

**THE 2016-2020 UZBEKISTAN UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK**

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

**Submitted by
Dr. Annette Ittig
and
Ms. Regina Safarova**

December 2019

ACRONYMS

BOS	Business Operations Strategy
CPD	Country Programme Document
CRR	Country Results Report
DaO	Delivering as One
DRM	Domestic Resource Mobilization
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GAVI	Global Alliance
GFATM	Global Fund
GEWE	Gender Equality and Women Empowerment
GoU	Government of Uzbekistan
GTG	Gender Theme Group
HDR	Human Development Report
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
ILO	International Labour Organization
JWP	Joint Work Plan
L2CU	Listening to the Citizens of Uzbekistan
LIC	Low Income Country
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAPS	Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support
MIC	Middle Income Country
MoE	Ministry of Economy
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoIFT	Ministry of Investment and Foreign Trade
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MPHSTF	Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund
NEET	(Young people) Not in Employment, Education or Training
NRA	Non-resident Agency
NHRC	National Human Rights Committee
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OMT	Operations Management Team
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCO	Resident Coordinator Office
RG	Results Group
SC	Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SSC	South-South Cooperation
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNAIDS	United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCG	United Nations Communications Group
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDCO	United Nations Development Coordination Office
UNDESA	United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs

UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	2
Acronyms	3
Executive Summary.....	6
1. Introduction.....	13
1.1 The Uzbekistan Context and National Development Priorities	14
1.2 The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF	16
1.3 The Uzbekistan UNDAF Evaluation	18
2. Major Findings of the Evaluation.....	20
2.1 Relevance of the UNDAF.....	21
2.2 Effectiveness of the UNDAF	25
2.3 Efficiency of the UNDAF.....	44
2.4 Sustainability.....	45
2.5 UN Comparative Advantage	46
2.6 DaO Coherence	47
3. Good Practices and Lessons Learned	50
4. Conclusions.....	50
5. Recommendations	52
Select Bibliography	55
Annexes	59
1. Terms of Reference.....	59
2. Evaluation Fieldtrip Schedule	66
3. List of Respondents	70
4. Primary UNDAF Stakeholders	72
5. Evaluators' Profiles	73

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Uzbekistan Context and National Development Priorities. The Republic of Uzbekistan has experienced a remarkable growth trajectory since its independence in 1991: according to Government statistics, its per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increased by nearly 500 per cent between 2002 and 2016, from \$471.00 to \$2,756.00, primarily due to the rise in prices for its gold and natural gas exports; and the rate of poverty in the country declined from 27.5 percent in 2001 to 11.4% in 2018. Uzbekistan transitioned from a Low-Income Country (LIC) to a Lower Middle-Income Country (LMIC) in 2011; and it intends to become a high middle-income country (HMIC) by 2030.

Uzbekistan has also confirmed its commitment to the achievement of the global 2030 Agenda and to its inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership approach for the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); and it has indicated that its current medium-term plan, the 2017-2021 National Action Strategy, will serve as a pathway towards SDG implementation. Moreover, the country boasts a young population – some 40% are under the age of 40 – that could provide a demographic dividend and play a key role in the achievement both of the SDGs and of the goals of its National Action Strategy.

However, Uzbekistan's significant development gains could be dramatically reversed by various internal as well as external threats, including problems associated with corruption and weak governance, or the environmental disasters to which this landlocked country is prone. Moreover, economic growth has not been inclusive; and gender inequality is still widespread. An additional risk is that the country's potential demographic dividend could become a demographic disaster, if sufficient jobs and income streams for youth are not created. Uzbekistan's most urgent development priorities therefore focus on sustainable, inclusive economic growth, including increasing employment and livelihood solutions for youth, women and the disabled; strengthened effective, inclusive governance; and improved natural resource management and access.

The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF. The 2016-2020 UNDAF is the framework for the UNDS's work in Uzbekistan for that period. The 2016-2020 UNDAF presents four interrelated strategic thematic areas through which the UN system can respond most effectively to Uzbekistan's development priorities: i. inclusive economic development, with a focus on employment and social protection; ii. quality health and education, to fully realize human potential; iii. Environmental protection, to ensure sustainable development; and iv. Effective governance, to enhance public service delivery and the protection of rights. These four thematic areas include eight outcomes and twenty-three outputs.

The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF Evaluation. The 2016-2020 UNDAF evaluation was commissioned by the UN; the objective of this consultancy was to conduct the final evaluation of the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF based on the detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in **Annex 1**. The evaluation considers the UNDAF's relevance, its achievements and progress against planned results, the sustainability of its results, and its effectiveness as a coordination and partnership framework and as a resource mobilization mechanism. The findings and recommendations from the evaluation are also intended to inform UN programming, coordination and financing in the forthcoming UNSDCF period (2021-2025). The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are UN and key national and county counterparts, as well as other Development Partners (DPs), including donors, the private sector, NGOs and civil society.

The evaluation covered ongoing and completed initiatives and assessed the strategic position of the UN as well as any outcome level changes. As the 2018 UNDAF *Consolidated Results Report* (CRR) and the 2018 UNCT *Annual Report/Summary of Coordination Framework* provide recent information on UNDAF

activities and outputs, this final evaluation is meant to be a macro-level, summative assessment with a light programme review.

Major Findings of the Evaluation Include:

Finding 1 (Relevance): The UNDAF is broadly relevant to and supports the achievement of Uzbekistan's national development priorities, despite significant changes in the country context during the UNDAF cycle; and it is well-aligned with international treaties and goals, including the Agenda 2030.

Finding 2 (Relevance): The SDGs are well integrated into UNDAF programming, and integrated programming under the UNDAF supports SDG acceleration.

Finding 3 (Relevance): The UN Programming Principles of capacity building, gender, HRBA and LNOB are well-integrated into the UNDAF, although the measurement of their results is problematic due to the lack of SMART indicators. Youth is a cross-cutting issue which is well integrated into the UNDAF, and data is a cross-cutting UNDAF concern.

Finding 4: (Relevance) The design of the 2016-2020 UNDAF appears fragmented: it features eight outcome areas which are more reflective of agency mandates rather than of how the UN will collectively work together; and there is no overarching Theory of Change which would provide greater cohesiveness. Furthermore, the large number of outcomes and outputs challenge UNDAF coordination and monitoring; and they have also limited the flexibility of the UNDAF to respond to post-design issues.

Finding 5 (Effectiveness): The UN's technical and policy advice, advocacy and capacity building interventions have contributed to significant development gains in Uzbekistan in the areas of inclusive economic development, effective governance, environmental sustainability and social development. However, when considered through the lens of its results framework, not all of the UNDAF's actual results are visible, due to the large percentage of indicators (56%) which cannot be measured.

Finding 6 (Effectiveness): Although the UNCT has put in place the requisite UNDAF coordination architecture, these structures vary in their effectiveness and efficiency.

Finding 7 (Effectiveness): The absence of a Theory of Change and the high percentage of unmeasurable indicators in the UNDAF results framework reflects an incomplete understanding of results-based management among programme and M&E staff.

Finding 8 (Effectiveness): The UN has a strong, long-standing relationship with Government; and it has well-leveraged this partnership to successfully advocate for, among others, SDG localization and the social protection single unit. However, its alliances with other expected UNDAF partners, including civil society and the private sector, should be strengthened to further ensure national ownership.

Finding 9 (Efficiency): Due to the lack of harmonization of the global business processes followed by different UN agencies, there are inconsistencies in the items included in their budget reporting; and this hinders the precise calculation of UNDAF budget gaps and of non-executed funds. DCO does not provide agency-specific guidance, and agencies are referred to their HQs for direction on financial data collection. Agreement on a harmonized approach to UNDAF budget reporting that is mutually-acceptable to both agencies' HQs and to DCO is an issue which requires resolution at the headquarters level.

Finding 10 (Efficiency): The resource gaps in most of the UNDAF outcome areas, save in Health and Governance, appear significant; and it is both timely and relevant for the UN to explore additional financing for the remaining UNDAF cycle and the forthcoming UNSDCF beyond its customary donors, through non-traditional donors, South-South Cooperation, Islamic finance, the private sector and other forms of multi-stakeholder partnerships.

Finding 11 (Efficiency): Transaction costs for UN agencies do not appear to have been reduced in terms of the staff time required for UNDAF-related work, as resource mobilization and programme implementation were carried out primarily as agency-specific activities rather than as DaO.

Finding 12 (Efficiency): The lack of harmonization of different agencies' business processes may have hindered the efficiency of integrated programming.

Finding 13 (Sustainability): Sustainability indicators for the current UNDAF are mixed: while some of its results have been institutionalized, their operationalization and the monitoring of their implementation will be key to ensuring their sustainability. Moreover, although the UN has undertaken extensive capacity building of its national partners in each of the UNDAF Outcome areas, and this may have strengthened individuals' competencies, it has been incompletely institutionalized; and this also constitutes a risk to the sustainability of UNDAF results.

Finding 14 (Comparative Advantage): Most evaluation respondents indicated that the UN has its greatest comparative advantage in the normative sphere. However, in the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context, the UN's technical expertise should be assessed on a regular basis, and it should be strengthened or built as required in order to respond emerging national priorities and challenges and to ensure the organization's relevance in-country.

Finding 15 (Delivering as One {DaO}): DaO coherence has been partially realized under the current UNDAF: one of the five DaO SOPs has been fully achieved. Increasing DaO cohesion will require raising the understanding of all UN staff about this approach.

Conclusions of the evaluation include:

Conclusion 1 (Relevance): (Based on Findings 1, 2, 3 and 4) The 2016-2020 UNDAF is broadly relevant to the Uzbekistan context: the UNDAF outcomes were aligned with national development priorities identified in the UNCT's extensive stakeholder consultations during the UNDAF formulation phase; and they also addressed several contextual development challenges identified in the 2014 CCA. Moreover, they also broadly aligned with the priorities presented in the subsequent medium-term reform plan, the 2017-2021 National Action Strategy, primarily because major development challenges such as poverty, exclusion and natural resource management remained the same throughout this UNDAF cycle. The SDGs and other international norms and standards which guide the UN's work have been well-integrated into the UNDAF. The Programming Principles of LNOB, capacity development, human rights and gender equality feature in UNDAF outcome statements and are mainstreamed across them, although the lack of SMART indicators hinders the assessment of the results of their integration.

Given the country's "youth bulge" and the urgency of creating jobs and other income streams for the ever-growing numbers of young persons entering the employment market annually in Uzbekistan, youth employment readiness and job creation has become a national priority; and youth should therefore also feature as a priority intervention area in the next UNSDCF cycle. Data has been a cross-cutting concern in this UNDAF, and it will remain so in the forthcoming UNSDCF.

Conclusion 2 (Effectiveness - Outcome Progress) (based on Finding 5). Under the UNDAF, the UN's strong normative role and high-level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each outcome area at both the service delivery and policy levels. However, UNDAF achievements have been under-reported due to a results framework which incompletely captures outcomes. As a result, progress against plan assessed through it is mixed: 4% of outcomes have been achieved; 40% have been partially achieved; and 56% are not measurable.

Conclusion 3 (Effectiveness – Partnership) (based on Finding 8). The UN's long-standing partnership with Government is one of its comparative strengths, and it has well-leveraged this partnership to successfully advocate for, among others, SDG localization and the social protection single unit. There is also a good potential for the UN to further leverage its partnership with Government to catalyze other partnerships in, for example, South-South cooperation. However, the UN's partnership with other expected local partners in the UNDAF, including civil society and the private sector, could be strengthened. It is understood that the UNCT intends to more actively pursue linkages with CSOs and business in the forthcoming UNSDCF, including convening consultation workshops with both groups during its formulation period. Although partnership with the private sector is expected to be more visible in the forthcoming UNSDCF (see 5.2.7, "Financing"), there is currently no UNDAF-wide private sector strategy to provide guidance in this area.

Conclusion 4 (Effectiveness - Financing) (based on Finding 9). Due to the lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies, there are inconsistencies in the items included in their budget reporting; and this hinders the precise calculation of UNDAF budget gaps and of non-executed funds. To avoid the challenges of consolidation at the country level, a harmonized approach to the mechanics of financial data collection should be agreed upon and actioned at the HQ level; and agencies should continue to lobby their regional and headquarters offices for a resolution of this matter.

Conclusion 5 (Effectiveness – Financing) (based on Finding 10). The UNDAF's effectiveness as a financing platform has been uneven. Significant amounts have been mobilized for large joint programme initiatives such as the Aral Sea JP, as well as through agencies' global programmes. However, it appears that nearly 50% of the 2016-2020 UNDAF remains unfunded, noting that the figures provided to the evaluation were inconsistent, due the lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies.

The current budget gaps indicate that traditional resource mobilization is no longer sufficient to fund the UNDAF. UN respondents concurred that additional funding sources, beyond the customary multi-lateral donors, will be needed to finance the new UNSDCF. However, Financing for Development (FfD), including SSC, Islamic finance, and private sector and other innovative development financing, is a relatively new area for many of the UN Uzbekistan team; and there is currently no UNDAF-wide strategy to guide them. It will be therefore be necessary to increase their level of understanding on innovative financing options and how they can support SDG achievement, as well as to formulate a UNDAF/UNSDCF financing and partnership strategy to provide guidance on how to engage with the private sector and other actors in this area. Advice on innovative financing and partnerships is available through, among others, the UN Global Compact, the UNOSSC, and the UN DESA Financing for Development Office.

Conclusion 6 (Efficiency). (Based on Findings 11 and 12). Beyond the cost-saving measures achieved under the OMT, there is little evidence that the UNDAF has decreased transaction costs for the UN

agencies for their UNDAF-related work. Additionally, it is difficult to assess the UNDAF’s value for money and the efficiency of its delivery, due to incomplete budget information.

Conclusion 7 (Sustainability): (Based on Finding 13). Sustainability indicators for the UNDAF’s results to date are mixed: The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, gender equality and other issues has been institutionalized through the drafting and, sometimes, enactment of several relevant national policies and legislation are positive indicators for the sustainability of UNDAF results. However, the lack of political will to create an enabling space for civil society to function freely, as well as ongoing partner capacity deficits in implementing human rights in line with existing commitments under ratified UN human rights treaties, pose sustainability risks. Moreover, the incomplete institutionalization of the capacity building provided by the UN to its national partners also poses a sustainability risk.

Conclusion 8 (UN Comparative Advantage). (Based on Finding 14). Most respondents agree that the UN’s great comparative advantage is in the normative sphere. The UN has well-leveraged its comparative advantage as an advocate for the SDGs and for other normative values, as a provider of high-level technical expertise; and as an honest broker with strong convening power, to support and influence the realization of Uzbekistan’s development priorities. However, given the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context, a critical self-assessment by the UN of its comparative advantage should be undertaken on a regular basis; and it should be strengthened or built as required to ensure it is fit for purpose to respond to emerging national priorities and challenges.

Conclusion 9 (DaO). (Based on Finding 15) DaO cohesion has been partially achieved during the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle: one of the five SoPs have been fully realized. DaO is an essential foundation for integrated programming, and raising the awareness of all UN Uzbekistan staff on this approach and on its implications for operations, programming, financing and partnership, will be key to greater DaO coherence there; and the staff induction process provides one opportunity to do this.

Recommendations for the Uzbekistan UNCT to build on the results of the 2016-2020 UNDAF during the current cycle and beyond are presented below.

