviewed before its design.*
- *In its **design**, UNDAF has followed the logical steps of convening a prioritization workshop and liaised with the Government in order to assure concordance with Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and MDG strategies. The UNDAF that emerged identified the issues to be tackled, the correct outputs and expected outcomes, although the gender equality issue has not received sufficient attention. The baselines and outcome indicators have been expressed mostly in quantitative terms.*
- *In most general terms, UNDAF is a well-prepared document. Nevertheless, it is not totally free of certain shortcomings which are not grievous, but have bearings on the next UNDAF. In some cases, which are not very many, outcomes and outputs are not clearly delineated. Some indicators are left to be determined later. Listing a number of indicators for which there is no reliable source to verify became a meaningless task and deprived the consultant from verifying whether expected outcomes, let alone impacts, are in fact obtained or likely to be obtained. The document is detailed, but not excessively, which essentially provides flexibility to adjust projects according to changing conditions and priorities of the Country.*
- *Two basic concepts are used in judging the **relevance** of UNDAF: namely, a) the strategic positioning and focus of UN on key outcomes; and b) the outcomes and impacts relevant to national priorities, as well as consistent with the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in Azerbaijan. UNDAF is relevant to the needs of Azerbaijan.*
- *Measured by administrative cost and by resource mobilization UNDAF appears to be **efficient**.*
- *While many project components of various agencies include **capacity building**, there are very few projects that specifically aim at capacity building which acquires an entirely different dimension, since Azerbaijan aims to become a net contributing country (NCC) and a donor country. It is imperative that the next cycle takes into consideration this particular dimension.*
- *In very general terms, overall outcomes, as delineated in the UNDAF document, are likely to be **sustainable**. However, the final verdict will have to wait until all projects completed and the programmes of each agency are subjected to an in-depth evaluation.*
- *The implementing partners appear to have a high regard for UN agencies. They frequently cited responsiveness, neutrality, administrative efficiency and flexibility, as well as UN's understanding of the realities of Azerbaijan.*

*The donor agencies also expressed high satisfaction with UN. Overall, UNDAF is **perceived** very positively.*

- *Regarding the fulfillment of the objectives, it appears that almost all UN agencies will succeed in reaching the expected results, thereby making UNDAF a successful document.*
- *Different UN agencies have different interlocutors within the government. This practice is less than desirable. Undoubtedly, different ministries will continue to be the interlocutor of the pertinent agencies for operational purposes. However, in order to maintain consistency and unified coordination, it is advisable that one single government entity should undertake coordination function of UNDAF and an active/efficient coordinating body should be established within the government.*
- *An important issue which is worth questioning is whether the programmes/projects of various agencies would have achieved the results they have achieved, had there been no UNDAF, and whether UNDAF is a fifth wheel or, in fact, has some added value. The answer to the questions is that UNDAF is seen as an indicative document for inter-agency cooperation and the articulation of the national priorities within the overall policy formulation of the UN family.*
- *The design was correct and appropriate and relevant to the realities of Azerbaijan. Given the particular conditions of the Country, it is reasonably efficient.*
- *It is **recommended** that the next UNDAF should be a road map towards sustainable human development, rather than a process document.*
- *The next UNDAF will start in 2011 and end in 2015. This timeframe coincides with the expected realization of the objectives enshrined in the State Programme of Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development (2008-2015) (SPPRS) which is aligned with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Hence, the majority of the programmes and projects must be directed to the realization of these objectives.*
- *The projects contained capacity building components, some implicitly, few others explicitly, yet the indicators to verify the results of capacity building per se are lacking. The end results of these capacity building efforts, in more cases than not, remain either unknown or, at best, are simply assumed and certainly difficult to assess. The report strongly urges that, whenever appropriate, capacity-building components of projects/programmes be very clearly spelt out and worked into UNDAF. The results related to capacity building should be verified vis-à-vis the efforts and achievements attained in improved infrastructural and institutionalizing dimensions. Appropriate and measurable indicators must also be spelt out.*
- *UNDAF should contain a systemic approach to capacity building/training, using proper Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) tools to track the respective progress related indicators.*

- *Too many indicators, both for impact and outcome assessments, will very likely end up yielding conflicting results. A few, but measurable indicators, should be selected with the assurance that they will be readily available and timely. In that vein, it is recommended that UNDP Human Development Report be considered as a major source for setting up indicators coupled with annual state statistics.*
- *Internal M&E process of UNDAF has been neglected until recently. It is strongly recommended that UNDAF M&E Group should be constituted, technically strengthened, and given due consideration for its mandate, which should be clearly spelled out.*
- *UNDAF should be viewed as a flexible instrument taking into consideration the particular mandate of different agencies. Long and detailed outcomes tend to put different agencies in a position that they first design projects and then seek the appropriate outcome category in the UNDAF document for a particular project. This goes exactly against the raison d'être of UNDAF. Such practices should be avoided at all cost.*
- *The aspiration of Azerbaijan to become an NCC, certainly, will make all projects/programmes demand-driven. In essence, this is a welcome transformation, but the implications on UNDAF are likely to be different. The next UNDAF should reflect the new realities.*

1. Introduction

1.1 Setting

Located in southwestern Caucasus and bordering the Caspian Sea, Iran, Georgia, Russia, Armenia and Turkey, Azerbaijan became an independent republic after the dissolution of USSR in 1991. It has an area of 86,600 sq. km.¹ and a population of 8.629 million (according to the State Statistics Committee, 2008) that enjoys a reasonably high standard of living with a per capita income of \$6,172 (ppp).² Compared to many developing countries its income distribution is less skewed (Gini coefficient= 36.5). It is a middle-income country; nonetheless, 13.2 % of the population lives below the poverty line.³

Azerbaijan is a country rich in mineral resources, such as petroleum, natural gas, ferrous and non-ferrous metals. Its economic structure is heavily tilted towards industry. While in 2008 the share of agriculture in GDP was 6% and that of services 31.4%, industry's share was 62.6%. Within the industrial sector petroleum and petroleum products have a preponderant role whose exports are significant in generating a positive trade balance.⁴ The high growth rate the country's economy experienced during the last several years is essentially attributable to the large and growing oil exports. The non-energy sector too has shown a double-digit growth. The future welfare of the country will be tied to oil exports, not excluding the diversification of non-energy sectors that will need foreign investment. Barring substantial decline in oil prices, Azerbaijan will have to manage its energy wealth successfully, in order to promote sustainable growth, spur employment and abate poverty.⁵

The medium-term outlook for Azerbaijan looks reasonably bright. But, during the transition process from October 18, 1991, until the very early years of the twenty first century, it faced political, institutional, economic and social challenges. The armed conflict with neighboring Armenia in and around Nagorno-Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan brought additional problems: not only did the conflict lead to the occupation of 20% of the country's most fertile land, it also resulted in the emanating influx of refugees and internal displacement of population.

The United Nations, through Common Country Assessment (CCA), extended assistance to Azerbaijan in 1997. The first UNDAF guidelines were issued in 2002 and subsequently amended in 2003. Several UN agencies, among them UNDP and UNICEF, in cooperation with the Government, developed the poverty reduction strategy paper [State Programme of Poverty Reduction and Economic Development (2003-2005) (SPPRED)] in 2002. Designed in 2004 for a five-year

¹ About 20% is under occupation as a result of the armed conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

² ppp = purchasing power parity.

³ In 2005, 29.3% of population lived below the poverty line; in 2007, this percentage was nearly halved. See; *State Programme of Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development (2008-2015)* approved by the Government of Azerbaijan.

⁴ In 2008 exports amounted to \$ 38.3 billion whereas imports were \$ 7.5 billion.

⁵ It is interesting to note that non-oil sector has been expanding fast. The growth rate in 2008 was 15.7% as opposed to 3.8% in 2002. See Annex 5.

period, the UNDAF was extended until 2010. The present evaluation is directed to assess the outcomes of the current UNDAF (2005-2010).

1.2 Methodology

The methodology used in this assignment is essentially the one developed and used by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and, to a certain extent, by UNDP.⁶ In essence, it consists of simultaneous use of perception, validation and documentation in order to assess why and how the outcomes have been achieved or are likely to be achieved at the end of the cycle. The concrete steps include:

- Review of all written documentation. These documents include, but are not limited to, CCA, SPPRED, SPPRS, 2005 National MDG Report, UNDAF Annual Review Reports for 2007 and 2008, Annual Resident Coordinator's Reports, specific project documents and their progress reports, etc.
- Briefing and interviews with United Nations Country Team (UNCT), representatives of cooperating assistance agencies, corresponding government entities, Civil Society Organizations (CSO), and beneficiaries. These interviews were essentially of open-ended nature.
- Visits to selected project sites for direct observation and also interviews with project personnel and, as much as possible, with the end users.
- Preparation of the draft report with special emphasis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, degree of change, and sustainability. Sustainability was scrutinized especially to assess whether perceived positive changes/outcomes in the development situation will be of enduring nature.
- Presentation/debriefing of major findings and conclusions with RC and the staff of UNCT and other concerned entities and key stakeholders.
- Finalization of the draft report based upon feedback received during the debriefing session with UNCT personnel and government representatives.

Two points must be elucidated, be it briefly, within the conceptual frame of reference. For the purpose of this report **outcomes** are the actual or intended changes in development conditions that the Framework is seeking to support, whereas **impacts** are those of long-term effects of programmes/interventions.⁷ While outcomes are usually observable at the end of the interventions, impacts are very much of a long-term proposition.⁸ The Terms of Reference of this evaluation requires the assessment of impacts, to the extent possible. The report hesitates to comply with this requirement. The report will clearly substantiate the outcomes, whereas, since not enough time has elapsed from the onset of the interventions, the assessment of the impacts will be fraught with the danger of being somewhat

⁶ This report follows, first and foremost, the methodology developed by UNEG. See: *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*. 2004; UN, UNDAF, *Evaluation Guidelines*. July 2005; UNEG, *Study of the Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework*. 2006 and also UNEG, *Evaluation in the UN System*. April 2007. As a supplementary source it also makes use of the following publications: UNDP/EO, *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*. New York, 2003, and *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. New York 2006.

⁷ "It is highly unlikely that any evaluation would be able to identify a contribution, linking UNDAF to the national goal level indicators." See: UNEG, *Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework*. p.20.

⁸ See: UNDP, *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating Results*, p. 101 and p. 103.

conjectural. Hence it will not be attempted. The focus of attention will be strictly limited to the outcomes.

1.3 Main Objectives of the Report and its Organization

The main objective of this report⁹ is to review the progress made in attaining the outcomes as stipulated in the UNDAF document and assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the programme elucidated in the document has moved towards achieving its outcomes and impacts. It is expected that the Report will identify the strengths and weaknesses in the programme design and implementation, the sustainability of the results achieved, and provide recommendations on sustaining the implementation of the activities initiated within the components for the next programming cycle. For this purpose the report focuses on the following specific issues:

- The level of progress made towards achieving the outcomes and impacts, including contributing factors and impediments.
- The extent of UNDAF's contribution to the achievement of the outcomes through related indicators.
- The viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcomes.
- Identification and assessment of lessons learnt and best practices in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve the related outcomes.
- Identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses and areas for the improvement of the Country Office programme strategy to reduce poverty through sustainable initiatives and more equitable economic growth.

These issues are elucidated in Sections 2 and 3. The main thrust of these sections is to assess the achievements. The report also pays special attention to the issue of sustainability, for it is of utmost importance to assess the sustainability of outputs and outcomes, if the recommendations made are to be realistic and implementable. The last Section presents the conclusions reached, makes recommendations on the implementation of remaining activities with respect to the next programming cycle.

2. Outcomes

2.1 Objectives

2.1.1 Objectives of UNDAF

UNDAF is woven around four expected outcomes (or objectives) and one cross-cutting objective for the realization of which a series of projects have been designed and implemented or are being implemented. These projects, in fact, constitute clusters to achieve five interrelated outcomes. These are:

- The effective and transparent management of oil resources to increase decent employment in the non-oil sectors (black gold is converted into human gold).

⁹ The Terms of Reference are given in Annex 1.

- The improvement of the state's delivery of services and its protection of rights, together with the involvement of civil society and in compliance with its international commitments.
- The improvement of health, food security and nutrition improve, particularly among women, children, and vulnerable groups.
- The improvement of the access and quality of education.
- The enhancement of gender equality and empowerment of women, civil society development and respect for human rights (cross-cutting).

It is of utmost importance to establish the concordance between the UNDAF objectives and the objectives of the Government of Azerbaijan. This is the first step in the examination of the relevance of UNDAF.

2.1.2 Objectives of the Government

It should be pointed out at the outset that the objectives of UNDAF, as indicated above, are not haphazard; they correspond in their totality to the objectives of the Government which are articulated in several policy documents. A brief review of these objectives is called for here.

The SPPRED document states six objectives:¹⁰

- Enabling environment for growth of income
- Macroeconomic stability
- Improvement in the quality, equity and access to basic health and educational services
- Improvement of infrastructure
- Reform of the existing system of social protection
- Improvement of the living conditions and opportunities of refugees and IDP

Hence, the concordance between the objectives of the Government and UNDAF interventions spelt out in the document become self-evident¹¹.

2.2 Findings

In what follows the report will analyze and make comments on outcomes. These comments constitute the totality of the findings that are based on the stated indicators and their verification, triangulated with the analysis of documentation and perceptions.¹²

¹⁰ See: The Republic of Azerbaijan, *State Programme on Poverty Reduction and Economic Development (SPPRED) 2003-2005 and Progress Report*, Baku 2005. In 2008 the Government issued a document entitled *State Program on Poverty and Sustainable development 2008-20015*. It is the second SPPRED. This document reiterates the six objectives of the previous SPPRED, emphasizes good **governance** and **sustainable environmental management**.

¹¹ Infrastructure of course remains outside the UN purview

¹² The format followed is identical to the monitoring tables given in the annex of the UNDAF document.

The findings are based on the information provided to the consultant by the agencies, on information obtained from interviews with government agencies and stake holders, internally conducted UNDAF reviews, as well as from the analysis of indicators listed in the UNDAF document. In other words, the analysis triangulated all the information available, perceptions and observations. Many of the quantitative indicators listed in the UNDAF document appear to have been prepared according to the SMART (Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Realistic; Timely) rule and are readily available.¹³ The report will return to this point and will make realistic and operational recommendations in its last Section.

The first column of the following matrix summarizes the expected outcomes and outputs, which are articulated in the UNDAF document. Before analyzing them, it should be noted that:

- All UN agencies have been involved in the implementation of UNDAF, according to their mandate and comparative advantages.
- All interventions relate to:
 - (i) Advocacy of policy advice and policy planning
 - (ii) Institution building and institutional capacity strengthening
 - (iii) Capacity building and training
- Since UNDAF is extended for one year beyond 2009, a categorical statement cannot be made whether the project clusters will yield the expected outcomes.

The second column of the matrix summarizes the major findings.