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations
<p>Relevance (findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 14)</p>	<p>When formulating the new UNSDCF, ensure its relevance to the Uzbekistan context and its alignment with UN reforms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use an ecosystem approach to strengthen UNSDCF synergies with, and minimize duplication with, other DPs activities 2. Develop a streamlined results framework with no more than five outcome areas and with clear alignment to national SDGs; both the Uzbekistan MAPS as well as the global Agenda 2030 suggest possible themes for outcomes. Reference UNDAF outputs and output indicators only in JWPs 3. Formulate an overarching ToC for the UNSDCF as well as Theories of Change for each Outcome Area for greater cohesion. Noting that the current understanding of RBM among the UN team is uneven, it is recommended that external expertise be engaged for both of these tasks.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. More explicitly support national priorities on youth employment readiness and job creation by featuring youth prominently in at least one outcome statement, in addition to the planned JP NEET 5. Pursue more integrated programming approaches for SDG acceleration 6. Conduct a critical self-assessment of UN comparative advantages to realistically inform planning, programming and financing in the new UNSDCF, as well as to ensure relevance in the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context
<p>Effectiveness (Findings 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15)</p>	<p>Strengthen the effectiveness of the UNDAF in the areas of:</p> <p>Financing and Partnership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Widen the UNDAF’s resource base: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the UNCT’s level of understanding on innovative financing options and how they can support SDG, through guidance and training from a recognized UN partnership authority such as the UN Global Compact, the UNOSSC or the UN DESA Financing for Development Office, among others • After the 2019 DFA, co-create an UNDAF/UNSDCF financing strategy in collaboration with the GoU, including forms of development financing beyond traditional multilateral aid such as non-DAC donor funding, SSC, domestic revenue mobilization, private sector partnerships and blended financing options 2. Build closer interaction with the private sector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map and explore community investment initiatives with local and international private sector actors • Consider initiating an informal private sector advisory committee under the leadership of the RC • Explore establishing an UN-led multi-stakeholder partnership platform such as an SDG Partnership Platform to catalyze and broker partnerships • Leverage current financial and non-financial private sector partnerships for additional financing 3. Continue to engage with Government and other relevant stakeholders for the development of a regulatory framework for Islamic finance 4. Further strengthen partnerships with IFIs, e.g. through extension of cross-cutting UNDAF thematic groups, for example, by the extension of the UN GTG into a cross-sector GTG with other DPs 5. Pursue more pooled funding, including thematic trust funds such as the JP Aral Sea MPHSTF <p>Budget Reporting</p>

	<p>1. Agencies must continue to lobby their regional and headquarters offices for resolution on the harmonization of financial data collection which is mutually acceptable both to their HQs and to DCO and which currently hinders UNDAF budget reporting.</p> <p>Knowledge Management</p> <p>1. Strengthen UNDAF knowledge management and RCO’s role as an UNDAF One Stop Shop by archiving all UNDAF-related documents not included in the UNINFO system, including RG minutes and joint monitoring reports, with RCO</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>1. Noting agency staff turnovers, provide annual RBM training to programme and M&E staff to ensure that there are necessary competencies in this area</p> <p>2. Noting that the current level of understanding of RBM principles among the UN team is uneven, engage external expertise to guide the development of ToCs for the UNSDCF and for each of its Outcome Areas (see also above, Relevance)</p> <p>Results Groups</p> <p>1. Introduce co-chairs and rotating chairs for the RGs</p> <p>DaO</p> <p>1. Raise the awareness of all UN staff on this approach and on its implications for operations, programming, financing and partnership through available organizational windows such as the staff induction process</p> <p>2.</p>
<p>Efficiency (Findings 11 and 12)</p>	<p>Strengthen the UNDAF’s operational efficiency in the areas of budget:</p> <p>1. Develop and implement a Common Budgetary Framework (CBF) which presents transparent data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized.</p>
<p>Sustainability (finding 13)</p>	<p>Mitigate sustainability risks:</p> <p>1. Reduce the sustainability risks related to the ongoing restructuring of Government ministries and high Government staff turnover by regularly assessing capacity gaps and by providing capacity development based on identified needs</p> <p>2. Provide a brief explanation of UNDAF aims and coordination structures at the commencement of each Joint RG meeting to ensure new members have a basic understanding of it</p>

1. INTRODUCTION

The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) presents the United Nation System's intended areas of collaboration and partnership with the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan for this period. It articulates how Government and the UN will jointly pursue the achievement of national development priorities, as well as the realization of the global Agenda 2030 and the country's commitments to other internationally agreed development goals and treaty obligations. It thus constitutes a mutual accountability framework between the Government of Uzbekistan (GoU) and the United Nations Country Team (UNCT).

This evaluation of the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF was jointly commissioned by the UNCT and the Government of Uzbekistan. It was conducted according to the detailed terms of reference (ToR) presented in **Annex 1**¹. The evaluation considered the relevance of the UNDAF as well as its achievements against expected results; efficiency, the sustainability of its results; and its effectiveness both as a coordination and partnership framework and as a platform for financing.

The scope of this evaluation is the entire 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF portfolio. UN organizational structures and systems outside of the UNDAF, such as regional architecture, are beyond the scope of this evaluation, and they have been noted only where they are clearly involved in UNDAF implementation. Consideration of UN contributions to national development results through the UNDAF, as well as of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach and of UN comparative advantage, are within the scope of this evaluation.

The evaluation has considered both overall strategic issues related to the UNDAF and to the UN system in Uzbekistan, in addition to progress towards expected UNDAF results. It has two main components: the analysis of development results and the strategic positioning of the UNCT. The overall objectives of the evaluation were:

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, organizational efficiency and sustainability of UNDAF contributions to development results;
- To provide lessons learned and actionable, forward-looking recommendations to the UNCT
- To inform the design and implementation of the UNDAF successor, the 2021-2025 United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF).

The findings and recommendations from the UNDAF evaluation are therefore intended to inform institutional learning, including UN programming, coordination and financing in the remainder of the current UNDAF and in the forthcoming UNSDCF cycle. As the 2018 UNDAF *Consolidated Results Report* (CRR) and the 2018 UNCT *Annual Report/Summary of Coordination Framework* provide recent information on UNDAF activities and outputs, this final evaluation is meant to be a macro-level, summative assessment with a light programme review.

The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are the UNCT and key Government stakeholders, as well as Development Partners, NGOs, civil society and the private sector.

¹ The current UNDAF cycle will not be completed until December 2020. This evaluation of the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF, which was conducted from September through October 2019, assesses activities only up to that period.

1.1 Overview of the Uzbekistan Context and National Development Priorities.

The Republic of Uzbekistan is a resource-rich country that has experienced a remarkable growth trajectory since its independence in 1991: according to Government figures, between 2002 and 2016, its per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increased by nearly 500 per cent from \$471.00 to \$2,756.00², primarily due to the rise in prices for its gold and natural gas exports³; and the rate of poverty in the country declined from 27.5 percent in 2001⁴ to 11.4% in 2018⁵. Uzbekistan transitioned from a Low-Income Country (LIC) to a Lower Middle-Income Country (LMIC) in 2011.⁶

During this period, Uzbekistan also realized significant progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁷, for example, on poverty reduction; on universal primary and secondary education and on reductions in maternal mortality. Between 2000 and 2018, Uzbekistan's human development index (HDI) value increased by 19.2 percent from 0.596 to 0.710, largely as a result of improvements in its education and health sectors, and in the overall standard of living⁸. Uzbekistan is therefore currently classified as a high human development country, with a rating of 105 out of 189 countries globally in UNDP's 2018 human development index⁹.

Uzbekistan has also confirmed its commitment to the achievement of the global 2030 Agenda and to its inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership approach for the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It has as well indicated that its current medium-term plan, the 2017-2021 National Action Strategy, would serve as a pathway towards SDG implementation; and that it intends to align its development goals in health, education, gender equality and financial inclusion to the SDGs.¹⁰

²It must be noted that In March 2019, the government revised national accounts data for 2014-2018: International Monetary Fund, *Republic of Uzbekistan: Staff Report For The 2019 Article IV Consultation* (IMF Country Report No. 19/129), May 2019, p. 5, footnote 1: <https://imf.org>media>files>publications> <https://countryeconomy.com/gdp/uzbekistan>; nonetheless, even if these figures are overly optimistic, they are indicative of a strong growth trajectory. Moreover, although GDP fell to \$1810 in 2017 following the depreciation of the currency as well as economic slowdowns in Russia and China, it is projected to rise from 2019 onwards: IMF, p. 5.

³The country ranks globally 16th in natural gas production, and 18th in proven reserves: ³ https://photius.com/rankings/2019/energy/natural_gas_production_2019_0.html And https://photius.com/rankings/2019/energy/natural_gas_proved_reserves_2019_0.html. It also ranks 12th globally for gold production: <https://www.gold.org/download/file/7593/Gold-Mining-Production-Volumes-Data.xlsx>

⁴<https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2016/04/13/uzbekistan-on-the-path-to-high-middle-income-status-by-2050>

⁵ Asian Development Bank, Basic Statistics 2019: , <https://data.adb.org/dataset/basic-statistics-asia-and-pacific>

⁶ Uzbekistan was reclassified as a lower middle income country in 2011 when its per capita GDP was calculated to have reached \$1,880.00, which is above the World Bank threshold for middle income status: World Bank

⁷ The MDGs were eight anti-poverty targets which guided the global development agenda from 2000 – 2015. The MDGs were superseded by the SDGs with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda in 2015.

⁸ http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/UZB.pdf

⁹ UNDP, "Briefing Note: Uzbekistan", *Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update*

¹⁰ International Monetary Fund, *Republic of Uzbekistan: Staff Report For The 2019 Article IV Consultation* (IMF Country Report No. 19/129), May 2019, p. 19: <https://imf.org>media>files>publications>

In 2018 some 28% of Uzbekistan's estimated 32.98 million population was under the age of 14¹¹; and the country's young population could play a key role in the achievement both of the SDGs and of the goals of its National Action Strategy. Given current population trends, Uzbekistan should be able to benefit from its youth-based demographic dividend¹² until at least 2050¹³, if the skills which are taught in school align with those required in the marketplace.

Since the election of President Shavkat Mirziyoyev in 2016, the Government of Uzbekistan (GoU) has been undertaking ambitious economic and social reforms. Key reform themes and aims include i) greater regional and sub-regional cooperation, particularly in trade, connectivity, preventing violent extremism and in the management of common water and energy resources; ii) economic transformation and market reforms; in support of private sector growth and job creation; iii) judicial reforms and greater protection of human rights; and iv) bottom-up citizen feedback mechanisms to inform the reform efforts. However, the rapid pace and wide-ranging scope of Government reforms could negatively impact upon the country's current growth trajectory, resulting in further social exclusion challenges, if their implications are not well considered before their implementation

Uzbekistan's significant development gains could also be dramatically reversed by various internal as well as external threats, e.g. problems associated with corruption¹⁴ and weak governance, or environmental disasters such as the desiccation of the Aral Sea Region. There are as well other development concerns: economic growth has not been inclusive, and it is estimated that some 11.4% of the population still live below the poverty line¹⁵. Gender inequality is still widespread: women remain underrepresented in key political decision-making positions¹⁶; and women's income is on average only some 56 percent of men's.¹⁷ Consequently, Uzbekistan has a Gender Inequality Index rating of only 0.303¹⁸, with a ranking of just 64 out of 162 countries in 2018.¹⁹

An additional risk is that the country's potential demographic dividend could become a demographic disaster, if sufficient jobs and income streams for youth are not created, noting that the current youth

¹¹See, "Population ages 0-14 (% of total population) – Uzbekistan", <https://data.worldbank.org/country/uzbekistan?view=chart> (2019). According to 2018 CIA figures, 23.6 % of the country's some 30,000,000 population is under the age of 14; and 17.8% is between the ages of 15-24: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/uz.html#field-anchor-people-and-society-age-structure>

¹² Rapid economic growth caused by an increase in the proportion of the working-age population relative to the dependent population; "Youth" is defined by the Government of Uzbekistan as 16-30

¹³ http://www.demographicdividend.org/country_highlights/Uzbekistan/

¹⁴With a rating of 158 out of 180, Uzbekistan has been ranked as one of the most corrupt countries in the world, according to Transparency International's *Corruption Perception Index 2018*: <https://www.transparency.org/country/UZB>

¹⁵ Asian Development Bank, *Basis Statistics 2019*: <https://www.adb.org/countries/uzbekistan/poverty>

¹⁶For example, only 16.4% of the seats in Uzbekistan's parliament are held by women: UNDP, *Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update*: <http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/UZB>

¹⁷ United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: 2018 Statistical Update – Uzbekistan*: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/UZB>

¹⁸United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: 2018 Statistical Update – Uzbekistan*: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/UZB>

¹⁹United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: 2018 Statistical Update – Uzbekistan*: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/UZB.pdf

unemployment rate is already double that of the general population²⁰, and that some 500,000 young persons enter the job market annually. Furthermore, Uzbekistan's graduation to LMIC status also has implications for the amount and types of assistance it still receives, as it is assumed that middle income countries have the capacity to finance their own development priorities²¹.

Uzbekistan's most urgent development priorities therefore focus on sustainable, inclusive economic growth, including increasing employment and livelihood solutions for youth, women and the disabled; strengthened effective, inclusive governance; and improved natural resource management and access.

1.2 The 2016-2020 UNDAF

With the aim of supporting the achievement of national development priorities, the Government and the United Nations Country Team Uzbekistan (UNCT)²² launched the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in 2016. It is the third generation of UNDAF in Uzbekistan, and it is the first in that country to deliberately adopt elements of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach.²³

The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF was designed not only to align with the GoU's national development priorities, but also with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and with other key internationally agreed development goals and principles. The Uzbekistan UNDAF provides a common operational framework for development activities upon which UN organisations can formulate their programmes, either as individual agencies or jointly. In addition, although the Uzbekistan UNDAF does not capture every activity undertaken by each of the resident and non-resident UN agencies',²⁴ its results matrix includes most of the UN system's interventions there.²⁵ Finally, the UNDAF is also intended to serve as a marketing tool through which the UNCT can present its intended achievements to partners, including funders, in a clear, compelling and coherent way.

The 2016-2020 UNDAF presents four interrelated strategic thematic areas through which the UN system can respond most effectively to Uzbekistan's development priorities:

²⁰ The unemployment rate for the total labour force is some 7.2%; for unemployed youth aged 15-24, it is 14.6%: United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: 2018 Statistical Update – Uzbekistan*: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/UZB>

²¹ Although bilateral ODA to Uzbekistan has decreased over the past ten years, the total volume of ODA that it receives continues to grow: the increased amount of total ODA that the country receives is due to a rise in multilateral aid, including both loans and grants: OECD, *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2019*, p. 440: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/18ea27d8-en.pdf?expires=1576261651&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=B8A633F3A843035844F22F4108C50679>

²² The fourteen resident and non-resident agencies currently represented in the Uzbekistan United Nations Country Team are: IAEA, FAO, ILO, UNCTAD, UNDP, UNECE, UNICEF, UNFPA, UN Women, UNESCO, UNODC, UNAIDS, WHO and UNV.

²³ *UNDAF 2016-2020*, pp. 6, 24, 46. DaO is not referenced in the 2010-2015 UNDAF, and Uzbekistan is not a DaO country

²⁴ For example, some agencies, including ILO and UNESCO, have undertaken activities in Uzbekistan both under the UNDAF as well as outside of it.

²⁵ *"The UNDAF results matrix should contain the majority of the UN system's interventions in a country, all of which should contribute to the achievement of UNDAF strategic priorities in support of national sustainable development goals. When an organization undertakes specific activities that do not fit under any strategic priority, they should be detailed here only under exceptional circumstances. An example is the antimicrobial resistance work of the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Organization for Animal Health, which is not always possible to integrate under a specific outcome."* UNDG, *UNDAF Guidance 2017*, footnote 27.

1. Inclusive economic development, with a focus on employment and social protection
2. Quality health and education, to fully realize human potential
3. Environmental protection, to ensure sustainable development
4. Effective governance, to enhance public service delivery and the protection of rights

These four thematic areas include eight outcomes and twenty-three outputs, with 47 outcome indicators and 184 output indicators.

The selection of the UNDAF thematic areas and outcomes was informed by the key contextual development challenges and root causes identified in the 2014 *Common Country Analysis (2014 CCA)*, including education, health, social protection, livelihoods and inclusive governance, and environment, resilience, capacity building, data, and human rights and gender equality as cross-cutting themes²⁶, as well as by the comparative advantages of the UN which were presented in it²⁷. To ensure the alignment of UNDAF results areas with national policies and programmes and with the SDGs and other global mandates, the UNCT also held extensive consultations with donors, national partners and NGOs, as well as a Strategic Prioritization Retreat (SPR)²⁸.

Following the 2016 presidential election and the launch of the 2017-2021 National Action Strategy by the country's new leadership, the UNCT, in collaboration with the GoU, developed a detailed Roadmap to more explicitly link the activities under the 2016-2020 UNDAF to the different development priorities presented in the Action Strategy²⁹, as tabled below:

Table 1
Priority Areas of Cooperation between Uzbekistan and the United Nations
Identified in the 2017 Roadmap

	Priority Areas of Cooperation	Supportive UNDAF Outcomes ³⁰
I	Enhancing cooperation to implement the Action Strategy and the Sustainable Development Goals	Outcome 1, "Livelihoods" Outcome 2, "Social Protection-1" Outcome 3, "Social Protection-2" Outcome 4, "Health" Outcome 5, "Education" Outcome 6, "Environment" Outcome 7, "Governance-1" Outcome 8, "Governance-2"

²⁶ UNCT Uzbekistan, *Common Country Analysis Final 2014*, 2014, pp. 19-126. The objective of the 2014 CCA was to identify areas upon which the UNCT could focus and prioritize its interventions in Uzbekistan, based on its Comparative Advantages, and to thereby provide the evidence base for the 2016-2020 UNDAF formulation.

²⁷ *CCA 2014*, pp. 17-18; 29-30; 51-2; 65-66; 78-79; 98-99; 115-6; 126-7.

²⁸ Beyond the UNCT, participants in the SPR included representatives from government ministries and agencies, research centres, NGOs, the Supreme Court, the Prosecutor General's office and the Academy of Public Administration.

²⁹ The five priority areas of the National Action Strategy are 1) improvement of state and public structures ; 2) rule of law and reform of the judicial system, 3) development and economic liberalization, 4) social development and 5) security, inter-ethnic harmony and religious tolerance, and foreign policy: http://uzsm.uz/en/press_center/uzb_news/on-the-strategy-for-the-further-development-of-the-republic-of-uzbekistan/

³⁰ As noted in the Roadmap

II	Strengthening regional cooperation and partnerships on cultural and humanitarian affairs	Outcome 1, "Livelihoods" Outcome 4, "Health" Outcome 6, "Environment"
III	Cooperation to mitigate the Aral Sea disaster and environmental challenges	Outcome 6, "Environment"
IV	Human rights cooperation	Outcome 8, "Governance-Legal, Judicial Reforms" Outcome 1, "Livelihoods" Outcome 7, "Governance-Public Administration"

The extent to which the UNDAF addressed the challenges presented in the 2014 CCA is considered below, under 2.2.2, "Key Achievements by Outcome Area". The UN's comparative advantage is discussed further under 2.5, "UN Comparative Advantage". The extent to which the UNDAF is aligned with national development priorities, and has proved flexible and responsive to contextual changes, is considered in 2.1, "Relevance."

A Results Group (RG) was established for each of the UNDAF outcome areas. Each RG is co-chaired by the lead UN agency's Head of Agency (HoA) and by a Ministerial level representative of the lead GoU ministry for that outcome:

Table 2
UNDAF Results Groups and Government/UN Agency Co-chairs

Outcome Area	Government Co-Chair	UN Co-Chair
1. Livelihoods	Representative, Ministry of Economy	UNDP Deputy Resident Representative
2. Social Protection 1 and 3. Social Protection 2	Minister of Employment and Labour Relations ³¹	UNICEF Representative
4. Health	Minister of Health	WHO Representative
5. Education	Minister of Public Education	UNESCO Representative
6. Environment	Chairperson, State Committee for Ecology and Environmental Protection	UNDP Resident Representative
7. Governance 1 and 8. Governance 2	Minister for Development of Information Technologies and Communications	UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative

The RGs are responsible for the operationalization of the UNDAF. They report to the UNCT, which has overall responsibility for the delivery of UNDAF results, through their respective UN agency co-chairs. The implementation of the UNDAF is guided by rolling joint work plans (JWPs) which outline the detailed activities, budgets and agencies responsible for implementation. The current JWPs cover the period from 2018-2020.

The resources required for the 2016-2020 UNDAF were originally estimated at US \$ 144.9 million.³²

1.3 The 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF Evaluation

³¹ These ministries have since been re-structured into the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Employment.

³² 2016-2020 UNDAF, p. 90.

1.3.1 Evaluation objectives and scope

This evaluation of the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF was jointly commissioned by the UNCT and the Government of Uzbekistan. It was conducted according to the detailed terms of reference (ToR) presented in **Annex 1**³³. The evaluation considered the relevance of the UNDAF as well as its achievements against expected results; efficiency, the sustainability of its results; and its effectiveness both as a coordination and partnership framework and as a platform for financing.

The evaluation has considered both overall strategic issues related to the UNDAF and to the UN system in Uzbekistan, in addition to progress towards expected UNDAF results. It has two main components: the analysis of development results and the strategic positioning of the UNCT. The overall objectives of the evaluation were:

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, organizational efficiency and sustainability of UNDAF contributions to development results;
- To provide lessons learned and actionable, forward-looking recommendations to the UNCT
- To inform the design and implementation of the UNDAF successor, the 2021-2025 United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF).

The findings and recommendations from the UNDAF evaluation are therefore intended to inform institutional learning, including UN programming, coordination and financing, in the remainder of the current UNDAF and in the forthcoming UNSDCF cycle. As the 2018 UNDAF *Consolidated Results Report* (CRR) and the 2018 UNCT *Annual Report/Summary of Coordination Framework* provide recent information on UNDAF activities and outputs, this final evaluation is meant to be a macro-level, summative assessment with a light programme review.

1.3.2 Evaluation Methodologies – Document Reviews, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, UN Debriefing and Stakeholder Preliminary Findings Presentation

The evaluation has been informed by a literature review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs) and an in-house debriefing for the UNCT, as well as a presentation of preliminary findings to the Joint UN-Government UNDAF Steering Committee. Additional stakeholder validation of the evaluation has been undertaken through comments received on the draft evaluation report. This mixed methodological approach has allowed triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data.

The consultants conducted interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) with 173 persons for the 2016-2020 UNDAF final evaluation. The list of UNs, GoU, donor and civil society stakeholders interviewed, included participants in the focus group discussions with RGs, is presented below in **Annex 3, “List of Persons Interviewed”**.

Respondents were selected through a systematic purposive sampling approach. The selection was based on the stakeholder mapping undertaken during the evaluation inception phase by the consultants (see below, **Annex 5, “The UNDAF’s Main Stakeholders”**); and it was further refined during the course of the evaluation, according to respondents’ accessibility and availability. Furthermore, all interviews were prefaced with an explanation on the objective of the evaluation and how information from the interviews would be used. All respondents were as well assured of anonymity. Moreover, the evaluation has followed a human rights-based approach through consultations with both duty bearers and rights holders;

³³ The current UNDAF cycle will not be completed until December 2020. This evaluation of the 2016-2020 Uzbekistan UNDAF, which was conducted from September through October 2019, assesses activities only up to that period.

these stakeholders are included in the mapping presented in **Annex 5**, below. The evaluation thus follows the United Nations Development Group's (UNDG) *Guidelines for UNDAF Evaluations* as well as the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. It also complies with the United Nations Evaluation Group's *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation* principles³⁴ and its guidance on *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*³⁵.

Interviews and FGDs with UN staff and GoU respondents, Development Partners and civil society stakeholders were facilitated by the UN Uzbekistan Resident Coordinator Office (RCO). The RCO further supported the evaluation through the provision of UNDAF-related documentation and through the English-Russian translation of questionnaire frameworks and of the evaluators' stakeholder presentation.

1.3.3 Evaluation Limitations

The turnover of staff in both UN agencies and in GoU offices, as well as the restructuring of Government ministries since the inception of the current UNDAF, hindered the collection of background information on its formulation and early implementation phase. In addition, the assessment of UNDAF current progress against plan was hampered by the fact that some 56% of the outcome indicators and 7% of the output indicators in its results framework were either poorly defined or lacked baseline data; and they were therefore unmeasurable (see below, Table 3, "Progress on Outcomes"; 2.2.6, "Monitoring and Evaluation"). Moreover, the data provided by the UNCT on UNDAF financing and funding gaps was incomplete (see below, 2.2.5, "Financing").

There were also logistical challenges, including delays in obtaining UNDAF-related documentation, as well as the necessity of scheduling of some key informant interviews after the data collection phase of the evaluation.³⁶ Furthermore, there was an incomplete understanding of "evaluation" among all groups of stakeholders: many respondents were unfamiliar with the concept of an evaluation as an analytical, constructively critical exercise intended to inform institutional learning, and which follows UN standards of ethics and confidentiality; and this may have constrained interview responses.

Finally, the direct attribution of UNDAF interventions to development outcomes is complicated by the fact that it captures only initiatives conducted by or on behalf of the UN; it excludes activities carried out by other development partners which may have also contributed to results. The UNDAF also does not include all UN agency activities. In addition, there is a lack of counterfactual evidence that would indicate what development results might have been achieved in the absence of the UNDAF. The assessment of UNDAF results is therefore based on contribution analysis.³⁷

³⁴ United Nations Evaluation Group, *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation-Foundation Document*, New York, 2008: www.uneval.org/document/download/548

³⁵ United Nations Evaluation Group, *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations-Guidance Document*, New York, August 2014: www.uneval.org/document/download/1294

³⁶Some key Development Partners were not available during the data collection phase of the evaluation and, although those interviews were intended to inform the evaluators' stakeholder validation presentation, they could only be conducted afterwards.

³⁷ "Contribution Analysis ...offers an approach designed to reduce uncertainty about the contribution (an) intervention is making to the observed results through an increased understanding of why the observed results have occurred (or not!) and the roles played by the intervention and other internal and external factors...Contribution analysishelps to confirm or revise a theory of change...(and to provide) evidence (for) a plausible conclusion that, within some level of confidence, (a) program has made an important contribution to the documented results."
https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/contribution_analysis

2. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE UNDAF EVALUATION

2.1 Relevance³⁸

- How well is the UNDAF aligned to National Development Priorities and to international treaties and goals?³⁹
- To what extent are the SDGs, the Programming Principles and other cross-cutting issues integrated into UNDAF programming?
- Was the design of the UNDAF adequate to properly address the issues envisaged in its formulation?

2.1.1 UNDAF alignment to National Development Priorities and International Treaties and Goals

Finding 1: The UNDAF is broadly relevant to and supports the achievement of Uzbekistan’s national development priorities, despite significant changes in the country context during the UNDAF cycle; and it is well-aligned with international treaties and goals, including the Agenda 2030.

The UNDAF’s relevance is linked to its alignment with and support to the national development priorities and policies identified at the time of its formulation, as well as to its responsiveness to changes in the country context since then. Moreover, the UNDAF outcomes also reflect all of the development focus areas proposed, and address many of the contextual development challenges identified, in the 2014 CCA⁴⁰.

The UNDAF Outcome Areas also support the priorities presented in the subsequent 2017-2021 National Action Strategy (see above, Table 1), primarily because major development challenges such as poverty, exclusion and natural resource management have not changed during this UNDAF cycle. The 2016-2020 UNDAF has thus remained broadly relevant to the Uzbekistan context.

The UNDAF also aligns with and supports the realization of several key international human rights norms, standards and commitments, as well as UN human rights mechanisms recommendations, including CEDAW, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action; the Convention on the Rights of the Child; the Universal Periodic Review, the Concluding Observations of UN Treaty Bodies and UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, and the 2030 Agenda and its SDGs.

2.1.2 Integration of the SDGs in the UNDAF

Finding 2: The SDGs are well integrated into UNDAF programming, and integrated programming under the UNDAF supports SDG acceleration.

The SDGs and their achievement are well-referenced in each of the 2016-2020 UNDAF Results Areas, and SDGs targets are also noted in the 2018-2020 JWPs. Moreover, integrated programmes under this UNDAF,

³⁸ Relevance refers to “. the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor”.: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee, *Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance*

³⁹ These questions, and those which preface the following sections, have been extracted from the Evaluation Matrix of the evaluation’s inception report.

⁴⁰ The focus areas broadly identified in the CCA were education; health; social protection; livelihoods; and inclusive governance; environment is proposed as cross-cutting issue: see above, footnote 13.

such as the Aral Sea Joint Programme (JP), serve as SDG accelerators through which multiple agencies can address several Goals through one programme.⁴¹

Support towards SDG domestication was also provided through the UNDAF, for example, the UNDAF RGs and the UN SDG Working Group (WG) supported Government in developing its 2018 road map for SDG achievement, including SDG localization and integration into national development plans; and sixteen national SDGs with 125 targets were subsequently approved in October 2018. Moreover, 206 national SDG indicators proposed by the six SDG/RGs were approved by Government in March 2018; and a national SDG portal has been launched.

2.1.3 Integration of UN Programming Principles and Other Cross-cutting Issues into the UNDAF

Finding 3: The Programming Principles of capacity building, gender, HRBA and LNOB are well-integrated into the UNDAF, although the measurement of their results is problematic due to the lack of SMART indicators. Youth is a cross-cutting issue which is well integrated into the UNDAF, and data is a cross-cutting UNDAF concern.

The UN Programming Principles are intended to guide UNDAF planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), as well as to focus the UN's support to national development priorities. Pre-2015 UNDAFs featured the five Programming Principles of Capacity Development, Results-based Management (RBM), Environmental Sustainability, Gender Equality and Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA). These have been modified into four Integrated Programming Principles in post-2015 UNDAFs⁴². The 2016-2020 UNDAF, which was designed before the introduction of the Agenda 2030, but launched shortly after it, is a transitional UNDAF which features both pre- and post-2015 Programming Principles. However, only the five pre-2015 principles are expressly mentioned in it.⁴³

The Programming Principles which feature most prominently in the 2016-2020 UNDAF are capacity building, gender equality and HRBA, and leave no one behind (LNOB). LNOB is referenced in each outcome statement⁴⁴; and capacity building, gender equality and HRBA are referenced in each outcome at the enabling environment level, through support to the development of legislation and policies, and at the individual level, through training and other activities. Capacity building is also highly visible at the organizational level. However, although capacity building is considered to be the key UNDAF implementing principle⁴⁵, the current UNDAF does not include an explicit capacity building strategy with well-defined objectives, targets or indicators which would allow an assessment of progress towards national management and ownership.

⁴¹ In the JP Aral Sea, these are SDGs 1,2,3, 5,8, 15, 16, and 17.

⁴² The four Integrated Programming Principles are leave no one behind; human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment; sustainability and resilience; and accountability. Capacity building is included in post-2015 UNDAFs as one of the approaches for delivering the Integrated Programming Principles, and it remains an important UNDAF theme.

⁴³ UNDAF, p. 15

⁴⁴ Through the references to "all" and "all people".

⁴⁵ UNDAF, p. 46

Gender and human rights also feature in UNDAF outcome statements⁴⁶, although the current UNDAF does not feature a gender-focused intervention. Furthermore, the GTG has been well-integrated into the UNDAF's implementation structures, and it is also exploring the possibilities of evolving into a cross-sector group with other DPs.

Finally, although the Environmental Sustainability and Resilience Programming Principles feature prominently in Outcome 6, they are less visible in elsewhere in the UNDAF. RBM is the Programming Principle which is least visible in the UNDAF (see also below, section 5. "Monitoring and Evaluation").