Results Matrix
United Nations Development Assistance Framework
Azerbaijan: 2005-2010

CROSS-CUTTING OBJECTIVES: Gender equality and the empowerment of women, civil society development, and respect for human rights	
1. The Effective and Transparent Management of Oil Resources; employment in Non-oil Sectors. Country Programme Outcomes	Findings
1.1 Effective and transparent management of state oil and pipeline revenues contribute to development of the non-oil sectors (UNDP) 1.2 Decent employment increases in the non-oil sectors, particularly for refugees/IDPs and other vulnerable people (ILO, UNDP, UNHCR) 1.3 Private investment in the non-oil sectors increases (UNDP)	1.1 Nature of intervention: (1), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government policies and follow ups. 1.2 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government follow ups. 1.3 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government follow ups.
2. State Improves Delivery of Services and its Protection of Rights Country Programme Outcomes	Findings

¹³ A questionnaire was designed and distributed to all Agencies requesting pertinent information about the projects in implementation. The Consultant gratefully acknowledges their full cooperation. For the internal evaluation see: *UNDAF Annual Review Report 2008*. Final Draft. Baku, 20 January 2009. For the indicators see Annex 3.

<p>2.1 Social protection and pension systems reformed (UNDP, ILO, UNICEF) 2.2 Addressed social assistance mechanism to the poor and vulnerable population according to the utility sector reforms is developed (UNDP) 2.3 ICT/MIS enhance efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the public sector (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA) 2.4 National and sectoral policies that mainstream population and gender concerns are effectively implemented (UNFPA) 2.5 Respect for reproductive rights of women, men, and youth expands within the socio-cultural and policy environment (UNFPA) 2.6 Migration management and protection of refugees, IDPs, migrants, and asylum seekers complies with national and international laws/standards (UNHCR) 2.7 Harmonized MDG, SPPRED, and poverty/vulnerability monitoring systems are established and operational in compliance with international standards (all UN agencies present in Azerbaijan) 2.8 The general public and stakeholders are widely aware of MDG/SPPRED progress and importance (UNDP) 2.9 National environmental protection and natural resource management improve (UNDP) 2.10 The Government effectively combats drug trafficking and consumption (UNDP) 2.11 Policy, planning and management decisions in areas of health, education and child protection are informed by disaggregated data and are in accordance with international standards (UNICEF) 2.12 Capacities of civil society organizations and media to promote and monitor CRC compliance strengthened (UNICEF) 2.13 Legislative, policy and implementation framework for facilitating and protecting child and women rights, improves (UNICEF) 2.14 Mechanisms are in place to enable children and young people to participate in decision affecting their lives (UNICEF) 2.15 The Government implements effective mine action (UNDP) 2.16 Ombudsman's Office effectively promotes rule of law and human rights (UNDP) 2.17 Capacity of juvenile justice system to deliver basic guarantees (UNICEF)</p>	<p>2.1 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government follow ups. 2.2 This outcome was not pursued 2.3 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government follow ups. 2.4 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: Depends on government follow ups. 2.5 Nature of intervention: (1), Outcomes: cannot be determined; Sustainability: not sustainable due to limited gov't capacity. 2.6 Nature of intervention: (1),(2); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: depends on further action of government 2.7 Nature of intervention: (1),(2), (3); Outcomes: +; Sustainability: depends on further action of government 2.8 Nature of intervention: (1); Outcomes: cannot be determined-; Sustainability: cannot be judged 2.9 Nature of intervention: (2); Outcomes: cannot be determined; Sustainability: cannot be determined (intervention is too new) 2.10 Nature of intervention: (3); Outcomes: cannot be determined; Sustainability: cannot be 2.11 Nature of intervention: (1), (2), (3); Outcomes: very likely; Sustainability: likely 2.12 Nature of intervention: (3); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: likely 2.13 Nature of intervention: (1), (2); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: likely 2.14 Nature of intervention: (1), (3); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: possible 2.15 Nature of intervention: (1),(2), (3); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: possible 2.16 Nature of intervention: (1); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: possible, depends on availability of funds 2.17 Not yet completed</p>
--	--

<p>3: Health, food security and nutrition improve, particularly among women, children, and vulnerables, disable groups</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Findings</p>
<p>3.1 State institutions build capacity for delivery of health-care services meeting the needs of women, men, adolescents, and children, including needs for reproductive health care and knowledge (UNICEF, UNHCR and UNFPA) 3.2 Children and women living in 8 focus districts benefit from and participate in improved, client-friendly preventative and curative maternal and child health services (UNICEF) 3.3 Policies, institutional capacity, and awareness re: HIV/AIDS and STI prevention are strengthened (UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, WHO) 3.4 Appropriate health, nutrition and child rearing</p>	<p>3.1 Nature of intervention: (1), (2); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: depends on government action 3.2 Nature of intervention: (1), (3); Outcomes: at least partially; Sustainability: cannot be determined 3.3 Nature of intervention: (1),(2),(3); Outcomes: very likely; Sustainability: very possible 3.4 Nature of intervention: (1), (3); Outcomes:</p>

practices for the pre-natal period through 8 years of age are adopted (UNICEF, WFP) 3.5 Malaria control is achieved (WHO) 3.6 National capacities for prevention, treatment and outbreak management of avian influenza strengthened	likely; Sustainability: very possible 3.5 Nature of intervention: (3); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: very likely 3.6 Nature of intervention: (1), (3); Outcomes: very likely; Sustainability: very likely
4: The access and quality of education is improved	Findings
4.1 Child-centered active learning methods are practiced countrywide (UNICEF) 4.2 Children age 0-6 benefit from community-based childhood education in 8 focus districts (UNICEF)	4.1 Nature of intervention: (1); Outcomes: likely; Sustainability: possible 4.2 Nature of intervention: (1) (3); Outcomes: possible; Sustainability: possible

Notes:

- a) (1) Refers to advocacy; (2) refers to institutional strengthening; (3) refers to capacity building.
- b) Sustainability is defined as: "Durability of positive programme or project results after the termination of the technical cooperation" See: UNDP, Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation, New York 1997. p. 26.

The matrix indicates that the four outcomes stated in UNDAF reflect very clearly two of the national priorities. The UNDAF outcomes (1) and (2), which are effective and transparent management of oil resources leading to increased employment in the non-oil sector, and improvement of delivery of services and delivery of rights support the national priority of good governance for ensuring poverty reduction. The UNDAF outcomes (3) and (4), which are improvements in health, food security, education with particular emphasis on women children, vulnerable groups, and improved quality education respectively, support the national priority of basic health and education for all people. Moreover, outputs are designed in such a way that, prima facie, they are conducive to the achievement of the expected outcomes; the division of labor among the agencies reflects their comparative advantage; and gender equality and empowerment of women, which is a cross-cutting objective, are woven into the expected outputs.

A close look into the projects is warranted here¹⁴. The report does not pretend to present a detailed account but highlight major project clusters in accordance with the tenets of UNDAF.

UNDP had variety of projects most of which were directed to policy advice, advocacy and capacity-building. Improving efficiency in oil revenue distribution, employment policies, regional development, and environment were distributed to several projects. UNDP's major advocacy product of the present UNDAF cycle was the 2007 National Human Development Report on gender attitudes which outlined a roadmap for achieving greater gender equality in the country. In collaboration and cooperation with other agencies and generally in parallel form, the projects were directed to pension reform (ILO and UNICEF), e-governance (UNICEF and UNFPA), and HIV/AIDS (UNICEF, UNFPA, and WHO). UNDP always played an active role in all human rights components including gender equality. One of UNDP's major contributions was carrying out, as the principal agency, a sex-disaggregated Labor Force Survey, with the involvement of ILO.

¹⁴ His section is based, in addition to UNDAF document itself, on UNDF Review Reports of, 2007 and 2008.,

UNICEF, as its mandate dictates, has carried out and is in the process of carrying out the projects directed to policy advice and technical assistance to the areas of social protection, improving of database with the emphasis on children's health and education and gender and assisting the government in legislative reform on above issues as well as capacity building of CSOs, who are active in assisting welfare of children and women and their rights. UNICEF has had projects related to capacity building on health care in parallel with UNHCR and UNFPA and completing WFP nutritional surveillance system, again in a parallel mode.

UNHCR, as its mandate dictates, have initiated and is carrying out projects related to protection of and assistance to refugees, asylum seekers, IDPs and others of concern to the organization. Until 2000, UNHCR was mainly involved in providing material assistance for the IDPs, however, with other actors increasingly involved in the post-emergency transition from relief to development activities, UNHCR has scaled down its work with IDPs and increasingly concentrated on its core mandate for asylum seekers and refugees. UNHCR advocates and assists the government in the establishment of rules and regulations about refugees, asylum seekers, IDPs, and others of concern in compliance with the international human rights standards. UNHCR has been involved in projects related to employment and health-care issues, with the special focus on persons of concern, in parallel with UNICEF and UNFPA.

Capacity building, as a priority dimension in UNFPA programming cycle, presents common technologies and methodologies for institutional, managerial and technical result-oriented activities. In addition, the project clusters mentioned above have mainly directed its efforts to advocacy and capacity building. With respect to capacity building, database about the population development and environmental concerns, from the gender perspective, must be mentioned. Also, intensive efforts of building capacity of NGOs and CSOs related to health legislation as well as required advocacy were provided.

WHO's *modus operandi* is on an biannual basis. However, the activities, in essence, conform to UNDAF outcome priorities which can be summarized as assisting the government in health reform and capacity building in the Ministry of Health and elimination of communicative diseases, such as TB, malaria as well as non-communicative ones, such as mental and environmental health problems. Another major important contribution of WHO has been to bring the current legislation and management to international standards, especially, but not exclusively, toward reforming the Ministry of Health.

WFP's project clusters have already been mentioned in conjunction with activities of other UN agencies. Therefore, it will not be repeated here. The above is by no means an exhaustive list. However, it strives to assert that the majority, if not all, of projects are in tandem with the tenets of UNDAF.

ILO, collaborating with UNDP and UNICEF, mainly focuses on youth employment issues, particularly on training needs.

OHCHR was established in 2005 and its counterpart is the Ministry of Justice. The main activities are concentrated on advising the Government of Azerbaijan on the

implementation of international human rights standards and protection of human rights in Azerbaijan.

2.3. Partners and Resources of UNDAF

UNDAF is a collaborative endeavour in which practically all UN agencies cooperate not only in programme implementation, but also in sharing the financing responsibilities. At the time when UNDAF was launched financial requirements were not estimated.

Table below indicates agency outlays as well as cost-sharing from the development partners of UN. The list is not exhaustive, but indicative. The intention is not to present full financial picture. That is beyond the TOR of this mission. However it should be emphasized that resource mobilization efforts yielded \$1.32 per \$1 of its own sources.

As can also be surmised from the table below, the implementation of the UNDAF components has been quite successful. No cost estimates were made when UNDAF was prepared. However, including the cost-sharing with the multilateral and bilateral agencies listed above, the realized financial assistance appears to be sufficient to cover the cost of the projects. From the partially available accounting information, two major conclusions can be drawn:

- All UN agencies, in different degrees, have been successful in the mobilization of funds, which clearly indicates the agencies' projects and programmes viewed favorably by multilateral and bilateral donors. More importantly, the Government has been becoming increasingly the major agent of financing the activities of the UN, especially UNDP.
- The Government of Azerbaijan has been becoming increasingly the major agent of financing the activities of the UN (especially UNDP) agencies thereby helping those agencies to fulfill UNDAF commitments.

Agency	Total Budget 2005-2009 (USD)	Agency Funds (USD)	Government Cost-sharing (USD)	Bilateral/ Multilateral Donors (USD)	Comments
UNDP	51,590,000	12,387,000	30,045,000	9,158,000	Major donors include Norway and EU as well as substantial contribution from the government
UNHCR	12,062,046	12,062,046	NA	N/A	Major donors include EC (ECHO, MIGR, TACIS) , US (BPRM), Statoil-Hydro, Liechtenstein Medicor Foundation
UNICEF	9,615,350	6,406,970	406,714	2,791,666	Major bi-laterals include US, UK, EU, and Japan.
WFP				2,700,000	Major donors include Russia, Japan, and Netherlands
UNFPA	5,756,912	5,099,114	0	2,795,000	Major donors include Norway, Italy, EU, The Heydar Aliyev Foundation
WHO	2,370,000	640,000	NA	1,270,000	Major donors include USAID, GF, GAVI, etc.
ILO					ILO budget is determined by the regional office.
IOM	832,978	549,283	In-kind		Major donors include EC, SDC, USA, and WFP
OHCHR	465,410				

3. Assessment of UNDAF

As has been stated in Section 2.1.1, the overall expected outcomes of UNDAF can be summarized as:

- The effective and transparent management of oil resources to increase decent employment in the non-oil sectors (black gold is converted into human gold).
- The improvement of the state's delivery of services and its protection of rights, together with the involvement of civil society and in compliance with its international commitments.
- The improvement of health, food security and nutrition improve, particularly among women, children, and vulnerable groups.
- The improvement of the access and quality of education.
- The enhancement of gender equality and empowerment of women, civil society development and respect for human rights, a cross-cutting issue that is woven throughout the interventions.

The findings elucidated in the previous chapter lead this evaluation to conclude that if not all, but certainly the great majority of outputs and outcomes will be realized.

However, before pursuing a detailed analysis several conceptual issues need to be pointed out. First and foremost, UNDAF, being a **holistic** document, is a general guideline that must be evaluated from the standpoint of its intent. Its success cannot be evaluated unless the outcomes of its component projects are assessed. Secondly, it is important to note whether UNDAF contains sufficient measurable indicators that are conducive to evaluation.¹⁵ In general terms this report finds that the UNDAF document has complied with these two conditions.

The report looks at UNDAF from a macro point of view and strives to assess its achievements under four sub-headings.

3.1 The Design and Use of UNDAF

UNDAF appears to have been prepared thoroughly and with great detail. It also appears that all requisite documents have been reviewed before its design. In other words, in preparing the document UNDAF has followed the logical steps of convening a prioritization workshop and liaised with the Government in order to assure concordance with PRSP and MDG strategies. The UNDAF that emerged identified the issues to be tackled and the correct outputs and outcomes, clearly delineated the baselines and expressed the outcome indicators in mostly quantitative terms. These appear to facilitate the assessment in the first instance. UNDAF lists close to 80 indicators many of which, are all quantitative and easily accessible. The remaining ones are either not available or were supposed to be determined later.

¹⁵ See: UNEG, *Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework*. 2006. p. 18

There is sufficient information in the currently available evaluation literature to pinpoint some common defects from which many UNDAF documents suffer.¹⁶ The two most important are: the UNDAF results are not yet SMART¹⁷ enough, and the other is that the information on the results is not generated and used effectively by UNCT to manage the achievements of the UNDAF outcomes and internal monitoring and evaluation is lacking. To some extent UNDAF of Azerbaijan suffers from the first defect, namely, indicators that are not available are no indicators at all, and to determine indicators at a later stage is not a good practice. On the other hand, the practice of reviewing the UNDAF results annually by UNCT/Azerbaijan is indeed laudable so long as such reviews lead to revisions and corrective measures, which seems to be the case.¹⁸ Nevertheless internal M&E has been lacking until recently. Apart from the annual UNDAF reviews (2005, 2007 and 2008), there was no an in-house M&E mechanism established.

3.2 Relevance

Two basic concepts are the guiding pillars in deciding the relevance of UNDAF in question: namely, a) the strategic positioning and focus of UN on key outcomes and impacts; and b) the outcomes and impacts relevant to national priorities, as well as consistent with the with the government policies and objectives which are well articulated. Each and every one of these objectives and the policy measures to achieve them are articulated in the document. Concomitantly the strengthening of the capacity of key institutions is a recurrent theme in the document, although there is not a single stand-alone capacity project. Hence, the Report expresses the opinion that the expected outcomes certainly reflect the priorities of the Government and the overall mandate of UNDAF. All Programmes under review in this Report are relevant and pertinent to the expected outcomes in the realm of enhanced capacity of designated institutions as well as contributors to the Millennium Development Goals. The relevance of the strategic positioning of UN is attested by the support it received from the donor community. The report finds that the interventions were timely and relevant and consistent with UN strategic goals and the goals of the Government.