It is difficult to measure the results of these Programming Principles across the outcome areas due to the lack of SMART indicators through which the degree of the improvements anticipated from their integration could be assessed⁴⁷. Furthermore, how they synergized with, or were complementary to, capacity building, gender equality or rights-focused initiatives by other DPs, for example, the institutional capacity building support offered by both the World Bank and the Asia Development Bank, has also not yet been assessed.

A thorough review of the forthcoming 2021-2025 UNSDCF document by the GTG, SDG WG, M&EDG, the OHCHR and other relevant subject specialists would support both the mainstreaming as well as the measurement of the results of its Integrated Programming Principles.

Beyond the Programming Principles, another cross-cutting theme in the UNDAF is youth. However, although youth feature as beneficiaries in interventions under each of the Outcome areas, and there are agency-specific youth engagement frameworks⁴⁸, there is no overt strategy for mainstreaming youth employment readiness and/or job creation, which are currently national priorities⁴⁹, in the 2016-2020 UNDAF. It is notable that at the time of the UNDAF's 2015 formulation, youth was not an area of focus for donors or other development partners⁵⁰. However, since the change in government leadership in 2016, youth inclusion and employment have become stated national priorities; and there are now concentrated efforts by Government and other development partners to ensure that Uzbekistan's youth bulge provides a demographic dividend. Among these efforts is a Joint Programme focused on (Young people) Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) Youth which the UN intends to launch in 2020.

An additional cross-cutting theme in the current UNDAF is data. There is a critical requirement for timely, accurate data⁵¹ to inform evidence-based policy and development programming, as well as to track and document SDG progress. The gaps in national statistical capacity at the time of the UNDAF formulation

⁴⁶ Although the Gender Swap Scorecard found gender sensitive indicators lacking in outcomes 7 and 8, the outcomes were subsequently revised in the 2018-20 JWPs with supervision from the UN GTG: see Andrea Lee Esser, *UNCT SWAP Scorecard: Assessment Results and Action Plan (for the) United Nations Country Team Uzbekistan*, December 2017, p 8 and the 2018-2020 JWPs for Outcomes 7 and 8.

⁴⁷ For example, one of the SWAP Scorecard recommendations was "...to consider adding/adjusting indicators to allow monitoring of progress of GEWE."

⁴⁸ For example, UNICEF's Adolescents and Youth Engagement Strategic Framework and UNESCO's 2014-2021 Operational Strategy on Youth, among others.

⁴⁹ For example, the 2016 Law on State Youth Policy; see also 2017 *Roadmap*, activities 37-40.

⁵⁰ This was during the tenure of the previous president, and the social barriers to youth inclusion, such as patriarchy and other cultural norms, are noted in the 2014 CCA, p. 97

⁵¹ For example, the most recent census in Uzbekistan was conducted in 1989; the most recent MICS was undertaken in 2006.

are reflected in, among others, the paucity of baseline data for many of the indicators in its Results Matrix. Since then, significant efforts have been undertaken by the State Statistics Committee to implement international standards; and further strengthening of this unit by the UN and other development partners is both ongoing as well as planned in advance of the national census planned for 2022.⁵² Data will therefore continue to be a crucial cross-cutting concern for the remainder of this UNDAF period and into the UNSDCF cycle.

2.1.4 UNDAF Design

Finding 4: The design of the 2016-2020 UNDAF appears fragmented: it features eight outcome areas which are more reflective of agency mandates rather than of how the UN will collectively work together; and there is no overarching Theory of Change which would provide greater cohesiveness. Furthermore, the large number of outcomes and outputs challenge UNDAF coordination and monitoring; and they have also limited the flexibility of the UNDAF to respond to post-design issues.

Although the UNDAF results framework is nominally outcome-based, it features a very large number of outcomes and outputs⁵³; and this hinders both coordination and monitoring. In addition, the eight UNDAF outcome areas are more reflective of agency mandates rather than of how the UN will collectively work together. Moreover, some of the outcomes, particularly Governance, encompass a broad range of activities, some of which are only tenuously linked. Furthermore, neither the UNDAF, nor any of its Outcome Areas, has a Theory of Change (ToC)⁵⁴ which could provide greater cohesiveness.

A large percentage of both UNDAF outcome and output indicators lack baselines or are poorly defined, and measurement of actual results achieved is therefore problematic (see below, 2.2, “Effectiveness” and 2.2.5, “Monitoring and Evaluation”). A better-articulated results chain would have helped to more clearly establish links between UNDAF interventions and outcomes.

The large number of UNDAF outputs also limits programmatic flexibility. As a result, following the 2016 change in national leadership and the introduction of the reform agenda, the UNDAF was somewhat constrained in its ability to respond to these changes. Consequently, the UN prepared a Roadmap jointly with Government to more explicitly link UNDAF activities to the Strategy’s priority areas.⁵⁵

A more streamlined UNDAF results framework would permit greater programmatic flexibility and the adjustment of activities in the event of post-design emergent issues. As SDG achievement is a corporate priority for the UN, outcomes which align with domestic SDGs and which support SDG acceleration, for example, as suggested in the 2018 Uzbekistan MAPS or, more broadly, with the 2030 Vision themes of People, Planet and Prosperity⁵⁶, suggest alternatives to agency-specific outcomes.

⁵² The last national census in Uzbekistan was conducted in 1989.

⁵³ UNDG guidelines recommend no more than five outcome areas in order to allow effective coordination.

⁵⁴ A TOC “... describes the interdependent changes necessary for the country to achieve the 2030 Agenda. The theory of change is a comprehensive articulation of different pathways and choices that illustrate how and why the desired change is expected to happen, and the risks and bottlenecks to be addressed.” UNSDG, *United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Internal Guidance*, June, 2019, p. 17

⁵⁵ The National Action Strategy features five priority areas: (i) governance and public administration, (ii) the rule of law and the judicial system, (iii) economic development and liberalization, (iv) social development and (v) security, tolerance, and foreign policy

⁵⁶ See, for example, the 2017-2020 Bangladesh UNDAF.

41Furthermore, as the blueprint for the UN’s work in Uzbekistan, the UNDAF should also acknowledge and complement the programme strategies of other DPs working there, e.g. the country partnership strategies of the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank⁵⁷, among others. However, the overlapping of some types of interventions by the UN with those of other DPs, for example, in the area of capacity building⁵⁸, indicates that an ecosystem approach was not fully applied in the formulation of the 2016-2020 UNDAF.

2.2 Effectiveness of the UNDAF

In this section, the evaluation considers

- The extent to which planned UNDAF outcomes have been achieved
- To what extent has the UNDAF supported National Development Priorities

2.2.1 Overall Assessment

Finding 5: The UN’s technical and policy advice, advocacy and capacity building interventions have contributed to significant development gains in Uzbekistan in the areas of inclusive economic development, effective governance, environmental sustainability and social development. However, when considered through the lens of its results framework, not all of the UNDAF’s actual results are visible, due to the large percentage of indicators which cannot be measured.

In the last year of the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle, the UN’s technical and policy advice, advocacy and capacity building interventions have contributed to significant development gains in Uzbekistan in the areas of inclusive economic development, effective governance, environmental sustainability and social development. However, as discussed above in section 2.1.1, “UNDAF Design and Its Alignment with National Priorities”, progress towards planned outcomes presented in the UNDAF results framework is mixed: 4% have been achieved, and 40% have been partially achieved. Some 56% have not been achieved or are unmeasurable, due in part to numerous indicators which were either not well-defined or which lacked baselines, and which therefore cannot be measured. Consequently, the UNDAF’s actual achievements have been under-reported due to a results matrix which incompletely captures outcomes.

UNDAF outcomes’ progress is summarized in **Table 3**, below.

The constraints to achievement that were most frequently cited by UN agencies were funding gaps; the paucity of current, accurate data; high Government staff turnover and the re-structuring of government architecture. Funding shortfalls are considered below, in 2.2.6, “Financing”; data quality issues are discussed in 2.2.4, “Monitoring and Evaluation”; and “Coordination” in 2.2.4.

⁵⁷ The World Bank Uzbekistan programme includes 22 projects totaling \$4.08 billion. Its programme focus on economic and institutional reforms, agriculture, health, education, water supply and sanitation, energy, transport, social protection system, and urban development

⁵⁸

2.2.2 2016-2020 UNDAF Results by Strategic Results Areas⁵⁹

Percentages are based primarily on analysis of output indicators and findings, progress reports and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) on outcome progress with Joint UN-GoU RGs during the field mission. There were in total eight outcome areas and 47 outcome indicators which were assessed; the results are presented in **Table 3**, below.

⁵⁹ I appreciate the efforts of Ms. Regina Safarova, the UNDAF National Consultant, for her production of Section 2.2.2, “Key Achievements by Strategic Results Area”, including Table 3, “Progress of Outcome Indicators”, on p. 27: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, Uzbekistan UNDAF evaluation

Table 3
Progress of Outcome indicators⁶⁰

	Outcomes	% Achieved	% Partially Achieved	% Not used in Assessment⁶¹
1	Livelihoods (7 outcome indicators) (18 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 8 indicators (44%)	0 indicators (0%) 8 indicators (44%)	7 indicators (100%) ⁶² 2 indicators (12%)
2	Social Protection 1 (5 outcome indicators) (18 output indicators)	1 indicator (20%) 12 indicators (67%)	2 indicators (40%) 6 indicators (33%)	2 indicators (40%) ⁶³ 0 indicators (0%)
3	Social Protection 2 (3 outcome indicators) (12 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 3 indicators (25%)	3 indicators (100%) 8 indicators (67%)	0 indicators (0%) 1 indicator (8%)
4	Health (5 outcome indicators) (30 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 15 indicators (50%)	1 indicator (20%) 12 indicators (40%)	4 indicators (80%) ⁶⁴ 3 indicators (10%)
5	Education (6 outcome indicators) (28 output indicators)	1 indicator (17%) 13 indicators (46%)	1 indicator (17%) 15 indicators (54%)	4 indicators (66%) ⁶⁵ 0 indicators (0%)
6	Environment (9 outcome indicators) (36 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 22 indicators (61%)	0 indicators (0%) 8 indicators (22%)	9 indicators (100%) ⁶⁶ 6 indicators (17%)
7	Governance 1 (7 outcome indicators) (21 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 10 indicators (48%)	7 indicators (100%) 10 indicators (48%)	0 indicators (0%) 1 indicator (4%)
8	Governance 2 (5 outcome indicators) (21 output indicators)	0 indicators (0%) 5 indicators (24%)	5 indicators (100%) 15 indicators (71%)	0 indicators (0%) 1 indicator (5%)
	Overall outcome achievement (47 indicators) Overall output achievement (184 indicators)	2 indicators (4%) 88 indicators (48%)	19 indicators (40%) 82 indicators (45%)	26 indicators (56%) 14 indicators (7%)

⁶⁰In the 2018-2020 JWPs, the eight UNDAF outcomes have 45 outcome indicators and 219 output indicators.

⁶¹Not measurable due to the lack of baseline, target or type of data sought

⁶² 1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 1.4; 1.5; 1.6; 1.7

⁶³ 2.2; 2.3

⁶⁴ 4.2; 4.3; 4.4; 4.5

⁶⁵ 5.1; 5.4; 5.5; 5.6

⁶⁶ 6.1; 6.2; 6.3; 6.4; 6.5; 6.6; 6.7; 6.8; 6.9

Outcome 1 LIVELIHOODS (Government Lead: Ministry of Economy; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)

1. SUPPORT TO SDGs LOCALIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Analytical and consultative support provided to the **adoption of national SDG targets and indicators** by the resolution “On measures to Implement the National Goals and Targets in the Field of Sustainable Development for the Period Until 2030” (16 national SDGs and 125 targets, and setting oversight, monitoring and data mechanisms). The assessment and recommendations of SDG MAPS mission (April 23-27, 2018) done and national **web-portal on SDG monitoring** launched at www.nsdg.stat.uz

2. PUBLIC FINANCE REFORMS AND FISCAL TRANSPARENCY

Citizens Budget and a series of infographics on budget and extra budgetary funds indicators published, Draft Strategy of Reforms of Public Finance Management for 2017-2025 submitted for consideration. Draft Concept of transition to medium-term budgeting, as well as strengthening the internal control system developed and submitted to MoF. Analytical support provided to the Concept of the Pension System Reform with **assessment of the revenue and expenditure scenarios of the State Pension Fund**.

3. SUPPORT TO ENABLING BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

Legislation on Authorized Economic Operators aimed at simplification of foreign trade procedures drafted, also National Global G.A.P. (good agricultural practices) standards, which are prerequisite for access to foreign markets, adopted. **Legal gap analysis on WTO requirements conducted** with trainings on tariff offer on goods and obligations on services implemented and support to export contracts worth more than 250 mln USD (international exhibitions Fruit Logistica, World Food Moscow, etc.) provided. **Investment guides** for select regions developed and **investment forums facilitated**. Support in developing and introducing of “**single window**” system for rendering public services to businesses resulted in 194 Single Window Centers in regions set up, public services offered on ‘single window’ principle from 16 to 34 increased. Building on their positive impact, the “Single window” centers for businesses have **been transformed into Public Service Centers** providing more than 100 services (up from 33 in 2017). New online business registration service developed and launched and **Uzbekistan is placed at 12th position in Doing Business 2019** ranking for this indicator.

4. ENHANCING LIVELIHOODS IN RURAL AREAS

Comprehensive **Needs Assessment** of the population in the Aral Sea region conducted and additional resources of **more than USD 2 mln. mobilized to support the Aral Sea region** with Government inputs of USD 500,000 and Donor funds of USD 520,000, and parallel financing of USD 1.075 mln. directed by UNICEF. 33 small infrastructure projects are finalized (7 projects underway) to benefit 21,191 rural people (51,3% women) in 33 communities to improve access to safe drinking water, electricity and improved schools and pre-school facilities with 22 inclusive business projects launched, creating over 96 (51 females) new jobs in such areas as bee farming, sewing and crafts development, food and milk processing, bakery, etc. In total 18,000 rural people directly and indirectly benefit from business projects, and an online population database of the Aral Sea Region developed (Republic of Karakalpakstan, Khoresm and Bukhara regions). **Investment Guide** to Karakalpakstan published and **Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund** for the Aral Sea region in Uzbekistan successfully established.

5. The Government has intensified its cooperation with the ILO in the areas of employment, informal economy and labour inspection. Formulation of National Employment Strategy 2025 launched.
6. The ILO and the Government have initiated and are implementing a comprehensive training and capacity building program for the national Public Employment Services (PES). A functional analysis of

PES, provided by the ILO, supports the program. The vision is to reform the PES so it provides innovative and inclusive services to the population, in strong and effective partnerships with employers and workers organisations and educational institutions.

7. Addressing position of women in the labour market is high in the Government's agenda is supported by ILO through legal, policy and assessment of institutional practices vis-à-vis gender equality in labour market and social protection.

Constraints to the achievements of results under this outcome include reorganization of key national partners and the lack of disaggregated data⁶⁷.

Table "Progress of outcome indicators" (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that all 7 outcome indicators have baseline information but don't have targets' information. That's why 100% of them are considered as not measurable. At the same time only 12% of outputs' indicators are considered not measurable.

The cause is that the State Statistics Committee (SSC) doesn't have needed data. There is important to integrate UN data base with the local data base. It's important to build institutional capacity of SSC, including through improving skills of employees.

The local banks provide small quantity of services and it also blocks opportunities for developing finance sector⁶⁸.

Outcomes 2 and 3 SOCIAL PROTECTION (Government Lead: Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (previous Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population)/Ministry of Finance; Lead UN Agency: UNICEF)

The 2013 CCA identified lack of inclusive and secure components as well as guarantees of rights of social protection – social assistance benefits, social insurance, and social services.

Comprehensive social protection assessment has been conducted by UNICEF, ILO and World Bank to analyze these issues and more. In addition, UN(ICEF) has done extensive quantitative analysis of the impacts of social protection system on children and young people.

The UN completed a comprehensive situations analysis on People with Disabilities.

A number of analysis done is helpful and should be continued to be on track on social protection issues which are very sensitive.

Related to this, child care reform, particularly deinstitutionalization of children with disabilities and children without parental care, is paramount. There is no a comprehensive approach on the issue of gender-based violence (trafficking, early marriages, and domestic violence) with relevant missing legislative gaps. A demand exists for substantial development of the social work profession. A clear need also exists to invest in relevant delivery mechanisms, institutional capacity, and information management systems. Without this, the efficiency and delivery of social protection benefits and services will be weak.

Key results and achievements include Social protection system assessed and recommendations done on **social allowances for children, institutional reform of the social protection system, single registry** (an

⁶⁷Livelihoods Results Group meeting 20 September 2019.

⁶⁸SDG Working Group and Data and M&E Group Focus Group Discussion 12 September 2019.

MIS pilot digitizing end-to-end processes in administering means-tested social assistance benefits), child care reform proposals developed, deinstitutionalization of child care launched, **U-report - digital platform for youth engagement** applied (an integrated youth participation platform with about 27000 U-reporters), social work strengthened, **study on children affected by migration** conducted, violence prevention and response and pension system reforms supported. The single registry project should become a foundation and enabler for further restructuring and reforms in this area. The laws on children rights and women's rights are accepted⁶⁹.

Comprehensive study/assessment of the national social protection system of Uzbekistan (CODI) is seen as a major evidence generation as well as a nationwide household survey "Listening to Citizens of Uzbekistan".

Due to advocacy through UNDAF SP RG, 2019 State Programme includes an item on creating a specialized state agency on social protection. UNICEF is supporting the Government in designing the concept of the agency and identifying its structure, main functions and responsibilities. Funding was mobilized from Joint SDG Fund to support the work in this area.

Besides, the UN Joint Programme on Social Protection and securing funding from SDG Fund developed (UNICEF, ILO and UNDP), the UN Joint Programme on Youth for further resource mobilization also was developed, and nationally representative survey on youth aspirations, needs and risks to inform UN Joint Programme on Youth and government policies and programmes prepared.

Constraints to the achievements of results under this outcome include the absence of one responsible state body to work on social protection and/or lack of common vision/strategy.

Table "Progress of outcome indicators" (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that Social Protection 1 and Social Protection 2 have 8 outcome indicators all together with 2 indicators considered as not measurable (25%). At the same time only one from 30 outputs' indicators is considered not measurable (about 3%).

Critical changes in Social Protection are possible because of political will of the GoU, good and strong partnership relations between UN Agencies and the state bodies, and dedication of UN Agencies' staff to their work. The civil society organizations are not well included into the work on social protection⁷⁰. This situation happens because of weak capacities of civil society⁷¹ in Uzbekistan.

Outcome 4 HEALTH (Government Lead: Ministry of Health; Lead UN Agency: UNFPA)

The 2013 CCA identified quality improvement a priority challenge for the health system. The lack of a strategic vision on quality improvement, together with weak capacity for quality management and tackling issues connected with health statistics, are addressed in this outcome.

New National Health Agenda launched: **NATIONAL HEALTH CONCEPT 2019-2025** on the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Measures for Cardinal Improvement of the Healthcare and Social Security System of the Republic of Uzbekistan Concept On Development Of The Health System.

High Level Policy Forum on Health Financing conducted to discuss National Health financing strategy and road map, NCD prevention and control **Concept and Action plan** prepared, the New Law on restricting water-pipe and electronic nicotine delivery devices adopted, the **National State Programme on Mental**

⁶⁹ Social Protection Results Group Meeting September 17, 2019

⁷⁰ ibid

⁷¹ ibid

Health and Suicide Prevention and Management adopted and started, cervical cancer prevention and control started with HPV immunization, piloting screening programmes, further diagnostics, treatment and palliative care. Since 2002, TB case notification two times and mortality to three times decreased, **malaria free certification 2018** received, special focus on newborn care⁷², early child development and adolescent health applied. The cold chain infrastructure and cold chain capacity at regional and district levels and cold chain equipment upgraded comprehensively. UNODC-WHO “International Standards for the Treatment of Drug Use Disorders” and “International Standards on **Drug Use Prevention**” introduced, **Health Supportive Environment in schools** implementation started, focus on regions to reduce disparities and quality improvement applied.

Changes to the Law on AIDS included, the Decree on TB prepared, +\$3 mln were attracted additionally. Besides, \$10 mln will be added from the GoU⁷³.

The quantity of outcome indicators was reconsidered and decreased from 11 in 2017 to 5 in 2018-2020. Table “Progress of outcome indicators” (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that 80% of outcome indicators are not measurable for now⁷⁴ and only 10% of outputs’ indicators are considered not measurable either.

Constraints to the achievements of results under this outcome include obsolete statistics data and the lack of reliable data and thus too ambitious achievements were planned⁷⁵. Uzbekistan is at the first place on the death because of heart attack. One of the causes of the problem is smoking. The problem can’t be resolved only by social advertisement on healthy life-style (as Uzbekistan does). More strong and sustainable partnership between the GoU and civil society organizations will lead to early identification of people infected with AIDs. Not enough attention is paid at the unhealthy products⁷⁶. More explanatory work for population, support for cardiologic centers can be resulted in behavior corrections of population.

Outcome 5 EDUCATION (Government Lead: Ministry of Public Education; Lead UN Agency: UNESCO)

The 2013 CCA identified unsatisfactory access and quality to inclusive early childhood education, and to robust and regular data and statistics for planning. There is a need for strong management policy, code of ethics, and improvement of teachers’ training. Further improvement of the school environment for healthy and equitable learning opportunities in mainstream education at all levels will need to cover children and young people with particular vulnerabilities, such as children with disabilities and those living with HIV. There exists a need for further improvement of monitoring and evaluation at all levels of education. This may include enhancing the standardization of education statistics and the capacities of policymakers to develop indicators for decision making. The process for enhancing the national capacities on education data collection and analysis, including set-up of the sector-wide Education Management Information System (EMIS) for evidence-based education policy making in the public education sector has been initiated starting with the scoping mission in November 2019 with the goal of designing costed technical documentation for further improvement of the EMIS.

⁷² Helping baby breath skill has been scaled up nationwide and lead to a big reduction of newborn death caused by asphyxia. District health system strengthen approach is piloted in the country. This approach is not only applied in maternal and child survival interventions, but also in other health areas. Validation of elimination mother to child transmission of HIV/syphilis starts. The largest National Nutrition Survey is completed which is the first time to provide regional-representative data.

⁷³Health Results Group meeting 17 September 2019.

⁷⁴ Though the Health Results Group declared that at least 4 from 5 outcome indicators are realistic to be achieved within this UNDAF period

⁷⁵ ibid

⁷⁶ ibid

1. EDUCATION POLICIES

Education Sectoral Plan of Uzbekistan **for 2019-2023** endorsed, Law on Education reviewed and updated, in-depth TVET Review conducted with actionable strategies for further improvement of the TVET System, review on “Employment issues in Uzbekistan: current situation, problems and possible solutions” conducted. Thematic studies and policy reviews on Inclusive Education Policy Review, International experiences on Public-Private Partnership (PPP) models for expanding preschool education; and mobilizing additional resources for expanding quality pre-school education, National Assessment Study on Learning levels of children conducted.

2. EDUCATION PROGRAMMES AND TEACHERS

A process of curriculum review and update towards competency development, **including early Learning Development Standards (ELDS)** launched, **Gender mainstreaming** in teacher education focused, Programmes related to life-skills, healthy lifestyle, disaster preparedness and response, skills for global citizenship and sustainable development, **prevention drug-use, crime, violence and bullying promoted**, teacher policy review conducted, and development of **teacher professional standard in process**, the **launch of a robust data collection system**, Education Management Information System (EMIS) supported, Guide on ICT competency assessment of teachers developed.

The results achieved with advance, other finances more than \$11 mln attracted, standards of preschool education, alternative models of education, obligatory preschool preparation, and development of evaluation indicator under development⁷⁷.

Table “Progress of outcome indicators” (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that Education has 6 outcome indicators with 4 (66%) considered as not measurable. At the same time none of 28 outputs’ indicators is considered as not measurable. Constraints for achievements in the education are no publicly available data on access to education for children living with HIV, the lack of an integrated functional Education Management and Information System, the closure of the organizations of national partners.

Outcome 6 ENVIRONMENT (Government Lead: State Nature Protection Committee; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)

The 2013 CCA identified needs in a comprehensive natural resource management policy; the principles of sustainable natural resource use, particularly climate change and biodiversity concerns, should be integrated into policymaking, legislation and institutions, to ensure water, energy and food security. Lack of inter-sectoral coordination and policymaking further hampers effectiveness of natural resource management policies. Particular attention will need to be given to issues of rapid urbanization (housing and transport), and industrial development growth, which are bringing about challenges of increasing atmospheric air pollution in cities that will affect the urban population. Agriculture development also brings high risks of environment challenges’ aggravation

1. LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT

Efficient use of water resources in **reduction of water loss** in pilot Water User Associations in Syrdarya and Samarkand regions **by 30%** (to 10,000 m³/ha/year from 12,500 m³/per/ha/year) due to improved water distribution and metering, **reconstruction of two canals, renovation/construction of 9 hydro posts, use of drip irrigation by 35 households**, Water sector capacity building Programme drafted, 5 training

⁷⁷Education Results Group meeting 18 September 2019

modules developed, **1,444 water specialists and water users** (63 women), and 122 community members enhanced knowledge on water management/planning skills.

Sustainable Land and Pasture use. Integrated Land Use Management Planning piloted in Bukhara and Jizzakh (on **3,600 ha**), **32,000 ha** of pasture vegetation cover in arid zones improved, **10 desert wells renovated** and allowed the rehabilitation of **67,000 ha** of pastures, Draft **Law "On pastures"** developed and discussions supported (Law adopted in May 2019), Formulation of Uzbekistan's **Agriculture development Strategy** supported.

2. BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION.

Finalization of the **National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)** for 2019-2028 supported and adopted in June 2019, **Programme and Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation and Snow Leopard Research and Monitoring Programme** drafted, **3** nurseries (**4 ha**) in western Tian-Shan and Pamir Alai mountain ecosystems for restoration of forests established, process for designation of the Lower Amudarya State Biosphere Reserve (NABR) to the World Network of Biosphere Reserve is in progress.

3. SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Environmental Performance review of Uzbekistan undertaken, National Expert Group meeting organized to enhance capacity for assessing industrial safety and develop national action plans **to access the Industrial Accidents Convention** with following a joint workshop in Tashkent, the draft **Law on environmental impact assessment** prepared, Uzbekistan's signing to the Stockholm **Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)** supported⁷⁸.

4. MITIGATION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARAL SEA DISASTER.

Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund for the Aral Sea region in Uzbekistan (MPHSTF) launched (73rd session of UN GA on 27.11.2018), capitalized and is operational Network of **10 meteo stations in Karakalpakstan automated, Drought Early Warning System (DEWS)** in Karakalpakstan launched to increase the climate resilience of **5,963 people** (20% women) in rural communities of 5 pilot districts through real-time weather monitoring and water availability forecast (with lead-time of **3 months and 70-100% validity**), **10 pasture cooperatives (43.5 ths people)** established in 4 pilot districts with female-focus community groups (**15,918 women**) dealing with pasture rehabilitation and management at **15,507 h**, Technical capacity of the Karakalpakstan **regional Department of Forestry strengthened** through supply of tractors and forest plantation equipment.

UN Joint Programme "Building the resilience of communities affected by the Aral Sea disaster through a Multi-Partner Human Security Fund for the Aral Sea" (2019-2019, donor: UNTFHS, 180,000 USD for UNESCO). Aimed at mitigating the inter-connected risks to Human Security and Building the resilience of communities affected by the Aral Sea Disaster through an integrated and multi-level approach and ensuring sustainable support through the establishment of a Multi-Partner Human security Fund for the Aral Sea. It was also aimed to strengthen the livelihoods and increase the income generating opportunities through the development of sustainable tourism and traditional craftsmanship in Karakalpakstan as well as use and management of natural resources of the region.

5. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

21 energy efficient and low-carbon housing designs adopted for construction under the national Affordable Rural Housing Programme for 2019-2021, **3 building codes** with stricter thermal performance requirements (by 30%) developed, adopted and are **mandatory effective** since 2 January 2019, a sound

⁷⁸ President of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev signed a Law "On ratification of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants" (<http://www.uzdaily.com/en/post/49656>). [The Convention is signed and ratified](#)

ground for the **Presidential Decree** in 2018 **mandating energy efficiency and use of renewable energy in new housing construction** in Uzbekistan.

Addressing the urgent human insecurities in the Aral Sea region through promoting sustainable rural development (2020 – 2021, donor: Governments of Uzbekistan and Norway, 150,000 USD for UNESCO). It aims to address environmental, social and economic insecurities in the most vulnerable communities of the Aral Sea region through bringing comprehensive solutions in addressing the environmental issues, promoting access to basic services, improving the living standards and sustainable tourism development. UN Joint Programme on Sustaining Livelihoods Affected by the Aral Sea Disaster (2012 – 2015, donor: UNTFHS, USD 347,322 for UNESCO). Within the programme UNESCO contributes to improving the economic and social well-being of the communities through the crafts industries and sustainable tourism based on cultural and natural assets in Karakalpakstan. In particular, the project promoted tourism itineraries, overnight accommodation, production and sale of handicrafts, development of guidebooks and capacity building of tourism professionals. One feature was the development of yurt camps demonstrating effective energy use via solar panels and innovative water purification techniques.

Drafting of the Cabinet of Ministers Resolution on **Strategy for the implementation of the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction for 2019-2030** in the Republic of Uzbekistan supported, National level training on implementation of the Sendai Action Plan provided to the members of the State Emergency Response System, Incorporation of **Disaster Risk Reduction and Safe Behavior into school curriculum** is being discussed with the Ministries of public of education and of emergency situations.

An Agricultural Strategy of FAO for the whole country exists, the volume of water for flowing from 12500 per hectare till 10000 decreased, water management projects supported. A law on renewed energy adopted, private business attracted to this sphere, a new Atomic Electricity Station is to be built, a center to inform population about coming natural disaster established, extra \$11 mln for safeguard and preserving natural and cultural heritage mobilized from Islamic Bank as well⁷⁹.

Constraints to the outcome on Environment are the lack of accurate and precise information (reflected at the outcome 6.4 defining non-irrigated land as 30% while in reality it was 35 – 40%) and reorganization in the state bodies (recent establishment of the Ministry of Energy).

Rapid changes in Uzbekistan (adoption of the law on renewed energy, plans of the GoU to attract private business to this sphere and to build a new Atomic Electricity Station) urge the UNDAF to be more flexible and dedicated simultaneously.

Again the table “Progress of outcome indicators” (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that all Environment outcomes’ indicators (100%) are not considered as measurable. Along with this only 17% of outputs’ indicators (6 from 36) are not considered as measurable. At the same time participants of the Results Group meeting declared about accessibility of almost all outcomes’ indicators.

Outcomes 7 and 8 GOVERNANCE (Government Lead: Ministry of Development of Information Technologies and communications of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)

The 2013 CCA identified Uzbekistan’s needs in public administration reform (including e-governance); civil society development; promotion of child-sensitive justice systems and evidence-based, equitable decision making for child interests at all levels; HIV prevention and treatment; and social inclusion of persons with disabilities and marginalized groups. Also media self-regulation, media-related policies and legislation,

⁷⁹ Environment Results Group meeting

and capacities of journalists in quality reporting should be strengthened. r. In addition, it is required to strengthen national law enforcement capacities to gather and analyze drug-related data.