3.3 Efficiency and Effectiveness

Efficiency can be measured in a variety of ways. One method would be to estimate the proportion of the resources that UN allots to a set of outcomes to their administrative costs. For the purposes of this report, efficiency was measured as the proportion of the resources that UN as opposed to resources mobilized

Overall administration cost varied during the years between 2005 and 2008. Information provided by a number of agencies lead this evaluation to conclude that administrative costs vary from agency to agency. However, under no circumstances do they exceed 15% and in some cases, it is below this percentage. There is no hard and fast rule as to what the administrative cost should be with

¹⁶ See: *Results Based Management at Country Level: Systemic Issues that Prevent good UNDAF Results*. Report prepared for UNEG (Alexander MacKenzie, Consultant) March, 2008.

¹⁷ For SMART indicators see: UNDP/EO, *Manual for Monitoring and Evaluation*, New York 1995, and 2009 CCA/UNDAF Guidelines.

¹⁸ See: UNCT Azerbaijan, *UNDAF Annual Review Report 2008*. It should be noted that the said review contributed greatly to the comprehensiveness of this report.

respect to total outlays. Administrative costs vary with prices and salary levels in a country. However, the report wishes to point out that certainly the administrative cost is very much at an acceptable level, which is a proxy as an efficiency indicator.

As it was pointed above, third-party contributions from the development partners of UN and especially from the government of Azerbaijan have been considerable. Therefore, one can surmise that comparatively administrative costs of UN must have played an important role in resource mobilization¹⁹.

Effectiveness poses the question whether, given the budget, the specified output could have been achieved at a lower cost. The consultant does not have any comparative data to make a fair judgment. Nor does UN's accounting system allow such a comparison. However, given the outputs and their qualities and the reasonably modest sums allocated to them, one cannot but help tend to think that, by and large, the UN Country Office was effective.

It is important in this context to mention at least some multilateral and bilateral partners of the UN agencies among which EU is the most important multilateral donor. Norway, Italy and USAID are among the top ones. In addition the Government and the private sector have also contributed.

3.4 Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the durability of positive results after the termination of the technical cooperation. It is important to assess that the programme/project results are institutionalized and internalized. With respect to outcomes and impacts, sustainability refers to whether the positive change in the situation will endure and lead to other projects/programmes pursued by the Government. This report adheres to the view that it would be rather presumptuous to discuss the sustainability of UNDAF, since in the final analysis its sustainability will depend upon the sustainability of the programmes/projects that have been completed at the end of the period and upon their success/failures to yield outcomes that are or are not sustainable. In very general terms, however, many of the outcomes, as delineated in the UNDAF document, are likely to be sustainable, provided that UNDAF is linked to national priorities.

It must also be noted that in many cases sustainability of outcomes is conditioned to further government policies and actions. One would assume that since all interventions adhere to the priorities of the Government, the Government will also take measures to make the outcomes sustainable. In that sense, it is safe to say conjecturally that sustainability is highly likely since, as argued above, there certainly is a close link between national priorities and expected UNDAF outcomes.

However, the final verdict will have to wait until the programmes/projects of each agency are subjected to an in-depth final evaluation. If and when such evaluations are conducted, three elements will come into play, namely, (i) the degree of

¹⁹ The efficiency of UN, certainly, is not the only reason. Its neutrality, transparency and its access to best technical advice from various sources must also be kept in mind.

transfer of technology, (iii) the intensity and internalization of training, and (iii) political will. Of these the political will is the most important determining factor for sustainability. Should subsequent evaluations find these three conditions in place, it is only then that one can unequivocally state that outcomes specified in UNDAF will be sustainable.

3.5 Perceptions

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

The implementing partners appear to have a high regard for UN agencies. They frequently cited responsiveness, neutrality, administrative efficiency and flexibility, as well as UN's understanding of the realities of Azerbaijan. They appeared to be impressed by the thoroughness of the UNDAF document, which helps them to understand better the issues surrounding the country. One agency in fact expressed its willingness to cooperate with UN when second UNDAF is in place.²⁰

Given the scope of work and time constraints, it was physically impossible to have a large sample to assess the perceptions of various entities of government organizations, donors and the wide variety of beneficiaries. However, those who were interviewed²¹ expressed satisfaction with the UN agencies with which they cooperate or collaborate or are beneficiaries of the interventions. They all expect that during the preparation of the next UNDAF the same collaboration, understanding and flexibility will prevail.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

In most general terms, UNDAF is a well-prepared document, but it is not totally free of certain shortcomings, which are not grievous. They need to be stated here, for they will have bearings on the next UNDAF:

- In some cases, which are very few, outcomes and outputs are not clearly defined.²² Some indicators are listed as "to be determined." That is not

²⁰ Admittedly, due to time constraints, the partners of UN are limited to the government of Norway, Social Protection Fund, and World Bank. In addition, however, extensive discussions were held with a number of government agencies. (see Annex 2). It is regrettable to note that no meeting could be held with the Ministry of Economic Development, the interlocutor of UN, hence the above judgment is somewhat conjectural.

²¹ See Annex 2.

²² See for example outcome 2.1, 2.8, and 3.3.

an acceptable practice. The document is not excessively but sufficiently detailed; hence it has flexibility to adjust the projects according to the changing conditions and priorities of the country. For adjusting projects to changing conditions, proper evidence-based assessment and monitoring should be carried out on an annual basis. This should be upheld for such rapidly changing country as Azerbaijan. Thus, proper means of verifications of the indicators should be put in place. It is noted, however, that some alterations to outputs have been made by UNDP.

- While many projects of the various agencies include it as a component, only very few projects specifically aim at capacity building. In fact, only 7% of the expected outcomes can be directly related to capacity building. Yet, in a country like Azerbaijan, capacity building should be a major concern. The need for capacity building differs among countries;²³ hence its enhancement should be an endeavor that must be tailored to the needs of a particular country. Azerbaijan moved from command to market economy only 18 years ago. Hence, capacity building acquires an entirely different dimension and it is imperative that the next UNDAF take into consideration this particular dimension.
- Internal monitoring and evaluation mechanism had been absent. UNDAF M&E Group should be constituted to carry out this function. However, the Group should have an in-depth knowledge and technical expertise on the matter.²⁴

Regarding the fulfillment of the objectives, it appears that almost all UN agencies will succeed in reaching the expected results, thereby making UNDAF a successful document. But, as mentioned earlier, in certain cases neither the outcomes nor the impacts could be ascertained with exactitude.

An important issue worth questioning is whether the programmes/projects of the various agencies would have achieved their results, had there been no UNDAF. The review of the information provided by the agencies leads this consultant to answer this question positively. This answer, however, begs another question, namely whether UNDAF is a fifth wheel or whether in fact it has some added value. The answer to this question too would be an unequivocal yes, provided that UNDAF is seen as an indicative document for inter-agency cooperation and for the articulation of the national priorities within the overall policy formulation of the UN family.

The report also concludes that the design of UNDAF was correct and appropriate and relevant to the realities of Azerbaijan. Given the particular conditions, it is reasonably efficient and effective and the perception it created is very positive.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Next UNDAF: The Precepts

²³ See, Sakiko Fukuda-Paar, Carlos Lopes, Khalid Malik, *Capacity for Development*, UNDP/Eartscan, New York 2002, and Marie Lavigne, *The Economics of Transition*, New York 1995.

²⁴ There is a growing body of literature with respect to the role and procedures of M&E groups which can be found in UNEG documents as well as the documents issued by various agencies.

The UNDAF document is well prepared and reflects fully the priorities of the Government of Azerbaijan. Certain shortcomings like, in some cases, inadequate indicators, which do not allow the appropriate assessment of outcomes and results, do not negate the validity and usefulness of the document, and can be corrected easily in the preparation of the next UNDAF. The economic profile of the country has changed over the past years (such as high per capita income, very favorable balance of trade, etc.); hence, the next UNDAF will have to take these changes into account and will have to differ drastically from the present one. The precepts of the next UNDAF can be described as follows:²⁵

- Economic growth does not have to be at the expense of increasing inequality
- Long-term growth must focus on human development and realization of MDGs
- Advocacy efforts must increase awareness in meeting development goals
- Good governance must be aligned with helping the poor
- Good governance should include necessary and feasible steps for decentralization
- Capacity development must guide the interventions
- Promotion of gender equality is the key-integrating theme of interventions
- The quality and quantity of data base in the country should be enhanced

These precepts should also be assessed within the prevailing worldwide economic crisis, lest it turns to the better. We can now turn to the next UNDAF

4.2.2 Next UNDAF: General Issues

The next UNDAF will start in 2011 and end in 2015. This timeframe coincides with the expected realization of the SPPRS and MDG objectives. Hence, the majority of the programmes and projects must be directed to the realization of these objectives.

- These objectives can be described as follows:
 - Eradication of extreme poverty and hunger
 - Achievement of universal primary education and improvement of overall quality of education
 - Promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women
 - Improvement of maternal and child health
 - Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
 - Ensuring environmental sustainability
 - Developing global partnership including civil society
 - Good governance

²⁵ These are not a haphazard set of norms, but are taken from the new strategic plan of UNDP (Executive Board Decision; October, 2007). It is highly likely that other specialized agencies will follow suit.

- As stated in the UNDAF matrix, the findings related to the sustainability of outcome results depend, in more cases than not, on further government policy actions and decisions. Hence, stock should be taken of the necessary government actions and, accordingly, the next UNDAF should incorporate further appropriate specific interventions.
- It is to be emphasized that elimination of poverty is a primordial objective for the Government. Each UN agency should develop projects specifically aiming at the realization of this objective. These projects should be under an umbrella programme so that synergy can be assured among them.
- The improvement of environment management is another important objective for the Government. UNDAF should contain projects that aim to realize all objectives in this realm.
- Despite its low incidence in the country, HIV/AIDS is another issue to be tackled. Prevention is better than curing. For this purpose, correct government policies should be designed and especially capacity of NGOs dedicated to HIV/AIDS prevention should be strengthened²⁶.
- Internally displaced persons, as a result of the armed conflict with Armenia, have been essentially taken care of by the government. However, issues related to refugees and illegal immigrants are very likely to continue. Also the projects dealing with disadvantaged groups may continue.
- A number of health issues will continue to be the tackled taking into consideration the progress in the national health care system. Elimination of malaria and TB and certain non-communicable diseases are more than likely to be in the forefront.

The report suggests strongly that the next UNDAF should continue to be a flexible road map towards the sustainable human development, rather than a process document or a rigid mandate. It should have sufficient flexibility to lead to closer inter-agency collaboration and cooperation, rather than striving to fill the appropriate boxes with different agencies' specific projects as an afterthought.

4.2.3 The Next UNDAF: Specific Issues

- It is axiomatic that any programme implementation is as good as its monitoring, and monitoring is as good as the indicators.
- The indicators specified in the next UNDAF should correspond totally and absolutely to SMART principles. It is important to keep in mind that the indicators selected should rely on existing operational information or publicly available set of data²⁷. Too many indicators, both for impact and outcome assessments, will very likely end up yielding conflicting results. A few but measurable indicators should be selected with the assurance that they will be readily available and timely. In that vein, it is recommended

²⁶ Several studies related to the effectiveness of various methods of prevention of HIV/AIDS have appeared in the literature lately. Perusal of an excellent study which appeared in the *American Economic Review* may be of some use in designing preventive methods. See: Rebecca L. Thornton, "The Demand for and Impact of Learning HIV Status," *American Economic Review*, 98:5. 2008. pp. 1829 ff.

²⁷ There are wide range of indicators such as quantitative indicators, qualitative indicators, proxy indicators and binary (yes/no) indicators.

that *UNDP Human Development Report (HDR)* be considered as a major source for setting up indicators. HDRs are usually a most comprehensive and reliable source and provide time series. If need be, some additional sources may also be used. A major additional source would be *Azerbaijan Human Development Report*.²⁸ However, care should be taken that collecting and verifying indicators must be especially consistent and cost efficient.²⁹ It would be good to keep in mind the SMART indicators designed by UNDP. In addition to HDR, reporting on MDG is an important source for most of the indicators to refer to because UNDAF priorities are related to the MDGs.

- Indicators should not only state the baseline, but also targets against which performance can be measured. During the collection of the updated data, the major challenge observed is that data are not available for some indicators. That is first and foremost because sources are inconsistent and the comparison of the old and new data show that certain components of indicators (such as ranges in ages) are quite different from each other that causes additional trouble and ultimately incorrect estimations in the data. Although the majority of the definitions for the indicators are clear-cut, there are still a few ones that do not either correspond to the generally used definitions in official sources or lack certain level of clarity. Another important observation is that some indicators are set in a way that they are hardly possible to be measured by certain criteria or they do not catch up with the changes in priorities. Therefore, certain information is missing about the baseline situation as the progress in terms of the updated data can not be measured. One suggestion could be to design indicators in line with the data that can be obtained from a certain set of sources³⁰.
- Since it is very likely that Azerbaijan will opt for NCC status, all projects will likely be financed by the Government of Azerbaijan; hence, it is indispensable that the Government has the required monitoring capabilities. Monitoring by the Government should be in addition to monitoring by the UN agencies. If such capability is lacking, a stand-alone project should be included into UNDAF to enhance the monitoring capabilities of the Government and implemented without delay. If conditions permit, such a project may be added to the present UNDAF with close collaboration among the agencies.
- As much as possible, multiplicity of projects with the same objectives and outcomes should follow the “programme approach” developed by UNDP.³¹
- Many of the projects are nationally executed. This modality undoubtedly nurtures national capacity building.³² The projects contained capacity

²⁸ The latest *Azerbaijan Human Development Report, 2007*, is dedicated exclusively to gender attitudes in Azerbaijan. While it has its own intrinsic value, its use as a source of statistical data is very limited. Subsequent issues may prove to be more useful if they contain statistical information related to socio-economic conditions in the country. .

²⁹ Given the time constraint, the consultant could only verify a few indicators. They are marked with red in their appropriate places.

³⁰ It is strongly suggested that **Annex 4** be reviewed critically and carefully. by the readers of this report.

³¹ There are a number of ways of designing programmes. They can be focused multi-sectoral programmes, umbrella programmes, and programmatic projects. For details see: UNDP, *The Programme Approach*. New York 1998. pp. 13 ff.

building components, some implicitly, few others explicitly, yet the indicators to verify the results of capacity building *per se* are lacking. The end results of these capacity building efforts, in more cases than not, remain either unknown or, at best, are simply assumed and certainly difficult to assess. The report strongly urges that, whenever appropriate, capacity-building components of projects/programmes be very clearly spelt out and worked into UNDAF. The results related to capacity building should be verified vis-à-vis the efforts and achievements attained in improved infrastructural and institutionalizing dimensions. Appropriate and measurable indicators must also be spelt out.