Besides, methodology of conducting user satisfaction developed and conducted in civil courts; e-justice system has been rolled out throughout country; methodology on use of UN human rights instruments in court decisions developed.

Key results and achievements include **Draft Law on Civil Service and policy** advice on public administration and public services developed, joint advocacy on e-governance reform and technical assistance in digitization of public services conducted, **“Citizens’ Budget 2018”** and **“Citizens’ Budget – draft Budget 2019”** issued, capacity building of journalists and mass media strengthened, 12 STEM events organized, **MICS 6** in order to fill the existing data gaps and provide an update on the key indicators on situation of children and women initiated, capacity building on **population census and the Population forecasts for Uzbekistan 2018-2050** activated, innovative programmes to engage youth into development activities (**DIGIGIRLZ UZBEKISTAN, Women Techmakers IWD Tashkent 2018, Google DevFest 2018, Open Data Challenge 2018, SDG Innovations and Governance Lab under the Ministry of Innovative Development**) implemented. Besides, Concept of administrative reform, law “On mediation”, Laws on gender equality and on gender-based violence, the e-court system in all civil courts of Uzbekistan were introduced as well as the State program on anticorruption was adopted.

Also recommendations to the **Draft Law “On prevention of domestic violence”** and Law On equal rights of men and women developed, joint advocacy with the national authorities in ratifying outstanding human rights treaties (**the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture - OPCAT** conducted, a long-term **Strategy of Juvenile Justice System Reform in Uzbekistan** drafted, technical support to national counterparts in drafting new civil and economic procedural codes, justice sector legislation, “On Mediation”, on drug control provided, a specialized approach to child victims and witnesses of crimes provided, support for adoption of the draft **law on Children Ombudsperson** provided, extended meeting to oversee the progress of implementation of the **National Plan of Actions** to address key CRC recommendations facilitated, a **CEDAW NAP** implementation monitoring exercise organized, and public consultations on the 6-th Periodic Report to CEDAW held; public consultations on the UPR action plan organized and inputs from UNCT provided; comments to the draft law on Free Legal Aid provided, and public consultations on the draft law supported jointly with the Chamber of Lawyers; capacity assessment of the Ombudsman office carried out and public report launched, with several recommendations from the report eventually implemented in law and in practice, including vesting the Ombuds Office with torture prevention mandate and clear steps towards establishing a national preventive mechanism; Comments on the draft law on rallies, meetings and demonstrations were shared with the Government highlighting concerns with regard to restrictive draft provisions; policy support to the Interagency **Commission on Combatting Corruption** provided and a series of public awareness raising events on anti-corruption co-organized. The UNCT provided support to two visits of the UN Special Procedures: the SR on FORB in 2017 and the SR on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers in 2019. UN supported holding of the Samarkand Asian Human Rights Forum which was an important breakthrough in terms in terms of providing access to Uzbekistan to human rights defenders from all Central Asian countries and international human rights NGOs. Promoting of the HRBA to data collection and awareness raising about human rights indicators and their important role in monitoring and reporting on human rights in the country were conducted.

The ILO has been monitoring the cotton harvest for child labour since 2013. In 2015, it began monitoring the harvest for forced labour and child labour as part of an agreement with the World Bank.

The ILO Third-Party Monitoring project facilitates dialogue between human rights activists and the Ministry of Employment and Labour and social partners. The dialogue process began in 2017 and has

continued to evolve in 2018-2019. Today, the civil society activists are monitoring alongside ILO experts and participate actively in government processes⁸⁰.

National commission on combating human trafficking and forced labor established in 2019.

Constraints to the achievements of results under these outcomes include the lack of regular, reliable and disaggregated official data across sectors and levels, weak capacity of officials to analyze data in line with internationally accepted standards and norms, and high level of turnover.

Table 3 “Progress of outcome indicators” (based on JWP 2018 – 2020) shows that Governance 1 and Governance 2 have 12 outcome indicators all together with zero indicators considered not measurable. And only 2 from 42 outputs’ indicators (5%) are considered not measurable. It demonstrates the importance of these spheres for the GoU and its willingness and capacities to deal with it.

In the whole national partners trust to UN Agencies and are willing to continue joint work. International partners value the UN contacts and partnerships with the GoU.

Along with this more responsibility and ownership should be transferred to the GoU.

2.2. Coordination

- How effectively has the UNDAF been managed?

Finding 6: Although the UNCT has put in place the requisite UNDAF coordination architecture, these structures vary in their effectiveness and efficiency.

2.2.1 High Level UNDAF Governance and Coordination Structures

Strategic decisions on UNDAF-related issues are made at the highest level jointly by the UNDAF Steering Committee (SC), which is co-chaired by the MoE and the UNCT, which is led by the UN Resident Coordinator (UN RC).

The SC was established to provide overall coordination between the UN system and the GoU for the realization of the UNDAF. The general membership of the SC is comprised of representatives from Government and the UN; no other national stakeholders are included in the SC. The full SC membership meets on an annual basis.

2.2.2 UN System Support to the UNDAF

Within the UN system, the UNCT has overall responsibility for the delivery of UNDAF results. The Operations Management Team (OMT) and the UN Communications Group (UNCG) also support UNDAF coordination and cohesion. Both of these groups report directly to the UNCT. The OMT and UNCG provide the foundations for the “One Office” and “One Voice” Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) of the DaO, respectively, and they are therefore both intended to be UNDAF enablers.⁸¹

⁸⁰ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_681372.pdf

⁸¹ The GTG, SDG TG, M&EDG support activities under the UNDAF in Uzbekistan but are not specifically part of the global DaO SOPs/UNDAF enablers. These groups are therefore referenced separately under sections 2.1.3. “Programming Principles”, 2.1.4, “Crosscutting Issues”, and 2.2.4, “Monitoring and Evaluation”.

The table below summarizes the membership and meeting frequency of the UNCT, OMT and UNCG:

Table 4

Management Tier	Membership	Meeting Frequency
UNCT	Heads of UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes accredited in Uzbekistan	Monthly
OMT	Heads of Administration Operations and/or alternatives designated by the HoAs of the UN Agencies resident in Uzbekistan	Quarterly
UNCG	Communication Officers of UN agencies	Monthly

The OMT was established in November 2017 by the UNCT with the aim of increasing the efficiency, and reducing the operational and transaction costs associated with the implementation of the UNDAF and leveraging economies of scale in negotiation power, including the preparation of the Business Operations Strategy (BOS).⁸² The OMT has since realized cost savings in a number of support service areas, e.g. ICT through the use of a common data server; events coordination: and translation services through the creation of a common roster, among others; and it is currently exploring options for a common UN premises. It developed and launched a BOS in 2018. However, it has not yet been possible to harmonize all business operations; and the current lack of UN common premises somewhat limits the efficiency gains made through shared services. The OMT, in collaboration with the RGs and the UNCG, is expected to contribute to the development of the UNDAF’s Common Budgetary Framework (CBF).⁸³

The UNCG is intended to act as the focal point for communication within the UN system. Through its Communications Strategy, it is also intended to act as the “One Voice” on the UN and UNDAF results to Government and other external partners, thereby supporting financing and partnership efforts. The UNCG is also mandated to raise public awareness about the UN and its support to Uzbekistan’s development priorities. A key focus of the UNCG activities is raising awareness among both national stakeholders and the general public on the SDGs⁸⁴.

Towards these objectives, the UNCG has well-leveraged both traditional and innovative social media platforms; the latter efforts resulted in a 28% increase in the number of subscribers of Facebook and 10% increase in the number of followers on Twitter page of UN in Uzbekistan⁸⁵. The UNCG has also worked with non-traditional partners, for example, with local religious leaders, to raise awareness on issues which

⁸² United Nations Uzbekistan, *Operations Management Team Terms of Reference*, p. 1

⁸³The CBF provides an all-inclusive overview of the UNDAF’s required, available and anticipated financing, as well as any funding gaps. It is an integral element of the UNDAF JWPs. In the new UNSDCF, the CBF will be replaced by a broader, more holistic Funding Framework, although the means of calculating the cooperation framework budget and funding gaps appears to essentially remain the same: *Guide UNSDCF, pp.22-23, 2019*

⁸⁴ National stakeholders also indicated to the evaluators that they expected that the UN would raise awareness of the SDGs in regions of the country beyond Tashkent: stakeholder FGDS

⁸⁵

are still considered to be somewhat sensitive, such as domestic violence⁸⁶; and it has extended its efforts beyond Uzbekistan in its collaborations with international media⁸⁷. Moreover, although some agencies have dedicated communications officers or focal points, who focus on agency-specific areas of interest and who are also UNCG members, the collaborative support offered by the UNCG to communication on the UN Aral Sea JP, including its MPHSTF, has demonstrated its credibility as the UN's One Voice.

The UNRCO is intended to serve as a One Stop Shop for information about the UNDAF, as well as to support the functions of the RC. It also supports UNDAF coordination as the liaison between the UNCT, the GoU, civil society and funders. UNRCO staffing currently consists of an acting interim Head of Office; an analyst; a communications officer, an administrative assistant and an international UNV. As of this writing, the RCO is not fully staffed, and it is therefore stretched to carry out all of its expected duties. For example, the RCO is unable to fully support the strengthened resource mobilization role envisaged of the RC, as the Development Coordination Officer role is vacant.

The UNRCO chairs the UN M&EDG, as well as co-chairs the Joint UN – Government UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group. It conducts various UNDAF-related M&E activities, e.g. it provided oversight to this evaluation of the UNDAF. UNRCO support to UNDAF knowledge management (KM) includes recording and archiving the minutes of meetings of the UNCT. However, it does not record or archive the minutes of the RGs; these are produced by the RGs' co-chairs. Collecting these and other UNDAF-related documents which are not stored in the UNINFO system would strengthen RCO's KM role.

2.2.3 Meso-Level UNDAF Coordination Structures

At the implementation level, a Results Group (RG) was established for each UNDAF results areas. The RGs are intended to be responsible for the operationalization of the UNDAF. Each RG is co-chaired by the lead UN agency's Head of Agency (HoA) and by a ministerial level official from the lead Government body for that outcome (see above, **Table 1, "UNDAF Results Groups and their UN/Government Co-chairs"**). The RGs report to the UNCT through their respective UN agency co-chairs.

It is notable that one agency (UNDP) co-chairs three RGs; and the evaluators were advised that UNDP is increasingly stretched to meet its growing RG responsibilities. At present, UNDP does not share its RG tasks with any other UN agency co-chairs, nor are there any rotating co-chairs.

According to their ToRs, the Joint RGs are intended to meet quarterly⁸⁸. The evaluators were advised that the RGs meet less frequently for UNDAF-related matters, but that they now convene more often on SDG-related work, for example, for the identification of SDG indicators relevant to their specific RGs.

The RGs confirmed to the evaluators that they record the minutes of their meetings. However, those minutes are not automatically shared with the RCO, although RCO is intended to be a repository for UNDAF-related documentation as part of its knowledge management function. Consequently, the evaluators did not receive any RG minutes, which were intended to inform their stakeholder KIIs and FGDs, before those discussions.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ UNCT Report 2018, p. 13; evaluation FGD with UNCG, 20 September.

⁸⁷ Evaluation FGD with UNCG, 20 September; see also UNCT Report 2018, op. cit., ibid.

⁸⁸ TOR for Joint Results Groups, July 2018.

⁸⁹ Two sets of RG minutes were subsequently sent to the evaluation team.

The evaluators also found that while the understanding of UNDAF mechanisms and processes was good among national Steering Committee members and some of the other macro level stakeholders interviewed, it was uneven among the Government line ministry staff who participated in the evaluation's Joint RG focus group discussions. National counterparts' variable understanding of and participation in UNDAF-related activities is at least partially due to a high rate of Government staff turnover, and summary briefings for GoU staff on UNDAF processes at the beginning of each RG meeting to address this has not been provided to them by their UN counterparts. Such briefings could also increase UNDAF ownership by national stakeholders.

2.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

Finding 7: The absence of a ToC and the high percentage of unmeasurable indicators in the UNDAF results framework reflects an incomplete understanding of results-based management among programme and M&E staff.

A UN inter-agency M&E and Data Group (M&EDG) was established to develop the M&E strategy for this UNDAF. Among its other tasks, the M&EDG led the process of successfully incorporating SDG targets into the UNDAF results framework. However, the evaluation found an incomplete understanding of RBM principles among UN respondents, and this is reflected in the UNDAF results matrix, for example, in the lack of an overarching UNDAF ToC⁹⁰ and in the high percentage of unmeasurable indicators. It is understood that UN staff had previously received RBM training through the PSG but, noting agency staff turnovers, such training should be offered on a regular, annual basis. Moreover, the development of a complex, multi-layered UNDAF ToC which reflects joined up approaches, rather than agency mandates, will require guidance from an external expert.

2.2.6 Partnerships

Finding 8: The UN has a strong, long-standing relationship with Government; and it has well-leveraged this partnership to successfully advocate for, among others, SDG localization and the social protection single unit. However, its alliances with other expected UNDAF partners, including civil society and the private sector, should be strengthened to further ensure national ownership.

Partners in the UNDAF process in Uzbekistan include the UN, the GoU, DPs, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and media; the private sector is represented by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry⁹¹. According to the UNDG *Guidelines*, it is expected that national ownership in the UNDAF will be ensured during its formulation through the inclusion and participation of all of these stakeholders.

The UN's long-standing partnership with Government is one of its comparative strengths. GoU and other DP respondents interviewed for this evaluation concurred that the UN is well-respected by Government, particularly for its neutrality and strong technical expertise, especially on normative issues. Moreover, the UN has well-leveraged its partnership with Government to successfully advocate for, among others, SDG localization and the social protection single unit, and there is a good potential for the UN to further leverage its partnership with Government to catalyze other partnerships in, for example, South-South

⁹⁰ There was, for example, some lack of clarity about the difference between a ToC, or "transformation strategy", and a programme objective: FGDs

cooperation (see 5.2.7, “Financing”). (The partnership between the UN and the GoU is also referenced above, in 2.2.4, “Coordination”.)

However, the UN’s partnership with other expected local partners in the UNDAF could be strengthened. For example, it appears that the involvement of civil society in the formulation of the current UNDAF was nominal⁹². It also does not appear that any private sector actors, such as workers and employers’ organizations, were consulted⁹³; nor is there currently an UNDAF-wide strategy for partnering with the private sector (see also below, 2.2.7, “Financing”). However, it is understood that the UNCT will convene consultation workshops with both CSO/NGOs and business during the forthcoming UNSDCF formulation⁹⁴.

Local partnership in and ownership of the UNDAF might also be improved through the inclusion of representatives from both the private sector and from civil society in relevant RGs, either as permanent or as ad hoc RG members, in the upcoming UNSDCF.

2.2.7 Financing

Finding 9: Due to the lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies, there are inconsistencies in the items included in their budget reporting; and this hinders the precise calculation of UNDAF budget gaps and of non-executed funds. Harmonization is an issue which requires resolution at the headquarters level.

Finding 10: The resource gaps in most of the UNDAF outcome areas, save in Health and Governance, appear significant; and it is both timely and relevant for the UN to explore additional financing for the remaining UNDAF cycle and the forthcoming UNSDCF beyond its traditional donors, through non-traditional donors, South-South Cooperation, Islamic finance, the private sector and other forms of multi-stakeholder partnerships.

The original funding requirement for the 2016-2020 UNDAF was \$144.9 million⁹⁵. The current UNDAF document does not include details on its financing, nor is there an explicit Resource Mobilization Strategy for the 2016-2020 UNDAF.

The current UNDAF’s effectiveness as a financing platform is uneven: it has been effective in the mobilization of funds towards, among others, the Joint UN Aral Sea Programme, including its MPHSTF, which includes support from Norway, Japan and the GoU, as well as for the development of the UN Joint Programme on Social Protection from the SDG Fund. Additional funding through the UNDAF includes support from the Global Alliance for Vaccine and Immunization (GAVI) for UNICEF and WHO to jointly support the Ministry of Health in implementing the GAVI Health System Strengthening (HSS) Grant⁹⁶; as well as a \$2.6 million grant for AVRs from the GFATM.

⁹² NGO FGD

⁹³ The CCI is not itself a private sector entity but a government organization which acts as an apex organization for the national private sector.

⁹⁴ Uzbekistan UNRCO, *New Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (SDCF) Roadmap* September 2019.

⁹⁵ 2016-2020 UNDAF, p. 90

⁹⁶ This intervention aims to strengthen cold chain capacity by improving infrastructure, upgrading equipment and training staff

However, beyond joint programming, much of the financing for other activities under the UNDAF has been agency-driven, and the evaluators were informed by respondents that the UN agencies often do not present as One when meeting with DPs about resource mobilization.⁹⁷

During the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle, the budget information for UN programming was collected by individual agency, as per the UN Development Cooperation Office (DCO) guidance for UN country teams; and it was subsequently consolidated by UNDAF outcome area by the RCO. However, due to the lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies, there are inconsistencies in the items included in their budget reporting, e.g. some agencies' reports may include operational costs and others not. As DCO does not currently provide any agency-specific advice⁹⁸, agencies are referred to their regional and HQ offices for guidance on UNDAF budget reporting. As the harmonization of business processes has not yet been realized, the issue of inconsistency in agencies' UNDAF budget reporting is yet to resolved.

While it is understood that the Uzbekistan UNCT intends to address this issue in the upcoming UNSDCF cycle, the mechanics of financial data collection should be agreed upon and actioned at the HQ level in order to avoid the challenges of consolidation at the country level.

The table below summarizes the UNDAF budget, funds disbursed and apparent funding gaps by outcome, based on information provided to the evaluators. The amounts mobilized or secured are uncertain; it is also not clear if the total planned delivery columns include carried over, or non-executed, funds.⁹⁹

Budget and Estimated Funding Gaps as of July 2019
(In USD)¹⁰⁰
(TBC)

UNDAF Outcome	Original UNDAF Budget USD	Total planned delivery 2016-2018	Total actual delivery 2016-2018	Total planned delivery 2016-2019	Estimated Gap as % of Budget As of end 2019
Outcome 1	26,735,000	6,498,735.00	3,809,286.00	5,177,546.00	80.7%
Outcome 2	5,800,000	1,008,640.25	890,759.75	1,397,054.50	76.0%
Outcome 3	4,750,000	369,523.20	840,476.80	1,131,429.60	76.2%
Outcome 4	22,195,000	(9,828,794.54)	27,085,475.54	35,678,978.35	(62.2%)
Outcome 5	11,200,000	2,073,075.60	1,728,924.40	2,645,379.80	76.4%
Outcome 6	49,260,000	5,105,541.00	7,798,895.00	10,710,841.00	78.3%
Outcome 7	13,125,000	(3,083,357.0)	7,204,721.91	11,380,972.91	13.3%

⁹⁷DP interviews.

⁹⁸ Email, Frederik Matthys, DCO to Annette Ittig, 18 November 2019

⁹⁹ The RGs informed the evaluators that they had sought advice from their agencies on UNDAF budget calculations: RG FGDs. The UNCT admits that the incomplete budget reporting for the 2016-2020 UNDAF is not best practice; and it is understood that these financial reporting issues will be addressed in the new UNSDCF Funding Framework.

¹⁰⁰ The evaluators acknowledge the assistance of UNRCO in providing the figures for this table; the estimated budget gap percentages have been calculated by the evaluators.

Outcome 8	11,875,000	1,023,636.66	3,884,192.00	5,791,507.00	51.3%
TOTAL USD	144,940,000	3,167,000.13	53,242,731.40	73,913,709.16	49.1%

According to these figures, as of this writing the estimated funding gap for the UNDAF is approximately 49%. As noted above, (2.2 “Effectiveness”), one of the major constraints to implementation cited by UN respondents was insufficient financing. The large shortfall for Outcome 1, “Livelihoods”, is of particular concern, and it underscores the urgency for the UNCT to widen its financing base beyond traditional multilateral project grants.

The amount of funding available to the UN in Uzbekistan has been negatively affected by the country’s graduation to LMIC status¹⁰¹: It has also been affected by the greater number of actors who have entered, or re-entered, the country’s aid ecosystem since the launch of the reform agenda in 2017. There are now more IFIs and donors present who focus primarily upon budget support programmes, rather than on multi-lateral funding. Moreover, there are also now more implementors with whom funders can partner.¹⁰²

Noting the general decrease in funding from traditional donors and the significant budget gaps in the current UNDAF, the evaluators asked UN respondents about the sources from whom they anticipated securing financing for the new UNSDCF. Their responses included Government co-financing, non-traditional donors and the private sector, as well as the multi-lateral donors and IFIs from whom the UN already receives financing.

The concept of co-financing, which is new to Uzbekistan, is not yet well-understood by either the UN agencies there or by Government. It may be premature to consider co-financing in a country in which there are still significant areas of poverty. Moreover, some DPs also thought it was unlikely that any of the loans that the GoU receives from IFIs would be diverted into cost-sharing on UN projects.¹⁰³ Thematic or programmatic trust funds, such as the MPHSTF for the JP Aral Sea, are more traditional vehicles through which host governments can support UN interventions; and they offer greater visibility.

There is as well a great potential for the UNCT to further develop partnerships with non-traditional funders, including in South-South cooperation and in Islamic finance.¹⁰⁴ The latter is an area already

¹⁰¹ Although total volume of ODA that Uzbekistan receives continues to grow, bilateral ODA to Uzbekistan, which includes funding from the UN’s traditional donors, has decreased over the past ten years. The increased amount of total aid that the country receives is due to a rise in multilateral aid, particularly from IFIs, and it includes both loans and grants: OECD, *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2019*, p. 440: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/18ea27d8-en.pdf?expires=1576261651&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=B8A633F3A843035844F22F4108C50679>

¹⁰² At least some of the UN’s traditional donors have begun to engage their own vetted contractors and consultants, rather than UN agencies, for project implementation. Prior to 2017, the UN was one of the few development organizations in the country.

¹⁰³ FGD with DPs.

¹⁰⁴ see, e.g. Indonesia, Malaysia. While there is as yet no regulatory framework there for Islamic banking or other forms of Islamic corporate finance and investment in Uzbekistan, the Government did issue a draft resolution to create infrastructure for Islamic banking and finance in May 2019. Traditional forms

under consideration by the UNCT¹⁰⁵, and lessons learned from the use of Islamic finance in support of SDG achievement elsewhere suggest ways in which it might be utilized in Uzbekistan, both as vehicle for foreign investment,¹⁰⁶ as well as for domestic resource mobilization (DRM)¹⁰⁷.

Partnership with both international and national private sector actors in Uzbekistan is another area which the UN has not yet fully explored. Although the concept of corporate community investment is relatively recent in Uzbekistan, there are already several global business partners of the UN present in the country for whom it is an established way of doing business and with whom it might consider local alliances.¹⁰⁸ Several agencies already have private sector engagement strategies¹⁰⁹, although there is not yet an UNDAF-wide strategy. It is notable that some UN agencies in Uzbekistan are already engaged in both financial and non-financial partnerships with the private sector.¹¹⁰ However, this is still an area which is relatively new to many of the UN Uzbekistan team; and increasing their level of understanding on private sector and other innovative financing options and how they can support SDG achievement would be beneficial. Guidance for UNCTs on innovative financing and partnerships is available through, among others, the UN Global Compact, the UNOSSC, and the UN DESA Financing for Development Office.¹¹¹

of Islamic social finance, including *zakat*, a wealth tax used for charitable purposes, and *waqf*, or endowments, already exist in Uzbekistan, for example, the Public Charity Foundation Vaqf: <https://vaqf.uz/en/pages/view/function>.

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g. <https://www.uz.undp.org/content/uzbekistan/en/home/presscenter/articles/2019/09/30/islamic-finances-discussion-took-place-in-tashkent-.html>

¹⁰⁶For example, Indonesia's \$1.25 billion green *sukuk* (bond): <https://www.id.undp.org/content/indonesia/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2018/4/indonesia-tackles-climate-change-through-the-issuance-of-green-s.html>

¹⁰⁷See, for example, the partnership between UNDP Indonesia and BAZNAS, the national *zakat* collection agency, for renewable energy in marginalized communities: <https://www.id.undp.org/content/indonesia/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2017/07/19/indonesia-national-zakat-body-extends-first-contribution-to-support-sdgs/> See also the UN Kenya SDG Partnership Platform's scoping study on Islamic financing in Kenya, including for DRM: Annette Ittig, *SDG Partnership Platform: Islamic Finance Rapid Scoping Study*, Nairobi 2019: https://kenya.un.org/sites/default/files/2019-09/SDGPP%20IF%20Scoping%20Study_final.pdf

¹⁰⁸ These include, among others, Cisco, DHL, Fedex, TNT, PWC, Deloitte and KPMG.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. UNDP, ILO and UNICEF, among others.

¹¹⁰For example, ILO's partnership with the Russian company LUKOIL in the "Partnerships for Youth Employment in the Commonwealth of Independent States" initiative, which focuses upon improving the effectiveness of youth employment policies and programmes in the CIS, including Uzbekistan, is a financial partnership. This programme is implemented outside of the UNDAF:

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/publication/wcms_630796.pdf An example of a non-financial partnership which is included in the UNDAF is the collaboration between UNICEF and UCell, the telecommunications operator, in support of the agency's global programme "U Report" in Uzbekistan. As the official corporate sponsor of the U Report in Uzbekistan, UCell provides in-kind support, including the platform, as part of its corporate community investment in the country: <https://www.unicef.org/innovation/U-Report/unicef-partners-launch-digital-platform-uzbekistan>

111

UN / multi-stakeholder financing platforms elsewhere, including the UN Kenya SDG Partnership Platform,¹¹² the Innovative Financing Lab in Indonesia¹¹³ and the UNEP-convened International Network of Financial Centres for Sustainability (FC4S)¹¹⁴ also suggest ways in which alliances between the UN Uzbekistan and the private sector could be catalyzed, brokered and managed. Furthermore, in Uzbekistan, the World Bank's Education Social Impact Bond for early childhood education presents another type of multi-stakeholder partnership¹¹⁵ which could also be considered.

The UNDP-supported Development Finance Assessment (DFA)¹¹⁶ for Uzbekistan, which is planned for late 2019, and which will map and analyze the country's financial landscape, should also identify potential funding sources which would be appropriate for the UN to explore when developing its 2021-2025 UNSDCF Funding Framework.

2.3 Efficiency

- To what extent has the UNDAF reduced transaction costs?¹¹⁷
- How well has the UNDAF promoted joint programming between UN agencies?

Finding 11: Transaction costs for UN agencies do not appear to have been reduced in terms of the staff time required for UNDAF-related work, as resource mobilization and programme implementation were carried out primarily as agency-specific activities rather than as DaO.

Finding 12: The lack of harmonization of different agencies' business processes hinders the efficiency of integrated programming.

During the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle, resource mobilization and programme implementation were primarily conducted as agency-specific activities and not as DaO. Transaction costs for UN agencies do not therefore appear to have been reduced in terms of the staff time required for UNDAF-related work.¹¹⁸ With regard to joint programming, the lack of harmonization of different agencies' business processes

¹¹² An initiative under the UNRCO Kenya: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/KEN00>

¹¹³ A UNDP-Government of Indonesia partnership with the private sector, among others: <https://www.id.undp.org/content/indonesia/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2018/9/inauguration-of-the-undp-innovative-financing-lab-in-indonesia--.html>

¹¹⁴ <https://www.fc4s.org/>

¹¹⁵ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/05/29/new-project-aims-to-strengthen-the-quality-and-access-to-early-childhood-education-in-uzbekistan>

¹¹⁶ For additional information on DFAs, see <https://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/meetTheSDGs/Achieving%20the%20Sustainable%20Development%20Goals%20in%20the%20Era%20of%20the%20AAAA%20-%20DFAs%20as%20a%20tool%20for%20Linking%20Finance%20with%20Results.pdf>

¹¹⁷ Transaction costs are defined as "...the cost associated with the processes and activities that the UN development system engages in, to deliver its programmes at the country level, and which are internal to the UN agencies, as well as those that are incurred by its national partners and donors when interacting with the UN development system: United Nations Development Group, *Definition, Identification and Measurement of In-country Transaction Costs in the Context of 'Delivering as One' Pilot Countries*, New York, 3 October 2010, p. 17:

https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/UNDG_incountry_transaction_costs_FINAL3.pdf

¹¹⁸ However, transaction costs have been reduced by agency specific initiatives such as the creation of global service centers by UNICEF and by UNDP; and the 'you cannot have two bites of the cherry' protocol

may have not only reduced efficiency but also increased transaction costs. However, as noted above (2.1.5, “Financing”), harmonization is a headquarters-related issue, and until it is resolved at that level, it will remain a major constraint to the efficiency of integrated programming under the UNDAF.

As also noted above, the OMT has already realized cost savings in a number of support service areas; and the use of economies of scale in procurement negotiation may result in financial savings greater than those that can be realistically achieved in reducing other transaction costs. Beyond the Business Operations Strategy launched by the OMT in 2018, a further step towards increasing operational efficiency and the overall DaO approach in the forthcoming UNSDCF cycle will be to develop and implement a Common Budgetary Framework (CBF) which presents transparent data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized. Although a significant investment of staff time will be required for its development, it should subsequently reduce transaction costs by freeing agencies from engaging in a complex matrix reporting structure that provides little practical benefit.

5.4 Sustainability

- How sustainable are UNDAF-supported results and strategies as a contribution to national development?

Finding 13: Sustainability indicators for the current UNDAF are mixed: while some of its results have been institutionalized, their operationalization and the monitoring of their implementation will be key to ensuring their sustainability. Moreover, although the UN has undertaken extensive capacity building of its national partners in each of the UNDAF Outcome areas, and this may have strengthened individuals’ competencies, it has been incompletely institutionalized; and this also constitutes a risk to the sustainability of UNDAF results.

UNDAF results could be sustained where they align with GoU priorities and policies, and where counterpart organizations have the staff and institutional capacities required. The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, access to justice, gender equality and other issues has been institutionalized through the drafting, or sometimes, enactment of relevant national policies and legislation (see above, section 5.2, “Key Outcomes”) also suggests that UNDAF outcomes in those areas will be maintained.

Moreover, significant institutional and human capacity building has also been undertaken by UN agencies in each of the UNDAF results areas in order to increase the sustainability of results.

However, UN respondents advised the evaluators that it was necessary to provide ongoing capacity development and training to their national partners, due to the high Government staff turnover. While there is anecdotal evidence that these capacity building efforts have resulted in increased individual competencies, it also indicates that it has not been institutionalized; and this poses a sustainability risk. Furthermore, there is no evidence that capacity building under the UNDAF has been informed by a systematic assessment of capacity gaps and assets, nor is there an explicit UNDAF-wide capacity building strategy, or baseline indicators or targets in the UNDAF results matrix, which would allow a structured assessment of progress of these activities towards national ownership (see also above, 2.1. 3, “Relevance: Programming Principles”).

2.5 UN Comparative Advantages¹¹⁹

- How valid are the stated comparative advantages of the UN System?

Finding 14: Most evaluation respondents agreed that the UN has its greatest comparative advantage in the normative sphere. However, in the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context, the UN’s technical expertise should be assessed on a regular basis, and it should be strengthened or built as required in order to respond emerging national priorities and challenges.