- However, the indicators to verify the results of capacity building *per se* are lacking. The end results of these capacity building efforts, in more cases than not, remain either unknown or, at best, are simply assumed and certainly difficult to assess. The report strongly urges that, whenever appropriate, capacity-building components of projects/programmes be very clearly spelt out and worked into UNDAF. Appropriate and measurable indicators must also be spelt out.
- UNDAF should contain a systemic approach to capacity building/training, assuring the participation of educational institutions in Azerbaijan.³³
- UNDAF should be viewed as a flexible instrument taking into consideration the particular mandate of different agencies, as well as the government priorities and donors' commitments. Long and detailed outcomes tend to put different agencies in a position that they first design projects and then seek the appropriate outcome category in the UNDAF document for a particular project. This of course goes exactly against the *raison d'être* of UNDAF. Such practices should be avoided at all cost.
- It is advisable that UN agencies in Azerbaijan should go through a Monitoring and Evaluation training process by seeking assistance in that matter from one or multiple agencies (such as UNDP Evaluation Office), for an intensive capacity building.
- Different UN agencies have different interlocutors within the government. This practice is less than desirable. Undoubtedly, different ministries will continue to be the interlocutor of the pertinent agencies for operational purposes. However, in order to maintain consistency and unified coordination, it is advisable that one single government entity should undertake coordination function of UNDAF and an active/ efficient coordinating body should be established within the government.
- Finally, since in the final analysis UNDAF is a guideline and a road-map, it is of utmost importance that it should fulfill its objectives as such. A set of questions in order to prepare a good UNDAF is given in Annex 6.³⁴

³² See: UNDP, *National Execution: Promise and Challenges*. New York 1995.

³³ Capacity building, especially in non-oil sector, remains a primordial objective of the Government. See, UNDP, *Converting Black Gold into Human Gold*. Baku 2007.

³⁴ The questionnaire is based on: UNEG, *Study on Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework*. (Paul Belagun, Consultant); December, 2006

5. Lessons learned and a glimpse of the future

5.1 lessons Learned

As it can be discerned from the above discussion, UNDAF in Azerbaijan has been a success. The question is what can be learned from this success both for the formulation of the next UNDAF in Azerbaijan as well as formulating UNDAF documents elsewhere. They can be briefly summarized thus:

- If UNDAF is formulated in a highly participatory and consultative manner, it would serve well its effectiveness to a common plan is enhanced
- MDGs, being a guiding principle for the formulation of UNDAF, can bring together successfully all agencies and the government around common themes
- Success of UNDAF depends on the political, economic and social environment. At the extent that UNCT is flexible and technically competent, UNDAF can be adjusted to dynamics of the development of the country
- UNDAF enhances ownership and coordination
- UNDAF is never a strict document, but rather a tool that helps to establish a common vision, incorporating the vision of the national decision- makers.

5.2 New Equations for the Next UNDAF

It is the understanding of the consultant that the underlying currents hint at Azerbaijan becoming a net contributing country (NCC) and joining the “club” of donor countries.³⁵ At the time of preparing the report, this could not be ascertained for sure. In the eventuality that it should be the case, there would be clear implications for the next UNDAF.

Before the report enters into the implications of the NCC status for Azerbaijan, it is of some importance to compare the overall socio-economic conditions of Azerbaijan with those of other NCC countries (Annex 4):

- All NCC countries fall into the category of high human development. In Azerbaijan, Human Development Index (HDI) stands at 0,758³⁶ (as of 2006).
- Per capita income (purchasing parity power (PPP)) in Azerbaijan is considerably lower than other NCC countries.
- Although some pockets of poverty exist in a few of them, such as Libya and Saudi Arabia, by and large, poverty has been eradicated in most NCCs. Azerbaijan is on the road to eliminate poverty.
- HIV/AIDS is of low prevalence in most NCCs. That also is the case of Azerbaijan.

³⁵ the realization of these currents will depend on the sustainability of the oil wealth streaming into the country. In the short run, the instability in the world markets and a possible decline in the demand for oil may result in the reduction of the inflow of receipts and may cause the positive trade balance to shrink. A drastic decline in the consumption of oil would, however, not be a realistic assumption for the medium term.

³⁶ It should be noted, however, that Azerbaijan’s HDI at the eve of independence (1990) stood at the level of 0.679.

- Ensuring environmental sustainability is still a challenge for NCC countries and it will be for Azerbaijan as well.
- In all NCC countries in the Middle East, economic diversification is an on-going challenge; this challenge will continue to exist in Azerbaijan as well.³⁷

5.3 Implications of the NCC status for the UN

Becoming an NCC country has certain implications both for UN and for Azerbaijan:

- A most important implication is that the NCC status will free the next UNDAF and UN agencies from the task of resource mobilization.
- There will be much less financial insecurity in the design of programmes and projects.
- The NCC status will permit the design of all programmes and projects to be in concordance with government priorities provided, of course, those UN agencies remain bound with their mandate.
- The NCC status can also provide certain advantages to the Government, since UN and its agencies are neutral and have no hidden agenda and, therefore, can offer the best possible advice and assistance.
- A medium term planning may result from the cooperation between UN and the Azerbaijan Government, especially in the areas of economic diversification; employment creation; better governance; gender equality; protecting environment, and providing education and health facilities to all citizens, and human resource development.

5.4 Implications for Azerbaijan

It is legitimate to ask if Azerbaijan will need UN, once it attains NCC status. In other words, is there a value added in the cooperation between UN and the Government of Azerbaijan? The answer cannot be anything else but yes. There are several reasons for this positive answer:

- All projects/programs will be demand driven.
- UN system has a great deal of flexibility as partner of Azerbaijan.
- The feeling of project/programme ownership would be further enhanced.
- The UN system has a wide array of international expertise and response quickly and well to emerging trends.
- The UN system is transparent and impartial and has access to a wide array of international expertise that is also impartial and transparent.
- Better programming, implementation and evaluation can improve efficiency.
- UN system has proven track record with respect to strengthening civil society organizations.

³⁷ For a succinct analysis of NCC countries see: EO/UNDP, *Evaluation of the Role of UNDP in the Net Contributing Countries of the Arab Region*. New York 2007.

- The Government of Azerbaijan will be forced to set-up its own monitoring and evaluation system, thereby enhancing its own capabilities. This will further improve efficiency of programmes/projects that are jointly designed.
- UN system provides technical expertise especially with the support from the specialized agencies.

5.5 Azerbaijan as Donor Country

It is the understanding of this evaluation that there are some serious discussion within the government circles about Azerbaijan's becoming a donor country. This political discussion is translated into decision and action, which is a laudable in itself, may not have direct impact on the next UNDAF. However, if the government seeks particular assistance for the operational aspects of such a decision, UN must include the pertinent activities into its outcome matrix.

6. Recapitulation

The preceding pages of the report have analysed UNDAF according to TOR issued and strived to answer all the questions contained therein. Many answers are explicit, although some may have remained implicit. This short chapter recapitulates the main questions raised and responds to them as concretely as possible in a matrix form. All questions are from TOR under the sub-heading “objectives and scope of work”.

Questions	Answers
Has UNDAF document been used by UN agencies and Government institutions in planning their activities, setting goals, and cooperating? Did existence of UNDAF make a difference compared to the previous period?	Yes it has. It cannot be compared to the previous one since it is the first UNDAF.
Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the CCA? Was the UNDAF results matrix sufficiently flexible and relevant to respond to new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNDAF cycle?	UNDAF addresses key issues; matrix is flexible; a thorough review of UNDAF was held in 2005, 2007, and 2008.
In terms of lessons learned which are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the UNDAF outcomes as reflected in the UNDAF M&E Plan? How were risks and assumptions addressed during the implementation of programmes and projects? To what extent did the UNDAF succeed in strengthening national capacities (including national execution), building partnerships, the realization of human rights and promoting gender equity and equality?	Risk assumptions are clearly and correctly identified. (See: UNDAF document, p.7); most projects are NEX
To what extent is the current UNDAF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework? Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe, resources and the planned Country Programmes, projects and programme strategies? To what extent have risks and assumptions been addressed in UNDAF design?	UNDAF is result oriented; outcomes are realistic; risk assumptions have been addressed
Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined and largely respected in the course of implementation?	Roles and responsibilities are well distributed, following the mandate of each agency
To what extent cross-cutting issues - [1] human rights principles, standards and a HRBA, [2] gender equity and equality including sex-disaggregated data and indicators, and [3] civil society empowerment - were reflected in the UNDAF and, as relevant, in the Country Programmes?	Cross-cutting issues, especially related to gender, have been addressed

Does the UNDAF help achieve the selected priorities in the national development framework?	Selected priorities are in accordance with national priorities; in many cases achievement depends upon government follow up
Does the UNDAF and Country Programmes respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes by the national partners?	Capacity development is addressed but mostly as one component of projects. Promotes ownership due to execution modality (NEX)
To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UN agencies)?	Most projects rely on comparative advantage of UN; further refinement as a result of retreat in Nov. 2008. See: UNDAF Annual Review Report 2008
To what extent and in what ways has UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies? Has the UNDAF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes? Have agency-supported programmes been enhanced as a result of joint programming and have they been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNDAF outcomes?	There are several joint programmes (See RESULT MATRIX).
Did UNDAF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main UNDAF outcome areas (e.g. within Government, with national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?	Yes; there are several joint programmes and co-financing with government and donors
To what extent and in what ways has UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies? Has the UNDAF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes? Have agency-supported programmes been enhanced as a result of joint programming and have they been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNDAF outcomes?	NA
To what extent and in what ways has the UNDAF 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 in the current/next UNDAF cycle? Were results achieved at reasonably low or the lowest possible cost?	It cannot be ascertained
To what extent have the organisations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction cost and to enhance results?	NA

<p>To the extent possible, assess the <i>impact</i> of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in UNDAF indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF, notably in the realization of MDGs, national development goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties:</p>	<p>Given the time frame of UNDAF impact assessment is too early to be carried out. However given the overall success of it positive impacts, barring the unknown, are likely.</p>
<p>To what extent and in what ways have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Have complementarities, collaboration and / or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Country Programmes and projects of individual UN agencies?</p>	<p>NA</p>

Annex 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TOR FOR UNDAF EVALUATION CONSULTANT March-April, 2009

Azerbaijan

Position:	UNDAF Evaluation Consultant
Duty Station:	Baku, Azerbaijan
Duration:	Two months
Starting Date:	March, 2009
Type of Contract:	SSA
Direct UN Contact:	UN Coordination Analyst

1. BACKGROUND

The United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in the Republic of Azerbaijan is comprised of 12 resident agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNHCR, WHO, WFP, UNDPI, ILO, OHCHR, World Bank, IMF, and IOM) and 5 non-resident agencies (UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNODC, FAO, and IFAD).

In 2004, the UNCT and its partners in the Government and civil society prepared the first United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Azerbaijan, covering the period 2005-2009. The UNDAF was based on the Government's State Programme for Poverty Reduction and Economic Development for 2003-2005. The Government and the UN agencies committed to and signed the UNDAF document, thereby enabling the continuation of UN contributions to the Government-led development process. The UNDAF articulates major development challenges and priority areas for UN intervention. Through a collective, coherent, and integrated response to national priorities and needs, the UNDAF has guided UN programming since 2005.

In 2008, the Government of Azerbaijan approved the State Programme for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development (SPPRSD) for 2008-2015. The SPPRSD provides an analysis of the development situation in Azerbaijan, a clear statement of national development goals, and an overarching framework within which the United Nations and other partners can ensure that their programming is consistent with national priorities. Also in 2008, the Government and the UN Country Team agreed to extend the current UNDAF through 2010. This decision harmonizes the next UNDAF, covering 2011-2015, with the SPPRSD and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which are also intended to be fulfilled by 2015. The formulation of the next UNDAF will take place during 2009. The next UNDAF will be anchored on the analysis and priorities articulated in the SPPRSD.

The UNCT is currently in the process of preparing its United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Evaluation for the period 2005-2009 which is mandatory in the penultimate year of the UNDAF cycle and represents a joint UN review conducted with national partners to assess the overall results expected from UN cooperation in Azerbaijan, including outcomes and impact.

The UNDAF Evaluation will use standard OECD/DAC criteria (*relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of results*) and will be guided with due regard to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards, particularly the key issues of *design, focus and comparative advantage* of the UN system, as the basis for its objectives and key questions, in order to ensure the veracity of the evaluation. The Results-Based Management principles will be applied during the UNDAF evaluation process to ensure that outputs, outcomes and impacts in various areas of UN support -- including analytic and normative work, policy advice, service delivery, advocacy, and capacity development -- ensured the UN contribution to the achievement of intended results.

The Declarations of Monterrey 2001, Rome 2002, Marrakech 2003, and Paris 2005, as well as the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR), evidence a growing trend to integrate all external support into the national development processes. Consequently, the UN is increasingly challenged to document its role and contribution within the broader context. The UNDAF Evaluation will explore this issue under the heading of comparative advantage of the UN system in Azerbaijan.

In Azerbaijan, it is proposed to complete the UNDAF Evaluation within two months (20 working days) starting in early March 2009 with the recruitment of an international consultant to undertake the data analysis and report writing as well as a national specialist for M&E data collection required for the evaluation process. The preliminary responsibilities for each of the concerned organisations as well as the whole of UNCT are identified in the Annex II and will be finalised in end-January - early February 2009 within an inception phase of the UNDAF Evaluation process.

The UNDAF Evaluation results will directly feed into the design and preparation of the new UNDAF (2011-2015) in terms of definition of UNDAF outcomes and expected impact, and ultimately of Country Programmes and projects by individual agencies. The main users of the Evaluation will be the UNDAF partners, i.e. the UNCT with the government, donors and civil society supporting the programmes. The use of Evaluation results, including responsibilities for such use, will be discussed at a later stage of the evaluation process.

The evaluation will, to the greatest possible extent, seek to be independent, credible and useful and adhere to the highest possible professional standards in evaluation. It will be responsive to the needs and priorities of the Republic of Azerbaijan and serve as accountability and learning mechanism for the UN system. The evaluation will be consultative and engage the participation of a broad range of stakeholders.

2. PURPOSE:

The UNDAF Evaluation will serve three main purposes:

1. To assess the relevance of the UNDAF outcomes, the effectiveness and efficiency by which UNDAF Outcomes and Country Programme outcomes are being achieved, their sustainability and contribution to national priorities and goals;
2. To determine how the UNDAF helped UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to national development efforts and capacity building;
3. To learn from experiences of the current programming cycle, and identify issues and opportunities emerging from the implementation of the current UNDAF, to inform the design of the next UNDAF and Country Programmes and projects by individual agencies as well as adjust the current programming as relevant.

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF WORK

The consultant will need to consider the following *objectives* in preparing the final report for the UNDAF Evaluation 2009 in Azerbaijan:

- a) Assess the *role*, *relevance* and *effectiveness* of the UNDAF: (i) in relation to the issues and their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the CCA undertaken at the beginning of the current programme cycle and in the context of national policies and strategies; (ii) as a reflection of the internationally agreed goals, particularly those in the Millennium Declaration, and international norms and standards guiding the work of agencies of the UN system and adopted by UN member states; and (iii) in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes:
 - Has UNDAF document been used by UN agencies and Government institutions in planning their activities, setting goals, and cooperating? Did existence of UNDAF make a difference compared to the previous period?
 - Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the CCA? Was the UNDAF results matrix sufficiently flexible and relevant to respond to new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNDAF cycle?
 - In terms of lessons learned, which are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the UNDAF outcomes as reflected in the UNDAF M&E Plan? How were risks and assumptions addressed during the implementation of programmes and projects? To what extent did the UNDAF succeed in strengthening national capacities

(including national execution), building partnerships, the realization of human rights and promoting gender equity and equality?

- b) Assess the *design* and *focus* of the UNDAF i.e. the quality of the formulation of results at different levels i.e. the results chain:
- To what extent is the current UNDAF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework? Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe, resources and the planned Country Programmes, projects and programme strategies? To what extent have risks and assumptions been addressed in UNDAF design?
 - Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined and largely respected in the course of implementation?
 - To what extent cross-cutting issues - [1] human rights principles, standards and a HRBA, [2] gender equity and equality including sex-disaggregated data and indicators, and [3] civil society empowerment - were reflected in the UNDAF and, as relevant, in the Country Programmes?
 - Does the UNDAF help achieve the selected priorities in the national development framework?
 - Does the UNDAF and Country Programmes respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes by the national partners?
- c) Assess the validity of the stated collective *comparative advantage* of the UN System in Azerbaijan:
- To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UN agencies)?
- d) Assess the *effectiveness* of the UNDAF, as a coordination and partnership framework, and the *efficiency* of the UNDAF as a mechanism to minimize transaction costs of UN support for the government and for the UN agencies:
- To what extent and in what ways has UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies? Has the UNDAF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes? Have agency supported programmes been enhanced as a result of joint programming and have they been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNDAF outcomes?
 - Did UNDAF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main UNDAF outcome areas (e.g. within Government, with national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?
 - To what extent and in what ways has the UNDAF 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 in the current/next UNDAF cycle? Were results achieved at reasonably low or the lowest possible cost?
 - To what extent have the organisations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction cost and to enhance results?
- e) To the extent possible, assess the *impact* of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in UNDAF indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF, notably in the realization of MDGs, national development goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties:
- f) Analyse to what extent results achieved and strategies used by the supported Country Programmes and projects are *sustainable*: i) as a contribution to national development, and (ii) in terms of the added value of UNDAF for cooperation among individual UN agencies:
- To what extent and in what ways have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs?
 - Have complementarities, collaboration and / or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Country Programmes and projects of individual UN agencies?

4. DURATION OF CONSULTANCY

The short-term consultancy (SSA contract) is expected to take 4-calendar weeks (20 working days). The consultancy will start in early March 2009 and must be completed by end- April 2009 with submitting a final report.

5. MANAGEMENT AND PROCESS

The Consultant will be expected to work independently on the evaluation although organisational support will be available from the Office of the Resident Coordinator and the UNDAF Evaluation Team (UET) which will be specifically created for this purpose and whose members will be nominated by Heads of Agencies and relevant government departments.

The UET's main tasks will be to guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and report stages (including the holding of an initial evaluation planning meeting and a data analysis meeting with the consultant) and regularly report back to the UNCT on progress.

Note on the UET:

- The UET will prepare, as far as possible, all necessary documentation for the consultant to complete the desk review in advance of the start of the consultancy.
- The UET will provide support to the national consultant in obtaining documents and organising interviews throughout the period of the evaluation to enable his/her effective and timely analysis of the data/information gathered, and to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the evaluation.
- The UET will also, during the course of the consultancy, endeavour to obtain any additional information needed, as well as provide any other relevant inputs (on behalf of their agency/government sector/ministry) as required.

The UNDAF Evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the UNCT and the government. Day-to-day evaluation management will be ensured through the RC Office in support of the UET.

The UNDAF Evaluation will be conducted by one external national consultant, selected by mutual agreement between the UNCT and the government through a transparent but rapid selection process. The Consultant will be entrusted with the evaluation based on the information and documents gathered, working with the UET and the RC Office to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the final UNDAF Evaluation report.

Budget

All costs directly related to the conduct of the evaluation will be covered through the RC Fund, based on the agreement reached within the UNCT.

6. METHODOLOGY

The Consultant will use the following methodology to evaluate the UNDAF 2005-2009 in Azerbaijan, bearing in mind the scope of the UNDAF Evaluation outlined in Section 3 above:

1. Undertake a comprehensive desk review (synthesis and data analysis) of existing studies, surveys and evaluations conducted by UN agencies and their partners during the current UNDAF cycle as well as documents from the government on national policies and strategies;
 2. Conduct interviews with Heads of UN Agencies, selected UN senior programme staff, and selected senior Government officials; and
 3. Prepare a report including identified constrains, lessons and challenges in relations to the priority interventions as well as specific recommendations made both to the UNCT and to individual agencies.
- The consultant will participate in an initial briefing meeting with the RC, UNCT and UET.
 - In the middle of the consultancy period, the consultant will debrief the RC, UNCT and UET on the progress of his/her work during a 'data analysis meeting' to facilitate the consultant's preparation of the first draft UNDAF Evaluation Report.
 - At least one week prior to the end of the consultancy, the consultant will submit the first draft report to the UET for circulation to the UNCT and Government of Azerbaijan, for comments and feedback (which will be channelled and communicated to the consultant through the RC Office and UET).

- The consultant will then participate in a debriefing session with the RC, UNCT and UET to validate the consultancy results and receive any final comments/recommendations on the report.
- After the UNCT debriefing meeting, the consultant will prepare a final revision of the UNDAF Evaluation report including an elaboration of the comments/recommendations previously received.

The UNDAF evaluation process will involve key stakeholders (e.g. UN staff, their counterparts in the government, NGOs, international actors, bilateral donors) and provide an opportunity to contribute to the capacity-building in evaluation of national partners.

The analysis should include appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of different stakeholders to results, thereby displaying a sense of proportionality between the relative contributions of each partner, and the results observed.

The analysis should provide evaluable illustrative examples (i.e. programmes, projects, and enabling activities) of the partnerships between UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies and the respective Government ministries and/or departments as well as other governmental entities, noting that programmes and projects are evaluable when they embody a set of activities that pursue specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) objectives with clear indicators that allow assessing at a later stage whether the objectives and corresponding results have been achieved and whether these are relevant and sustainable.

7. DELIVERABLES

The key deliverable will be a brief UNDAF Evaluation report (max 15 pages) for dissemination to the UNCT and Government which considers its *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact* and *sustainability of results*, as well as the key issues of *design, focus* and *comparative advantage*.

Content and format of the report should comply with the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards, and the UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards.

Analysis should include appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results.

The report should include:

- An Executive Summary;
- An Introduction;
- A Reflection on the main findings which considers: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with Heads of UN Agencies, selected senior programme staff, and selected senior Government officials;
- A Conclusion; and
- Recommendations: identifying issues and opportunities to consider in preparing for the next UNDAF cycle (2011-2015).

8. QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE

Experience and skills required:

- Advanced university degree (Masters and equivalent) in development studies, economics, international relations, or related field
- 8-10 years of relevant professional experience is highly desirable, including previous substantive involvement in evaluations and/or reviews
- 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; Results Based Management (RBM) principles; logic modelling/logical framework analysis; quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches
- Knowledge of development challenges in the CIS region including the South Caucasus

- Excellent written and spoken English. Knowledge of Turkish and/or Russian is an asset
- Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills
- An understanding and ability to abide by the values of the United Nations
- Awareness and sensitivity to enable working with people of various cultural backgrounds

TOR (cont'd)
ANNEX I
Proposed UNDAF Evaluation Timeline

By March 2009	9-20 March	23 March – 3 April	6-27 April	By end-May 2009
<p><u>UNCT Meeting in January 2009:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and agree on formation of specific UNDAF Evaluation Team (UET) to manage the Evaluation process. • Review the applications and short-list qualified candidates. • UN Heads of Agencies & key Govt counterparts to appoint staff to the UET • The UET meeting to review a ‘desk review documents list’, and ‘consultants list’. 	<p><u>Consultant:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hired Consultant for desk review, interviews and report writing. <p><u>Desk Review:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant to start desk review process • UET to regularly communicate and convene as appropriate with Consultant <p><u>Initial Briefing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant/UET discuss pre-collected documents for desk review (from both UN & Govt); • Distribute tasks & responsibilities for UET 	<p><u>Data Analysis:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant/UET/ UNCT to formally convene to analyse initial review of all collected data & documents by the consultant. • Consultant/UET/ UNCT to agree on final timeframe for inputs for preparing first draft of report. 	<p><u>Report Preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant to conduct semi-structured interviews with Heads of Agencies and selected Govt officials • Consultant prepares first draft report. <p>UET to provide inputs (on behalf of the UNCT) for the first draft UNDAF Evaluation Report.</p> <p><u>Draft Report Finalization:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial RC/Consultant Meeting. • Consultant completes interviews and consolidates inputs in second draft report to be circulated to [a] the UNCT, and [b] the Govt. • Second draft report discussed with the UET/ UNCT. • Final comments received on draft report from the UNCT & Govt. 	<p><u>Final Report Preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final UNDAF Annual Evaluation Report prepared and circulated to the UNCT & Govt. <p><u>Disseminate Final Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disseminate the evaluation findings & recommendations to stakeholders.

TOR (cont'd)

ANNEX II

UN Institutional Arrangements for UNDAF Evaluation***The UN Resident Coordinator and the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) will:***

- lead the UNDAF Evaluation process to ensure that a coordinated approach is applied;
- take specific policy decisions related to the planning and implementation of the Evaluation;
- appoint members of the UNDAF Evaluation Team (UET), and oversee and evaluate its activities;
- provide timely feedback and comments on the draft UNDAF Evaluation report; and
- implement the follow-up plan i.e. dissemination of findings.

The UNDAF Evaluation Team will:

- support the recruited international and national consultant as required;
- gather relevant data including compiling previous Agency specific reviews and evaluations, conduct field visits and interviews if necessary;
- analyze all the relevant data collected (during the data analysis workshop);
- meet regularly as required in a professional manner (preparing agendas and minutes);
- respond to any queries from the government or UNCT for information on the process;
- prepare inputs for the UNDAF Evaluation Report [with RC Office Support] on behalf of their agency and give these to the respective consultants;
- facilitate the provision of inputs from their respective government counterparts; and
- provide timely feedback on the draft UNDAF Evaluation Report to the RC Office.

Individual Heads of UN Agencies will:

- be responsible for nominating staff to participate in the UET and ensure their effective participation;
- provide staff and resources, in partnership with relevant national counterparts, to be fully responsible for providing timely reviews, analysis and data provision (as inputs for the report);
- provide timely inputs, comments and recommendations on the draft Evaluation Report from their agency;
- ensure that their nominated UET member(s) facilitate the provision of inputs from their government counterparts;
- be responsible for adhering to deadlines in submitting their finalized agency comments on the draft report, in order for the national consultant to finalize the report on schedule; and
- provide timely feedback on the finalized draft UNDAF Evaluation Report to the RC Office.

The UN RC Office will:

- prepare UNDAF Evaluation documentation as required (including TOR);
- support/facilitate the organisation of the UNCT's UNDAF Evaluation preparatory meeting; and support/participate in the regular meetings of the UET;
- ensure that the consultant receives inputs, comments and recommendations on the draft UNDAF Evaluation Report from the UNCT and Government;
- support the international and national consultants in the preparation of the draft and final UNDAF Evaluation Report [with Evaluation Team Support]; and
- submit the final UNDAF Evaluation Report to the UNCT, Government, Peer Support Group, Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO), and Non-resident Agencies.

Additional support is available from:

- UN agency M&E Officers; UNDG Coordination Practice Area; DOCO geographic/regional focal points.

Annex 2

2008 UNDAF Annual Review

UNDAF M&E Framework

UNDAF Outcome 1:

**“The effective and transparent management of oil resources leads to increased decent employment in the non-oil sectors
(black gold is converted into human gold)”**

CP Outcome	Indicator	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
1.1 Effective and transparent management of state oil and pipeline revenue contributes to development of the non-oil sectors	Non-oil sector growth rate (%)	3.8 (2002)	12				MF/MED (UNDP)
	Real non-oil GDP growth rate <u>including</u> oil & gas transportation (%)	13.8 (2004)	8.4	11.9	11.5 (preliminary)		IMF
	Real non-oil GDP growth rate <u>excluding</u> oil & gas transportation (%)	13.3 (2004)	7.9	8.2	7.0 (projected)		IMF
	Poverty rate (%): Total	46.7 (2002)	29	20			SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004 (UNDP)
	Poverty rate (%): Total	28.5 (2004)	24.0	20.8	16.0		IMF, WB (2006-07 attributed to SSC)
	Poverty rate (%): Female	47.1 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Poverty rate (%): Male	46.3 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Poverty rate (%): Age 0-15	52.8 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Poverty rate (%): Age 15-29	44.9 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Poverty rate (%): Urban	47.8 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Poverty rate (%): Rural	45.4 (2002)					SSC, SPPRED Progress Report 2004
	Inflation – end of period	10.4 (2004)	5.5	11.4	19.5 (preliminary)		IMF
	Inflation – end of period	10.4 (2004)	5.4	11.4			SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Inflation – period average	6.7 (2004)	9.7	8.4	16.6 (preliminary)		IMF
Inflation – period average	6.7 (2004)	9.6	8.3	16.7		SSC (www.azstat.org)	
1.2 Decent employment	Unemployment rate (%): Total	10.7 (2003)					SSC, Labor Force

increases in the non-oil sectors, particularly for vulnerable people						Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Female	12.2 (2003)		6.5		SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Male	9.6 (2003)		7.1		SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 15-19	10.1 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 20-24	30.8 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 25-29	17.7 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 30-34	10.4 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 35-39	8.7 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 40-44	8.1 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 45-49	6.7 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 50-54	5.4 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 55-59	1.5 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 60-64	0.5 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Age 65 and up	0.1 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
	Unemployment rate (%): Urban	14.3 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey
Unemployment rate (%): Rural	7.1 (2003)				SSC, Labor Force Survey	
1.3 Private investment in the non-oil sectors increases	Non-oil FDI (billion US\$)	2.2 (2002)	2.25	0.63		MED, AIPAF (UNDP)
	Non-oil domestic investment (billion US\$)	0.52 (2002)	1.07	2.62		MED, AIPAF (UNDP)
	Private (domestic) investment in non-oil sector (% of GDP)	15.6	19.8	13.4	6.5 (preliminary)	IMF

UNDAF Outcome 2:

**“The state improves the delivery of services and its protection of rights
—with the involvement of civil society and in compliance with its international commitments”**

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
2.1 Social protection and pension systems reformed	# of social security contributors with personal accounts: Total	Zero (2004)	Zero	1,027,600	1,277,689	1,476,921	State Social Protection Fund
	# of social security contributors with personal accounts: Female	Zero (2004)	Zero	469,613	614,441	674,924	State Social Protection Fund
	# of social security contributors with personal accounts: Male	Zero (2004)	Zero	557,987	663,248	801,997	State Social Protection Fund
	% of social security contributors with personal accounts: Total	Zero (2004)	Zero		85	83	State Social Protection Fund
	% of social security contributors with personal accounts: Female	Zero (2004)	Zero				State Social Protection Fund
	% of social security contributors with personal accounts: Male	Zero (2004)	Zero				State Social Protection Fund
	# of social workers	0	0	0	0	0	
	Existence of a state programme on de-institutionalization	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	# of child care institutions transformed into modern alternative form of care	0	0	0	0	0	Master Plan on Transformation of Child Care institutions
	Existence of a model for local level child protection mechanism	No	No	No	No	Partially	
2.2 Social assistance programme for poor and vulnerable people affected by utility reforms developed							WB, MED
2.3 ICT/MIS enhance efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the public sector	# of government entities computerized	8 (2003)	757	982	1202		NICTS
	% of government entities computerized		13.5	16.5	20.7		NICTS
	# of government entities interconnected				n.a.		
	# of government e-services provided to public				1	3	State Students Admission Commission, Ministry of Taxes, TQMK
	Internet users per 100 population	3.69 (2002)	8	10	11		ITU, PMU, MCIT
	ITU digital access index, scale 0 to 1 where 1 is the highest access	0.24 (2002)					ICT Digital Access Index, ITU
2.4 National and sectoral policies that mainstream	Maternal mortality (official)	25.8 (2004)	28.9	34.2	35.5		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Maternal mortality (survey)	79 (1988)					PMU, UNICEF

UNCT in Azerbaijan

UNDAF Evaluation

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification	
population and gender concerns are effectively implemented	estimate)							
	Life expectancy: Total	72.4 (2004)	72.4	72.4	72.4		SSC (www.azstat.org)	
	Life expectancy: Female	75.2 (2003)	75.2	75.2	75.1		SSC (www.azstat.org)	
	Life expectancy: Male	69.6 (2002)	69.6	69.6	69.7		SSC (www.azstat.org)	
	# of abortions	16,912 (2003)	19,586	20,867	22,325		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)	
	# of abortions per 1,000 women of ages 15-49	6.9 (2003)	7.8	8.1	8.6		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)	
	Abortion rate (per woman)				2.3		DHS	
	Total fertility rate (per woman) (SSC)	2.1 (2004)	2.3	2.3	2.3		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)	
	Total fertility rate (per woman) (DHS)			2.0			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 15-19			33			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 20-24			170			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 25-29			113			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 30-34			60			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 35-39			25			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 40-44			4			DHS	
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 45-49			0			DHS	
	# of data collection operations, specialized surveys (census, DHS, migration, etc.) and research completed according to international standards	First population and housing census 1999; first Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2000; first Reproductive Health Survey 2001; no DHS						SSC, MLSPP, UNFPA, UNICEF
	User-friendly national population and development databank functioning	Zero (2003)						SSC, MLSPP, UNFPA

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
	# of users of the national databank (by type of institutions) increased by set % point(s)	Zero (2003)					SSC, MLSPP, UNFPA
2.5 Respect for reproductive rights of women, men, and youth expands within the socio-cultural and policy environment	# of abortions	16,912 (2003)	19,586	20,867	22,325		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)
	# of abortions per 1,000 women of ages 15-49	6.9 (2003)	7.8	8.1	8.6		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)
	Abortion rate (per woman)				2.3		DHS
	Total fertility rate (per woman) (SSC)	2.1 (2004)	2.3	2.3	2.3		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)
	Total fertility rate (per woman) (DHS)			2.0			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 15-19			33			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 20-24			170			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 25-29			113			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 30-34			60			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 35-39			25			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 40-44			4			DHS
	Age-specific fertility rate (per 1,000 women): Ages 45-49			0			DHS

2.6 Migration management and protection of refugees, IDPs, migrants, and asylum seekers complies with national and international laws/standards	# of changes in migration-related legislation that are consistent with international standards			State Migration Programme approved	State Migration Services est'd		
	# of national border guards trained and using improved knowledge and skills in their post-training work assignments			237 border guards, 37 customs officers trained (2006-2008)			IOM
	# of national migration managers			70 trained (2006-2008)			IOM

	trained and using improved knowledge and skills in their post-training work assignments						
	# of actors from civil society participating in migration dialogue	35 NGOs are members of Forum of NGOs on Migration (FANGOM) (2003)					FANGOM
	Fair and efficient Refugee Status Determination (RSD) procedures and National Asylum System operational	Governmental RSD Unit partly operational (2004)			RSD Department fully operational and integrated into civil service		SCR (RSD), UNHCR, SBG, MIA, MJ, COE
	Reduction of statelessness [to be omitted – reliable/precise data are not available]						
2.7	Harmonized MDG, SPPRED, and poverty/vulnerability monitoring systems are established and operational in compliance with international standards	Issuance of integrated MDG-national development strategy report	One (2003)				2.7.1 SPPRED Annual Progress Report – 2003 (2004)
2.8	The general public and stakeholders are widely aware of MDG/SPPRED progress and importance	# of town hall meetings held		6	3		MED
		# of people who attended town hall meetings					MED
2.9	National environmental protection and natural resource management improve	Protected areas (ha.)	571,281 (2004)	583,434	699,329	700,000	MENR
		Protected areas (%)	6.6 (2004)	6.7	8.1	8.1	
		Land affected by erosion (ha.)	3.7 million (2004)	3.7 million	3.7 million	3.7 million	MENR
		% of land subject to erosion	43.3 (2004)	43.3	43.3	43.3	MENR
		Land affected by salinization (ha.)	1.2 million (2004)	1.2 million	1.2 million	1.2 million	MENR
		% of land subject to salinization	13.9 (2004)	13.9	13.9	13.9	MENR
	State-owned mechanism in place (Conference of Parties of the	no	no	yes	yes		

	Caspian Convention provides joint management of the Caspian environment)						
	CO ₂ emissions per capita (tons)	4.21	4.46	4.74	4.9		MENR
2.10 The Government effectively combats drug trafficking and consumption	# of cases of drug trafficking prosecutions	2,114 (2004)	2,229	2,067	2,670		Ministry of Internal Affairs, SCAD project
	# of drug addicts: Total (<i>gender disaggregated data not available</i>)	18,000 (2004)	18,118	19,200	21,199		MoH
	Annual change in # of drug addicts (%)	5%	<1%	6%	10%		MoH
2.11 Policy, planning and management decisions in areas of health, education and child protection are informed by disaggregated data and re in accordance with international standards	# of administrative units implementing International Classification of Diseases-10						2.11.1 MoH
	Percentage of children having immunization cards	Zero					MoH
	Availability of data on children in need of special protection (working/street children, children with disabilities, institutionalized children, abused children, trafficked children, adopted children)	No					MYST, ME, MoH
	Availability of data on children in need of special protection disaggregated by gender	No					
	Availability of an initial web-based version of the national database	No	No	No	No	Yes	UNICEF
	# of key users who know how to use DevInfo	n/a	n/a	2	4	5	MOH, SSC, MED, UNICEF
	Results of DHS are disseminated to respective parties and public (Y/N)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	UNICEF
	# of completed research and # of policymakers reached with results and findings research on child issues annually						UNICEF
	Updated child-related statistical data on the situation of children in Azerbaijan is available every year within the framework of MONEE project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	UNICEF
	Availability of an overview of public allocations for children	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
# of completed studies on resources for children	0	0	0	1	2		

	Disaggregated data on education is available at the State Statistics Committee	No						SSC, ME
	National Concept Paper on Health Reform adopted by mid-2008							
	Health Financing Strategy adopted by mid-2008							
	# of structural changes in MoH system in compliance with international best practices							
2.12 Capacities of civil society organizations and media to promote and monitor CRC compliance strengthened	Awareness of members of NGO Alliance for Child Rights as well as CSOs in 8 focus districts of CRC and human rights based approach to programming [revise]							UNICEF
	Inclusion of CRC into secondary school curriculum	No						ME, UNICEF
	Awareness among journalists of CRC and child-friendly reporting	No						UNICEF
	% Young people participating in Youth forums No of UNICEF assisted projects involving YP participation at planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages.	No	No	2	3	5		UNICEF, Ministry of Youth and Sport
2.13 Legislative, policy and implementation framework for facilitating and protecting child and women rights improves	# of court decisions referring to international instruments on the rights of women and children	No						
	% of recommendations from international treaty bodies on the rights of women and children implemented							
	Existence of a unit in Council of Ministers to coordinate CRC reporting established and operational							
2.15 The Government implements effective mine action	Square meters cleared	7,163,592 (2004)	7,156,396	20,063,714		16,260,435		ANAMA
	Cost per square meter cleared	1.44 (2004)	1.19	0.99		1.01		ANAMA
	# of schools in mine-affected areas providing mine awareness information	0 (224)	665	665	665	790		ANAMA, UNICEF
2.16 Ombudsman's Office effectively promotes rule of	# of complaints - total received			14,536				Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints investigated			6,580				Ombudsman's Office

law and human rights	# of complaints refused during investigation			432			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints refused			7,956			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints satisfied			1316			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints partially satisfied			1,024			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints not satisfied			233			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - female			5216			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - refugees			55			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - IDPs			430			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - military			349			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - disabled			846			Ombudsman's Office
	# of complaints - prisoners			569			Ombudsman's Office
Existence of a child rights unit at the Ombudsman Office	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Existence and # of ombudsman child rights focal points at the regional level	No	No	No	No	Yes/5		
2.17 Capacity of juvenile justice system to deliver basic guarantees contained in CRC and UN Minimum Standards is strengthened as part of ongoing justice sector reforms	Existence of a national coordination mechanism on juvenile justice reform	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	# and kind of justice professional attending the regular training on juvenile justice standards						
	Existence of child rights curricula into pre-service training of justice professionals	No	No	No	No	Partially	
	Adoption of law and policies on juvenile justice	No	No	No	No	Partially	
	# of children participating in the models of JJ diversion project	0	0	0	16	130	

UNDAF Outcome 3:

“Health and nutrition improve, particularly among women, children, and vulnerable groups”

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
3.1 State institutions build	% of deliveries attended by	89 (2001)					UNFPA (RHS)

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
capacity for delivery of health-care services meeting the needs of women, men, adolescents, and children, including needs for reproductive health care and knowledge	skilled attendants						
	% of deliveries attended by skilled attendants	87.5 (2000)					UNICEF (MICS)
	% of deliveries attended by a health professional			88.6			DHS
	% of mothers completing pregnancy with delivery in hospital	79 (2001)					SSC, PMU
	% of deliveries in a health facility			77.7			DHS
	Infant mortality (official): Total	14.4 (2004)	12.7	11.9	12.1		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Infant mortality (survey estimate)	85 (1999)					
	Infant mortality (WB)		74				WB (World Development Indicators)
	Infant mortality (official): Female	13.3 (2004)	11.6	11.1	11.4		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Infant mortality (official): Male	15.4 (2004)	13.6	12.6	12.7		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Under-5 mortality (official): Total	24.8 (2001)					MoH, UNICEF, SSC, MJ
	Under-5 mortality (survey estimate): Total	108 (2000)					
	Under-5 mortality: Female						MoH, UNICEF, SSC, MJ
	Under-5 mortality: Male						MoH, UNICEF, SSC, MJ
	Maternal mortality (official)	25.8 (2004)	28.9	34.2	35.5		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Maternal mortality (survey estimate)	79 (1988)					
	% of improper prenatal care	27.8 (2000)					UNICEF (MICS)
	% of improper prenatal care	30.3 (2001)					UNFPA (RHS)
	% of mothers receiving antenatal care from a health professional				76.9		DHS
	Number of trained staff in IMC	120 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF
Immunization coverage: BCG	98.9 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF	
Immunization coverage: HepB1	99.2 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF	
Immunization coverage: DTP1	97.8 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF	
Immunization coverage:	97.4 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF	

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
	DTP3						
	Immunization coverage: Polio3	98.5 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF
	Immunization coverage: MCV1	98 (2003)					MoH, UNICEF
	Immunization coverage: [By age]						MoH, UNICEF
	Immunization coverage: [By district]						MoH, UNICEF
	Immunization coverage: [By population group]						MoH, UNICEF
	% of facilities adequately equipped with cold-chain						MoH, UNICEF
	% of health in GDP	0.8 (2001)					MoH, UNICEF, Parliament
	% of health care in state budget expenditures	4.9 (2004)	5.4	4.3	4.2		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Increase in the proportion of skilled medical personnel who work in primary health care						
	# of health system personnel trained and using improved knowledge and skills in their post-training work assignments						
3.2 National policies and plans for reducing child mortality are developed and modeled	Infant mortality (official): Total	14.4 (2004)	12.7	11.9	12.1		SSC (www.azstat.org)
	Infant mortality (survey estimate)	85 (1999)					
	Infant mortality (official): Female	13.3 (2004)	11.6	11.1	11.4		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)
	Infant mortality (official): Male	15.4 (2004)	13.6	12.6	12.7		SSC (Women & Men in Azerbaijan)
	Under-5 mortality: Total (official)						
	Under-5 mortality: Total (survey estimate)						
	Under-5 mortality: Female						
	Under-5 mortality: Male						
	% of babies exclusively breastfed up to 6 months						UNICEF
	% of exclusive breastfeeding						UNICEF

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
	% of population practicing hygienic behaviors						UNICEF
	% of population with access to safe drinking water						UNICEF
	% of children underweight: Total						UNICEF
	% of children underweight: Female						UNICEF
	% of children underweight: Male						UNICEF
	# of policy documents on perinatal care updated according to international standards	0	0	0	1	1	UNICEF
	# of clinical protocols on perinatal care developed according to international standards	0	0	0	0	25	UNICEF
	National peri-natal concept adopted by the Government	No	No	No	No	No	
3.3 Policies, institutional capacity, and awareness re: HIV/AIDS and STI prevention are strengthened	Prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS (%): Total	<0.1 (2002)					UNAIDS, Epidemiological Fact Sheets
	Prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS: Female						
	Prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS: Male						
	Prevalence of HIV/AIDS among pregnant women						MOH
	% of survey respondents who say HIV can be prevented by using condoms and limiting sexual intercourse to one uninfected partner: Total						DHS
	% of survey respondents who say HIV can be prevented by using condoms and limiting sexual intercourse to one uninfected partner: Youth (ages 15-24)						DHS
	% of survey respondents who say HIV can be prevented by						DHS

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
	using condoms and limiting sexual intercourse to one uninfected partner: Female						
	% of survey respondents who say HIV can be prevented by using condoms and limiting sexual intercourse to one uninfected partner: Male			50.7			DHS
	National Policy on HIV/AIDS is updated and operational	No					Council of Ministers, UNICEF
	Prevalence of HIV/AIDS among intravenous drug users and commercial sex workers						
	Clinical protocols on PMTCT and pediatric care are developed and endorsed (yes/no)	No	No	No	No	No	
	# of schools with life skills based curricula with focus on HIV prevention	No	No	no	128	4,500	
	Availability of updated reliable data on HIV and co-infections among the most-at-risk population groups	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	
3.4 Appropriate health, nutrition and child rearing practices for the pre-natal period through 8 years of age are adopted	IDD monitoring and surveillance system in place and operational	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	MoH, UNICEF
	% of adequately iodized salt consumption at household level			54 (DHS)	65 (bio-monitoring survey)		MoH, UNICEF
	% of children with Vitamin A deficiency						MoH, UNICEF
	% of children age 6-59 months who received Vitamin A supplements during the last 6 months			4.3			DHS
	% of mothers of children aged 3-59 months with iron deficiency anemia	40% (RHS) 30.4/100 (2001) SSC					

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
		& 16.7% (2002)					
	% of children attending pre-school facilities: Total	11.4 (2000)					UNICEF (MICS)
	% of children attending pre-school facilities: Female						
	% of children attending pre-school facilities: Male						
	% of parents aware of child rights						Ombudsman's Office, UNICEF
	National Policy on ECD is in place	No					CMAR, ME, UNICEF
	Prevalence of anemia among children aged 0-14 years (%): Total	0.6 (2002)					SSC, PMU
	Prevalence of anemia among children aged 0-14 years (%): Female						
	Prevalence of anemia among children aged 0-14 years (%): Male						
	Prevalence of helminthes in children in districts with large IDP populations (%)	31 (2005)	31	11	3		WFP
	Availability of baseline assessment for nutrition of mothers and children as well as early childhood development	No	No	No	No	Yes	
3.5 Malaria control is achieved	Number of malaria cases	482 (2003)	242	143	110		SSC, MH, UNICEF, WHO
	Number of active pestholes of malaria	181 (2003)	97	74	70		MoH and RCHE
	Number of districts affected by malaria	47 (2003)	37	36	36		MoH and RCHE
3.6 National capacities for prevention, treatment, and outbreak management of avian	Availability of a national Avian Influenza communication strategy	n/a	n/a	yes, it was prepared in May, 2006	Yes	Yes	UNICEF

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
influenza strengthened	# of districts/community members covered by the campaign	n/a	n/a	4, 419 people in 8 districts	320,000 people in 8 districts	24,000 people in 4 districts	
	Existence of a Task Force on donor and government AI response	n/a	n/a	Yes	Yes	Yes	

**UNDAF Outcome 4:
“Access and quality of education is improved”**

CP Outcome	Indicators	Baseline (with year)	2005	2006	2007	2008	Source of verification
4.1 Child-centered active learning methods are practiced in grades 1 and 2 countrywide	Net primary school enrolment rate: Total	88 (2000)					ME, UNICEF (MICS)
	Net primary school enrolment rate: Female						ME, UNICEF
	Net primary school enrolment rate: Male						ME, UNICEF
	# of boys & girls starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 or higher (survival rate)						UNICEF
	% of boys & girls starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 or higher (survival rate)	99.4 (2000)					UNICEF (MICS)
	Existence of a national policy on active learning methodology	No	NO	No	Yes	Yes	UNICEF
	Adoption of primary school curriculum with integrated AL component	No	No	No	No	Yes	UNICEF
4.2 Policy framework for provision of ECD services and care for young children is adopted	# of children attending pre-school facilities: Total	11.4 (2000)					ME, UNICEF (MICS)
	# of children attending pre-school facilities: Female						
	# of children attending pre-school facilities: Male						
	Development and adoption of early learning development standards	No	No	No	No	Partially	
	Availability of multiple forms of school readiness programmes	No	No	No	No	Partially	

UNCT in Azerbaijan

UNDAF Evaluation

	and parenting education						
	Availability of baseline assessment for early childhood development as well as nutrition of mothers and children	NO	No	No	No	Yes	

Annex 3

Outcome Indicators

Country Program Outcomes and responsible agencies from UN side	Indicators	Baseline	2008
1.1 Effective and transparent management of state oil and pipeline revenues contribute to development of the non-oil sectors. Responsible agency: UNDP	1.1.1 Non-oil sector growth rate 1.1.2 % of population in poverty: total, by gender, age and region.	1.1.1 3.8%, (2002) 1.1.2 Total 46.7% (2002) Female 47.1% (2002), Male 46.3% (2002), 0-15 years old – 52.8%, 16-29 years old – 44.9% (2002), urban – 47.8% (2002), rural 45.4% (2002).	1.1.1 15.7%, (2008) 1.1.2 Total – 15.8% (2007) Not available by gender, age and region
1.2 Decent employment increases in the non-oil sectors, particularly for vulnerable people. Responsible agency: UNDP, ILO	1.2.1 Unemployment rate, total, by gender, age and region.	1.2.1 Unemployment: Total: 10.7%.(2003). By gender (2003): 9.6% for men (2003), 12.2% for women (2003). By age (2003): 15-19 years old: 10.1%, 20-24 years: 30.8%, 25-29 years: 17.7%, 30-34 years: 10.4%, 35-39 years: 8.7%, 40-44 years: 8.1%, 45-49 years: 6.7%, 50-54 years: 5.4%, 55-59 years: 1.5%, 60-64 years: 0.5%, 65 and over years: 0.1%. By region (2003): 14.3% in urban areas, 7.1% for rural areas.	1.2.1 Unemployment: Total: 6.5% (2007). By gender (2007): 7.8% for men (2007), 5.3% for women (2007). By age (2007): 15-19 years old: 7.5%, 20-24 years: 24.9%, 25-29 years: 19.3%, 30-34 years: 12.8%, 35-39 years: 13.05%, 40-44 years: 7.45%, 45-49 years: 6.3%, 50-54 years: 6.1%, 55-59 years: 2.3%, 60-64 years: 0.2%, 65 and over years: 0.1%.
1.3 Private investment in the non-oil sectors increases. Responsible agency: UNDP	1.3.1 Non-oil FDI 1.3.2 Non-oil domestic investment	1.3.1 2,2 billion \$, (2002) 1.3.2 519.8 million \$ (2002)	1.3.1 706.9 million \$, (2007) 1.3.2 915 million \$ (2007)
2.1 Social protection and pension systems reformed. Responsible agency: UNDP	2.1.1 % of pensioners with personal pension accounts	2.1.1 Zero (2003)	2.1.1 Zero (2008)
2.2 Addressed social assistance mechanism to the poor and vulnerable population according to the utility sector reforms is developed Responsible agency: UNDP	TBD	TBD	
2.3 ICT/MIS enhances efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the public sector. Responsible agency: UNDP	2.3.1 Number of Government entities using software systems 2.3.2 Internet users per 100 population 2.3.3 Number of districts implementing ICT4D-10 2.3.4 ITU digital access index, scale 0 to 1 where 1 is the highest access	2.3.1 8 (2003) 2.3.2 3.69 (2002) 2.3.3 TBD 2.3.4 0.24 (2002) (belongs to Low Access Group)	2.3.1 not available yet 2.3.2 11 (2007) 2.3.3 TBD 2.3.4 no updated data available

2.4 National and sectoral policies that mainstream population and gender concerns are effectively implemented	2.4.1 Maternal mortality 2.4.2 Life expectancy, total and by gender	2.4.1 Official data 19.9 (2002), Survey Estimates: 79 (1988) 2.4.2 Total 72.2 (2002), Male 69.4 (2002), Female 75 (2002)	2.4.1 Official data 35.5 (2007), Survey Estimates: 79 (1988) 2.4.2 Total 72.4 (2007), Male 69.7 (2007), Female 75.1 (2007)
Responsible agency: UNFPA	2.4.3 Number of abortions 2.4.4 Number of data collection operations, specialized surveys (census, DHS, migration, etc.) and research completed according to international standards 2.4.5 User-friendly national population and development databank functioning 2.4.6 # of users of the national databank (by type of institutions) increased by set % point(s)	2.4.3 16.6 thsd. (2002) 2.4.4. First population and housing census held in 1999; first Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey held in 2000; first Reproductive Health Survey held in 2001; no DHS held in the Republic of Azerbaijan 2.4.5. Zero (2003) 2.4.6. Zero (2003)	2.4.3 22.3 thsd. (2007) 2.4.4. First population and housing census held in 1999; first Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey held in 2000; first Reproductive Health Survey held in 2001; first DHS held in 2006 2.4.5. Zero (2008) 2.4.6 Zero (2008)
2.5 Respect for reproductive rights of women, men, and youth expands within the socio-cultural and policy environment. Responsible agency: UNFPA	2.5.1. Number of abortions 2.5.2 Fertility: total and by age group	2.5.1 16.6 thsd. (2002) 2.5.2 Total: 1.8. By age group TBD	2.5.1 22.3 thsd. (2007) 2.5.2 Official data: Total: 58.6 (2007). By age group (2007): 15-19 years old: 46, 20-24 years: 180.2, 25-29 years: 137.4, 30-34 years: 64.3, 35-39 years: 25, 40-44 years: 6.3, 45-49 years: 0.8, 2.5.2 DHS Survey Estimates: 66 (2006) By age (2006): 15-19 years old: 33, 20-24 years: 170, 25-29 years: 113, 30-34 years: 60, 35-39 years: 25, 40-44 years: 4, 45-49 years: 0,

<p>2.6 Migration management and protection of refugees, IDPs, migrants, and asylum seekers complies with national and international laws/standards Responsible agency: IOM, UNHCR</p>	<p>2.6.1 Establishing efficient regulation of migration processes: by Developing a National Program and Establishing an information center 2.6.2 Data base/ system on migration flows functioning 2.6.3 National Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Persons operational 2.6.4 Number of actors from civil society participating in migration dialogue 2.6.5 Fair and efficient Refugee Status Determination (RSD) procedures and National Asylum System operational. 2.6.6 Reduction of statelessness</p>	<p>2.6.1 First assessment of situation made by task forces (1999) but Policy Program and information center are not available (2004) 2.6.2 National Automated Passport System is functioning at some border checkpoints (2000) 2.6.3. Zero (2003) 2.6.4 35 NGOs are members of Forum of NGOs on Migration (FANGOM) (2003) 2.6.5 Governmental RSD Unit is partly operational (2004) 2.6.6 Circa 40,000 stateless persons (exact statistics Non-available)</p>	<p>2.6.1 First assessment of situation made by task forces (1999) and State Migration Service established to implement state policy in the sphere of migration, develop management system, regulate and forecast migration processes and coordinate activities of relevant state bodies (2007) 2.6.2 National Automated Passport System is functioning at some border checkpoints (2000), Integrated border management system at the southern border of Azerbaijan to enable a more efficient management of cross-border flows while preventing irregular migration and deterring crime (2007). 2.6.3. Approved by Decree # 208 of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan and operational since 2004. MIA Unit to coordinate the activities under this action plan. MIA cooperation with NGO capacity building on victims of trafficking shelter and hotline management by IOM (2008) 2.6.4 36 NGOs are members of Forum of NGOs on Migration (FANGOM) (2008) 2.6.5 no updated data available 2.6.6 2300 stateless persons only for 2300 (2005 UNHCR Statistical Yearbook – a different source than in the previous evaluation)</p>
<p>2.7 Harmonized MDG, SPPRED, and poverty/vulnerability monitoring systems are established and operational in compliance with international standards. Responsible agency: all</p>	<p>2.7.1 Issuance of integrated MDG SPPRED Progress Report</p>	<p>2.7.1 One (2003)</p>	<p>2.7.1 Two (first in 2003 and second in 2005)</p>
<p>2.8 The general public and stakeholders are widely aware of MDG/SPPRED progress and importance. Responsible agency: UNDP</p>	<p>2.8.1 Survey on awareness of MDGs, SPPRED progress and importance</p>	<p>2.8.1 TBD</p>	
<p>2.9 National environmental protection and natural resource management improve. Responsible agency: UNDP</p>	<p>2.9.1. Ha of protected areas 2.9.2. Area of land affected by erosion/ salinization</p>	<p>2.9.1. 565,000 ha (2002) 2.9.2 3.7 million ha (erosion), 1.2 million ha (salinization)</p>	<p>2.9.1. 699 329 ha (2008) 2.9.2 3.7 million ha (erosion), 1.2 million ha</p>

2.10 The Government effectively combats drug trafficking and consumption Responsible agency: UNDP	2.10.1. Number of cases of drug trafficking prosecutions 2.10.2. Number of drug addicts 2.10.3 Annual change of drug addicts	2.10.1 2049 (2003) 2.10.2 17187 (2003) 2.10.3 Increase by 806 (2003)	2.10.1 2287 (2008) 2.10.2 20374 (2007) 2.10.3 Increase by 1533 in 2007 (as compared to 2006)
2.11 Policy, planning and management decisions in areas of health, education and child protection are informed by disaggregated data and are in accordance with international standards. Responsible agency: UNICEF	2.11.1 No of administrative units implementing International Classification of Diseases-10 2.11.2 Percentage of children having immunization cards 2.11.3 Availability of data on children in need of special protection (working/street children, children with disabilities, institutionalized children, abused children, trafficked children, adopted children) 2.11.4 Number of UN and Government agencies implementing DevInfo 2.11.5 Disaggregated data on education is available at the State Statistics Committee	2.11.1 TBD 2.11.2 Zero 2.11.3 No 2.11.4 Zero 2.11.5 No	2.11.4 Zero (2008)
2.12 Capacities of civil society organizations and media to promote and monitor CRC compliance strengthened. Responsible agency: UNICEF	2.12.1 Awareness of members of NGO alliance for Child Rights as well as CSOs in 8 focus dsistricts of CRC and Human Rights based Approach to Programming 2.12.2 Inclusion of CRC into secondary school curriculum 2.12.3 Awareness among journalists of CRC and child-friendly reporting	2.12.1 TBD 2.12.2 No 2.12.3 No	
2.13 Legislative, policy and implementation framework for facilitating and protecting child and women rights, improves. Responsible agency: UNICEF	2.13.1 Conformity of national legislation with CRC, CEDAW and other international instruments. 2.13.2 Awareness among parliamentarians, government officials at central and district levels, foreign embassies, donors and development agencies, in particular judiciary, police, district education departments and primary school teachers in 8 focus districts on issues affecting child and women rights. 2.13.3 Existence of a unit under the CMAR to coordinate CRC reporting established and operational 2.13.4 Number of emergency plans at community level	2.13.1 TBD 2.13.2 TBD 2.13.3 No 2.13.4 Non-available	2.13.3 No 2.13.4 Non-available
2.14 Mechanisms are in place to enable children and young people to participate in decisions affecting their lives. Responsible agency: UNICEF	2.14.1 # of Youth Resource Centers in the country 2.14.2 # of Youth Media Centers in 8 focus districts 2.14.3 Number of projects where participatory approach in planning, monitoring and evaluation is used	2.14.1 21 2.14.2 Zero 2.14.3 Non-available	
2.15 The Government implements effective mine action. Responsible agency: UNDP and UNICEF	2.15.1 Sq. m. cleared (UNDP) 2.15.2 Casualties per year, total and disaggregated by fatalities and injuries (UNDP) 2.15.3 Mine awareness among population/children (UNICEF)	2.15.1 7,090,000 (2003) 2.15.2 Total 28 (2003): 14 fatalities, 14 injuries. 2.15.3 Non-available	2.15.1 18.669.207 (2008) 2.15.2 Total 11 (2008): 0 fatalities, 11 injuries. 2.15.3 Textbooks published and distributed to pupils in 9 regions under the mine threat.

<p>2.16 Ombudsman's Office effectively promotes rule of law and human rights. Responsible agency: UNDP</p>	<p>2.16.1 Number of complaints accepted to consideration 2.16.2 Number of complaints satisfied completely or in part</p>	<p>2.16.1 TBD 2.16.2 TBD</p>	
<p>3.1 State institutions build capacity for delivery of health-care services meeting the needs of women, men, adolescents, and children, including needs for reproductive health care and knowledge. Responsible agency: UNFPA, UNICEF</p>	<p>3.1.1 Percentage of deliveries attended by skilled attendants 3.1.2 Proportion of mothers completing pregnancy with delivery in hospital 3.1.3 Infant mortality 3.1.4 Under 5 mortality 3.1.5 Maternal Mortality 3.1.6 % of improper prenatal care 3.1.7 Number of trained staff in IMCI 3.1.8 Immunization coverage: Total. By age, districts, population groups TBD 3.1.9 % of facilities adequately equipped with cold-chain 3.1.10 # of certified baby-friendly hospitals 3.1.11 % of health in GDP</p>	<p>3.1.1 89% (RHS, 2001) 87.5 % (MICS 2000) 3.1.2 79% (2001) 3.1.3. Official Data: 12.8 (IMR, 2002). Survey Estimates: 85 (IMR, 1999) 3.1.4 Official Data: 24.8 (2001). Survey estimate 108 (2000) 3.1.5 Official Data: 19.9 (MMR, 2002). Survey Estimates: 79 (MMR, 1988) 3.1.6 27.8% (MICS, 2000) 30.3% (RHS, 2001) 3.1.7 120 (2003) 3.1.8 BCG 98.9 (2003) HepB1 99.2 (2003) D'TP1 97.8 (2003) D'TP3 97.4 (2003) Polio3 98.5 (2003) MCV1 98 (2003) 3.1.9 Non-available 3.1.10 29 (2003) 3.1.11 0.8 (2001)</p>	<p>3.1.1 89% (DHS, 2006) 3.1.3. Official Data: 12.1 (SSC, MoH, 2007). Survey Estimates: 43 (DHS, 2006) 3.1.4 Official Data: 16.1 (2007). Survey estimate 50 (DHS 2006) 3.1.5 Official Data: 35.5 (SSC, 2007). No updated data available from MMR 3.1.11 0.9 (2008)</p>
<p>3.2 Children and women living in 8 focus districts benefit from and participate in improved, client-friendly preventative and curative maternal and child health services. Responsible agency: UNICEF</p>	<p>3.2.1 Implementation of Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses in 8 focus districts 3.2.2 Under-5 mortality 3.2.3 Infant Mortality 3.2.4 % of babies exclusively breastfed up to 6 months 3.2.5 % of extensive breastfeeding 3.2.6 % of population practicing hygienic behaviors</p>	<p>Non-available (Will be made available as soon as 8 focus districts have been identified and baseline data collected)</p>	<p>3.2.2 Survey estimate 50 (DHS 2006) 3.2.3 Survey Estimates: 43 (DHS), 2006) 3.2.4 12% (DHS 2006) 3.2.5 (immeasurable indicator) 3.2.6 no data available</p>

	3.2.7 % of population with access to safe drinking water 3.2.8 Prevalence of underweight children		3.2.7 46,5% (2007) 3.2. 8% (DHS 2006)
3.3 Policies, institutional capacity, and awareness re: HIV/AIDS STI prevention are strengthened. Responsible agency: UNICEF, UNDP	3.3.1 Increase in the number of people who are HIV/AIDS positive 3.3.2 Prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS in general population 3.3.3 Prevalence of HIV/AIDS among pregnant women 3.3.4 Prevalence of HIV/AIDS among young people aged 15-24 3.3.5 % of adolescents citing 3 ways of preventing, 3 HIV transmission modes and 3 misconceptions on HIV/AIDS (UNICEF) 3.3.6 National Policy on HIV/AIDS is updated and operational (UNICEF)	3.3.1 As of 1 April 2004, 28 new cases compared to April 2003. 3.3.2 Less that 0.1% (2002) 3.3.3 TBD 3.3.4 TBD 3.3.5 88% of youth (19-24) have no real information on HIV (2001) 3.3.6 No	3.3.1 41 new cases in 2008 compared to 2007. 3.3.2 Less that 0.2% (2007) 3.3.5 Survey estimates: 44.5% of youth (19-24) have no real information on HIV/AIDS (DHS 2006) 3.3.6 No (2008)

¹ Targets and indicators for HIV/AIDS are particularly problematic, due to the low number of tests currently carried out in the country.

<p>3.4 Appropriate health, nutrition and child rearing practices for the pre-natal period through 8 years of age are adopted. Responsible agency: UNICEF</p>	<p>3.4.1 Nutritional surveillance system in place 3.4.2 % of iodized salt consumption at household level 3.4.3 % of children with Vitamin A deficiency 3.4.4 % of mothers of children aged 3-59 months with iron deficiency anemia 3.4.5. % of children attending pre-school facilities 3.4.6. % of parents aware of child rights 3.4.7 National Policy on ECD is in place 3.4.8 Prevalence of anemia among children aged 0-14 years</p>	<p>3.4.1 No 3.4.2 69% 3.4.3 81% 3.4.4 40% (RHS) 3.4.5 11.4% (MICS 2000) 3.4.6 Non-available 3.4.7 In Progress (not yet implemented) 3.4.8 0.6% (2002)</p>	
<p>3.5 Malaria control is achieved Responsible agency: WHO, UNICEF</p>	<p>3.5.1 Number of malaria cases 3.5.2 Number of active pestholes of malaria 3.5.3 Number of districts affected by malaria</p>	<p>3.5.1 482 (2003) 3.5.2 171 (2003) 3.5.3 47 (2003)</p>	
<p>4.1 Child-centered active learning methods are practiced countrywide. Responsible agency: UNICEF</p>	<p>4.1.1. Net primary school enrolment rate 4.1.2. % of students absent for more than 3 days/month by gender/grade 4.1.3. School drop out rates by sex and age 4.1.4. # and % of boys & girls starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 or higher (survival rate)</p>	<p>4.1.1 88% (MICS 2000) 4.1.2 Non-available 4.1.3 Non-available 4.1.4 99.4 (MICS 2000)</p>	
<p>4.2 Children age 0-6 benefit from community-based early childhood education in 8 focus districts. Responsible agency: UNICEF</p>	<p>4.2.1. # of children attending pre-school facilities 4.2.2. % of parents aware of child rights 4.2.3. % of parents aware of child's age specifics (physical, emotional, intellectual needs for ages)</p>	<p>4.2.1 11.4 (MICS 2000) 4.2.2 Non-available 4.2.3 Non-available</p>	

Annex: 4

Azerbaijan and Other NCC Countries

Country	HDI	Per Capita Income / PPP (USD)
Azerbaijan	0,758	6,172
Bahrain	0,866	21,482
Kuwait	0,773	26,321
Libya	0,840	13,362
Qatar	0,875	27,664
Saudi Arabia	0,812	15,711
UEA	0,868	25,514

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 2008*. New York, 2008

Rules and regulations related to NNC 29 January 1999 Executive Board decision 99/2

The Executive Board,

1. Takes note of the additional information on the review of the successor programming arrangements contained in document DP/1999/CRP.3;
2. Recalls that in its decision 98/19, the Executive Board, inter alia:
 - a. Decided to apply the various financial planning parameters of decision 95/23 for the years 2000-2001, including the provisions of paragraph 25;
 - b. Endorsed the proposed extension of the percentage earmarking for programme resources set out in decision 95/23 with certain modifications from 2001 onwards (as specified in para 4 of decision 98/19); and
 - c. Reaffirmed the basic methodology for the distribution of resources as described in paragraphs 21-26 of decision 95/23 as the basis for calculating target for resource assignments from the core line 1.1.1 (TRAC-1) earmarking for individual countries, as well as for overall TRAC allocations, with certain modifications from the year 2001 (as specified in para 5 of decision 98/19);
3. Reaffirms, as basic principles for the allocation of, programme resources in accordance with paragraphs 21-26 of decision 95/23: the focus on the low-income and least developed countries; progressivity in favour of the low-income countries; and a gradual move to net contributor status and graduation for countries that achieve higher levels of gross national products;
4. Decides to use 1997 or latest available gross national product per capita and population data in the calculation of TRAC-1 earmarking for the years 2001-2003;
5. Decides to adjust the gross national product per capita breakpoint delineating the low- and middle-income countries from \$750 to \$900;
6. Expresses concern that unless there is early attainment of the target of \$1.1 billion, the focus on low-income countries and least developed countries in terms of impact would not be attained and requests the Administrator to propose to the Executive Board ways and means to redress any shortfall in the target;
7. Recognizes the important contribution that DNDP brings to supporting net contributor countries in their pursuit of the objectives of sustainable human development;
8. Decides that UNDP should consider net contributor countries as a separate group of programme countries outside the TRAC distribution model;
9. Endorses the proposal to eliminate the system of reimbursable TRAC earmarking with effect from 2001, subject to the following provisions:
 - a. First-time net contributor countries will continue to receive, for a grace period of three years, a TRAC-1 calculated at 60 per cent of the earmarking of the previous period;
 - b. First-time net contributor countries will continue to benefit from the waiver of Government local office costs during the grace period of three years;
 - c. After the shall be ensured by instruments; grace period, reimbursement of the country office costs the net contributor country through a flexible mix of
 - d. UNDP must consult with Governments on costs associated with the UNDP local office structure;

- e. Whenever there should be a Resident Representative and a Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP should continue to cover the cost;
10. Also endorses the proposed establishment in all interested net contributor countries of a locally reimbursed revolving TRAC (LRRT), providing a flexible and responsive tool for UNDP support as follows:
 - a. The initial outlay to the LRRT in a new net contributor country in the three-year grace period will be funded from its TRAC-1 earmarking. For an existing net contributor country, the initial outlay will be funded by the net contributor country itself. Any outlays under the LRRT will be subsequently reimbursed from government or third-party cost-sharing contributions;
 - b. The LRRT will be used as seed funding for the initiation of UNDP non-core development activities;
 - c. The level and use of the funding will be discussed and agreed to at the country level;
 - d. All UNDP rules, regulations and procedures will continue to apply, including the elaboration of a country cooperation framework for approval by the Executive Board;
 11. Decides to maintain the current gross national product per capita thresholds for net contributor countries at \$4,700;
 12. Requests the Administrator to proceed with the calculation of TRAC-1 earmarking in accordance with the provisions of the present decision and of paragraphs 4 and 5 of decision 98/19, using 1997 or the latest available data, and on this basis to proceed with programme planning and implementation for the period 2001-2003;
 13. Also requests the Administrator to submit to the Executive Board, at its annual session 2002, a report on possible improvements of the present TRAC resource distribution model, including a review of thresholds.

Annex 5

Public spending on health and Education (as % of GDP) in Selected Countries

Country	Health Expenditures	Education Expenditures
Azerbaijan	0.9	2.5
Turkey	5.2	2.4
Georgia	1.5	2.9
Armenia	1.4	3.2
Iran	3.2	4.7
Kuwait	3.2	5.1
Bahrain	2.7	3.9
Saudi Arabia	2.5	6.8
Libya	2.9	2.7
Source: UNDP, <i>Human Development Report 2007/2008</i>		

Annex 6

Key Questions for a Good UNDAF Document³⁸

Does the UNDAF include:

1. A clear explanation of the purpose of the UNDAF?
2. A clear definition of the roles and responsibilities in the planning and implementation of the evaluation?
3. Who the main intended users are likely to be?
4. What the main information needs of the intended users are likely to be?
5. When in the UNDAF programme cycle the evaluation should be carried out?
6. Who the other major stakeholders are for delivery against the UNDAF, their expected roles and level of contribution.
7. What the scope (outlining what is covered and what is not covered by the evaluation) should be?

II. Clarity of intent of the subject to be evaluated (relevance and design of the expected outcome statements and results matrices)

Does the UNDAF include:

8. A clear explanation of how UNDAF Outcomes are derived from the diagnostic work carried out in the CCA and/or other processes?
9. Does the UNDAF narrative or results framework identify what the causes of the problems identified are and the evidence supporting these assumptions?
10. Does the UNDAF narrative or results framework identify why the identified interventions will impact positively upon the causes identified within the life of the UNDAF?
11. Does the UNDAF identify UNDAF outcomes at the appropriate levels? The UNDAF outcome will be formulated as an expected change in institutional capacity for achieving the national priority or goals, or as behavioural change. It may represent a contribution at either the national or sub-national level.
12. Does the UNDAF identify CP outcomes at the appropriate level? CP outcomes describe the intended results to which a specific agency-supported Country Programme contributes.
13. Does the UNDAF identify CP outputs at the appropriate level? These refer to specific products or services resulting from development interventions. They can normally be drafted when elaborating the Country Programme document.
14. Does the Results Framework specify CP outcomes for all of the identified UN agencies, together with the contributions of other partners, which would allow one to examine whether there is a reasonable chance that they will lead to the attainment of the UNDAF outcome.
15. Conclusion: Are the elements present in the results framework which would allow one to assess whether logically and plausibly related.

III. Existence of sufficient measurable indicators and collection of reliable data for analysis

16. Do the results and/or M&E matrices identify quantitative or qualitative measure(s) of the results expected?
17. Are baselines included for relevant indicators?
18. Are these disaggregated by gender and any additional characteristics that may be relevant to disparities between population groups in the country?

³⁸ It is taken and abridged from: UNEG, *Study on Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework*. (Paul Belagun, consultant). Dec. 2006

19. Do the UNDAF Outcome indicators identify the specific results which the United Nations system expects to realize within the time frame of the UNDAF as its contribution towards the achievement of the national development priorities and goals in each area of cooperation.
20. Do the CP Outcome indicators identify the specific results which the identified agency expects to realize within the time frame of the UNDAF as its contribution towards achievement of the UNDAF outcome?
21. Are there indicators included that measure progress towards the identified outcome as well as achievement of the outcome.
22. Are the indicators relevant for assessing performance?
23. Was the guidance followed in this UNDAF?

IV. Quality of joint monitoring systems

24. Does the UNDAF include Programme Cycle Calendar?
25. Does the UNDAF specify what data gathering systems should be in place to generate information on indicators?
26. Identify who will be responsible for collecting the necessary monitoring data?
27. Does the UNDAF state whether the resources needed to ensure that the predefined data will be collected and analyzed in a timely manner are in place.
28. Does the UNDAF specify what provisions will be put in place to help other partners strengthen their data collection and processing mechanisms from the onset of the UNDAF's execution so as to facilitate their own monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF?
29. Identify data requirements that cannot be met through existing monitoring and evaluation systems and responsibility for meeting these needs?
30. Used the Guidelines?

V. External factors (positive or negative) that have influenced the process and the realization of expected outcomes.

31. Identify what the enabling conditions for successful execution of the UNDAF are?
32. Identify specific indicators to track the risks and assumptions?
33. Who will monitor whether these enabling conditions (assumptions and risks) change?

Annex 7

Persons Interviewed

United Nations:

	Title	Agency
Bruno Pouezat	UN Resident Coordinator	
Yashar Hamzayev	National Correspondent	ILO
Vassiliy Yuzhanin	Head of Mission	IOM
Teymur Malik-Aslanov	Programme Analyst	OHCHR
Noura Hamladji	Deputy Resident Representative	UNDP
Jamila Ibrahimova	Assitant Resident Representative	UNDP
Nadir Guluzade	M&E Adviser	UNDP
Farid Babayev	Assistant Representative	UNFPA
Nigina Abaszadeh	Chair, UN Gender Theme Group	UNFPA
Leyla Nugmanova	Officer-in-Charge	UNHCR
Ayaz Khan	Programme Associate	UNHCR
Mohamed Bendriss Alami	Acting Representative	UNICEF
Siraj Mahmudov	Programme and Planning Specialist	UNICEF
Fuad Huseynov	Officer-in-Charge	WFP
Kamran Garakhanov	Head of Office	WHO

Government of Azerbaijan:

Gurban Sadykhov	Head of Department for IDP/refugees, Cabinet of Ministers
Nazim Ismailov	Director, ANAMA
Dadash Ahmedov	Juvenile Diversion Centre and Legal Clinic
Ogtay Ibrahimov	State Social Protection Fund

Multilateral/Bilateral Partners:

Richard Scarbourough	Counselor, Embassy of Norway
Gregory Jedrzejczak	Country Manager, World Bank

Annex 8

Bibliographical Note

The report does not list separately all the publications and reports consulted in its preparation. To do so would have been repetitious since appropriate footnotes in the body of text of the report clearly indicate all proper sources consulted and used.