Prior to the formulation of the 2016-2020 UNDAF, the 2014 CCA undertaken for the UNCT noted several comparative advantages (CAs) of the UN in Uzbekistan¹²⁰. This evaluation of the 2016-2020 UNDAF identified the four CAs described below, based on discussions with non-UN respondents.

- **Technical Expertise and Policy Support**

The wide-ranging, high level technical expertise of the UN, including input from agencies outside of the Uzbekistan UNCT, is evident in each of the UNDAF results areas, as noted above in section 2.2, “Key Achievements”. The UN has also introduced international best practices into the Government’s reform agenda, for example, the social protection single unit. Moreover, throughout the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle, UN agencies have supported the strengthening of institutional as well as individual capacities across all of the outcome areas at both the policy and service delivery levels.

However, in the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context, the UN’s technical expertise should be assessed on a regular basis, and it should be strengthened or built as required in order to respond emerging national priorities and challenges. The UNSDCF formulation process during late 2019-early 2020 offers an opportunity for the UNCT to re-assess its technical expertise and other comparative advantages, as well as to determine if there are areas where additional agencies or other development actors might be better placed to deliver results.

- **Advocacy for and Support to the Achievement of the SDGs**

The SDGs are a corporate priority for the UN, and it has well-leveraged its comparative advantage in this area in support of the 2030 Agenda in Uzbekistan, for example, in the localization of the SDGs, including human rights-based approaches, and in their integration into national development plans (see also above, **2.1.3, “Relevance-Integration of the SDGs”**, p. 13). However, it must be noted that further work will be required to ensure that the national SDG framework includes human rights indicators relevant to the country context.

- **Advocacy on sensitive issues**

The UN has proven its ability to advocate strongly and consistently on sensitive issues like human rights and GEWE; and this has contributed to the enactment of several new policies and pieces of legislation, including the National Action Plan on the implementation of CEDAW recommendations, amendments to the Law on the Ombudsman, and implementation of six UPR recommendations related to the

¹¹⁹ “Comparative advantage includes the mandate to act, the capacity to act and the positioning to act”, UNDG, UNDAF Guidance 2017, p. 25

¹²⁰ “The United Nations is viewed as an impartial, competent and reliable partner, uniquely equipped to promote and support nationally-owned and -led responses. The United Nations is also in a unique position to conduct joint advocacy on particularly sensitive issues and to facilitate a dialogue between duty bearers and right holders”, CCA 2014, pp. 17-18

independence of National Human Rights Institution, i.e. the Ombuds Office (NHRI). Moreover, UN policy recommendations also influenced the development and endorsement of the State Programme on the support of Persons with Disabilities (PWD) in 2017, as well as the development of the draft Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

- **As an honest broker and convener**

The UN is considered by Government stakeholders to be an honest broker with strong convening power. Under the current UNDAF the UN has well-leveraged its convening role to engage and bring together a broad range of stakeholders to support programming planning, implementation and financing, for example, in the establishment and launch of the Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund for the Aral Sea Joint Programme, and in the Government's establishment of a social protection single unit, among others (see also above, "Effectiveness")

2.6 DaO Coherence

Finding 15: DaO coherence has been partially realized under the current UNDAF: one of the five DaO SOPs has been fully achieved. Increasing DaO cohesion will require raising the understanding of all UN staff about this approach.

The Delivering as One (DaO) approach is an integral part of the UN reform agenda¹²¹. DaO is intended to ensure Government ownership and to facilitate coherence and cohesion between agencies, as well as to reduce transaction costs for governments and development partners. The five DaO components, or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), are One Leader, One Programme, One Common Premise, One Budgetary Framework (including One Fund) and One Voice.

In accordance with the global UN reform process, the UNCT in Uzbekistan follows the DaO approach,¹²² although Uzbekistan has not yet formally requested to become a UN DaO country. In the scorecard below, the evaluation has revisited the UNCT's 2016 self-assessment of DaO.¹²³ As the scorecard indicates, DaO has been partially realized by the Uzbekistan UNCT under the current UNDAF:

¹²¹ "Delivering as One" refers to a concept at the core of the UN reform process: coordinating different agencies to exploit their competitive advantages.

¹²² "UNDAF Outcomes will be achieved through a practical application of key elements of a Delivering as One approach to joint and complementary programming and implementation. A major element of this approach centres on having an Outcome-level UNDAF, with inter-Agency results groups responsible for joint planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting with national partners. A Joint Steering Committee, including Government representatives, will provide formal oversight and management direction throughout the UNDAF cycle", 2016-2020 UNDAF, p. 6; "The United Nations System will pay particular attention to accelerating implementation of the standard operating procedures for Delivering as One in order to achieve greater results", op.cit., p. 24

¹²³ Uzbekistan UNCT, *Summary of Coordination Results*, 2016, p. 6; at that time the Uzbekistan team assessed "Significant progress was made on implementation of the DaO SOP, with the majority of SOPs elements being fully or partially implemented (10 fully and 1 partially out of 15)."

Delivering as One Scorecard for the Uzbekistan UNCT¹²⁴

Pillar	No.	SOPs Core Element	Achieved		
			Yes	No	Partial
Overarching Prerequisite for DaO: Government Ownership	1	Joint oversight and ownership agreed between Government and UN and outlined in agreed terms of reference for a National/UN joint steering committee	X		
	2	Annual reporting on joint UN results in the UN country results report	X		
One Programme	1	Signed UNDAF at the outcome level with legal text as appropriate	X		
	2	Joint Work Plans (of results groups) aligned with the UNDAF and signed by involved UN entities	X		
	3	Results groups (chaired by Heads of Agencies) focused on strategic policy and Programme content established and aligned with national coordination mechanisms			X ¹²⁵
Common Budgetary Framework (including One Fund)	4	A medium term Common Budgetary Framework aligned to the UNDAF/one programme as a results-oriented resourcing framework for UN resources		x	
	5	Annual Common Budgetary Frameworks (as a part of the joint frameworks) updated annually with transparent data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized			X ¹²⁶
	6	A joint Resource Mobilization Strategy as appropriate to the country context (with the option of one fund duly considered) approved by UNCT and monitored and reported against in the UN country Results Report		X	
¹²⁷ One Leader	7	Strong commitments and incentives of the UNCT to work towards common results and accountability through full implementation of the management and accountability system and the UNCT conduct and working arrangements.	X		
	8	Empowered UNCT to make joint decisions relating to programming activities and financial matters	X		
Operating as One (One Office)	9	Business Operations Strategy endorsed by UNCT is highly recommended, adapted to local needs and capacities to			X ¹²⁸

¹²⁴ This scorecard is based on the model DaO scorecard in United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office, *'Delivering as One' and the UNDG Standard Operating Procedures*, p. 2: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, UNDAF evaluation

¹²⁵ RGs which are co-chaired by UN HoAs and GoU ministerial level officials have been established, but national coordination mechanisms are not clear

¹²⁶ There is an annual CBF integrated into the JWPs, but the data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized is inconsistent and unclear.

¹²⁸The BOS was launched in 2018; and savings have been made in a number of support service areas. However, it has not yet been possible to harmonize all business operations; and the current lack of UN common premises somewhat limits the efficiency gains made through shared services. See also about, 5.x.x, "OMT".

		enhance operational oneness processes eliminating duplication of common processes to leverage efficiencies and maximize economies of scale			
	10	Empowered ¹²⁹ operations management team (chaired by a Head of Agency)		X ¹³⁰	
	11	Operations Cost and Budget integrated in the medium-term Common Budgetary Framework		X ¹³¹	
Communicating as One (One Voice)	12	A Joint Communication Strategy appropriate to the country context approved by the UNCT and monitored and reported against in the UN Country Results Framework	X		
	13	Country Communications Group (Chaired a Head of Agency) and supported by regional and HQ levels, as necessary			X ¹³²
Total (out of a possible 13)			5	4	4

Accordingly, only one of the five DaO SoPs have been fully achieved.

Although harmonization measures at the operational level have contributed to greater efficiency and cost savings (see above, section.5.3. “Coordination - OMT”), business processes have not yet been harmonized across all agencies, and multiple reporting requirements – to agencies’ headquarters, to donors and to the Uzbekistan Ministry of Finance, beyond the UNDAF - increase transaction costs. As noted above, harmonization is an issue which requires resolution at the headquarters, rather than at the country, level; and it is one of the areas currently under consideration as part of the UN’s global reform.

Much of the funding under the UNDAF was agency-driven rather than DaO, and individual agency financing may be the greatest challenge to DaO. Since funds are generally disbursed according to individual agency mandates, agencies are challenged to balance their headquarters’ resource mobilization requirements with the DaO approach. An essential step towards further realizing DaO by the Uzbekistan UNCT will therefore be to develop and implement a fully transparent Common Budget Framework/Funding Framework.

The evaluators also found that UN respondents’ understanding of DaO and its implications for programming, financing and partnership was uneven. Increasing DaO cohesion will also require raising the understanding of all of the UN team – including programme, operations and administrative staff - about this approach. The staff induction process could provide one opportunity to do so.

¹³⁰ “‘Empowered’ in this context refers to the elevation in stature (and corresponding accountability) of the Operations Management Team in the “Delivering as One” context to the equivalent of a One Programme Results Group, to be chaired by one of the UN Country Team members (who must be a Head of Agency), and ensuring that sufficient financial, political and human resources are available to effectively implement the Business Operations Strategy.”: United Nations Development Group, *Standard Operating Procedures For Countries Adopting The “Delivering As One” Approach*, August 2014, footnote 33. The OMT is not chaired by a HoA.

¹³¹ Operations costs do not appear to be consistently incorporated into the common budgetary framework: evaluators’ interviews. It was also observed that, for the preparation of their UNDAF-related budgets, agencies were seeking guidance from their respective headquarters for guidance, and not from UNDCO: FGD with UN agency staff.

¹³² The UNCG is not chaired by a HoA.

3 GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

There are several good practices and key lessons learned from the 2016-2020 UNDAF which can inform programme planning, coordination, partnerships and implementation in the forthcoming UNSDCF. These include:

3.1 SDG Integration. Although the 2016-2020 UNDAF is a transitional UNDAF which was formulated prior to the launch of the Agenda 2030, the M&EDG and RGs have well-integrated the SDGs into the UNDAF JWPs and results framework. The recent identification of national SDGs should lead to even greater integration of the Goals into the forthcoming UNSDCF.

3.2 Gender. Based on the findings of the Gender Swap Scorecard, and with guidance from the UN GTG, gender has been clearly mainstreamed across all of the UNDAF outcomes, including a recent revision of indicators in outcomes 7 and 8.

3.3 Integrated Programming. Integrated programming under this UNDAF, such as the JP Aral Sea, is an example of good practice in SDG acceleration, as it provides a vehicle through which multiple agencies can address several Goals through one programme.

3.4 Harmonization. The lack of harmonization of agencies' business practices results in inconsistencies in UNDAF budget reporting; and it is therefore not possible to precisely calculate UNDAF budget gaps and or non-executed funds. Harmonization is an issue which requires resolution at the headquarters level. Agencies must continue to lobby their regional and headquarters offices for a harmonized approach to UNDAF budget reporting that is mutually-acceptable to both agencies' HQs and to DCO.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation findings and its conclusions are summarized below.

Conclusion 1 (Relevance): (Based on Findings 1, 2, 3 and 4)

The 2016-2020 UNDAF is broadly relevant to the Uzbekistan context: the UNDAF outcomes were aligned with national development priorities identified in the UNCT's extensive stakeholder consultations during the UNDAF formulation phase; and they also addressed several contextual development challenges identified in the 2014 CCA. Moreover, they also broadly aligned with the priorities presented in the subsequent medium-term reform plan, the 2017-2021 National Action Strategy, primarily because major development challenges such as poverty, exclusion and natural resource management remained the same throughout this UNDAF cycle. The SDGs and other international norms and standards which guide the UN's work have been well-integrated into the UNDAF. The Programming Principles of LNOB, capacity development, human rights and gender equality feature in UNDAF outcome statements and are mainstreamed across them, although the lack of SMART indicators hinders the assessment of the results of their integration.

Given the country's "youth bulge" and the urgency of creating jobs and other income streams for the ever-growing numbers of young persons entering the employment market annually in Uzbekistan, youth employment readiness and job creation has become a national priority; and youth should therefore also feature as a priority intervention area in the next UNSDCF cycle. Data has been a cross-cutting concern in this UNDAF, and it will remain so in the forthcoming UNSDCF.

Conclusion 2 (Effectiveness - Outcome Progress) (based on Finding 5). Under the UNDAF, the UN's strong normative role and high-level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each outcome area at both the service delivery and policy levels. However, UNDAF achievements have been under-reported due to a results framework which incompletely captures outcomes. As a result, progress against plan assessed through it is mixed: 4% of outcomes have been achieved; 40% have been partially achieved; and 56% are not measurable.

Conclusion 3 (Effectiveness – Partnership) (based on Finding 8)

The UN's long-standing partnership with Government is one of its comparative strengths, and it has well-leveraged this partnership to successfully advocate for, among others, SDG localization and the social protection single unit. There is also a good potential for the UN to further leverage its partnership with Government to catalyze other partnerships in, for example, South-South cooperation. However, the UN's partnership with other expected local partners in the UNDAF, including civil society and the private sector, could be strengthened. It is understood that the UNCT intends to more actively pursue linkages with CSOs and business in the forthcoming UNSDCF, including convening consultation workshops with both groups during its formulation period. Although partnership with the private sector is expected to be more visible in the forthcoming UNSDCF (see 5.2.7, "Financing"), there is currently no UNDAF-wide private sector strategy to provide guidance in this area.

Conclusion 4 (Effectiveness – Financing) (based on Findings 9 and 10)

The UNDAF's effectiveness as a financing platform has been uneven. Significant amounts have been mobilized for large joint programme initiatives such as the Aral Sea JP as well as through agencies' global programmes. However, it appears that nearly 50% of the 2016-2020 UNDAF remains unfunded, noting that the figures provided to the evaluation were inconsistent, due the lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies. Nonetheless, the current budget gaps indicate that traditional resource mobilization is no longer sufficient to fund the UNDAF. UN respondents concurred that additional funding sources, beyond the customary multi-lateral donors, will be needed to finance the new UNSDCF. However, Financing for Development (FfD), including SSC, Islamic finance, and private sector and other innovative development financing, is a relatively new area for many of the UN Uzbekistan team; and there is currently no UNDAF-wide strategy to guide them. It will be therefore be necessary to increase their level of understanding on innovative financing options and how they can support SDG achievement, as well as to formulate a UNDAF/UNSDCF strategy to provide guidance on how to engage with the private sector and other actors in this area. Advice on innovative financing and partnerships is available through, among others, the UN Global Compact, the UNOSSC, and the UN DESA Financing for Development Office.

Conclusion 5 (Efficiency). (Based on Findings 11 and 12)

Beyond the cost-saving measures achieved under the OMT, there is little evidence that the UNDAF has decreased transaction costs for the UN agencies. Additionally, it is difficult to assess the UNDAF's value for money and the efficiency of its delivery, due to incomplete budget information.

Conclusion 6 (Sustainability): (Based on Finding 13)

Sustainability indicators for the UNDAF's results to date are mixed: The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, GEWE and other issues has been institutionalized through the drafting and, sometimes, enactment of several relevant national policies and legislation are positive indicators for the sustainability of UNDAF results. However, the lack of full political will to create an enabling space for civil society to function freely, as well as ongoing partner capacity deficits in implementing human rights fully in line with existing commitments under ratified UN human rights treaties, pose sustainability risks. Moreover, the

incomplete institutionalization of the capacity building provided by the UN to its national partners also poses a sustainability risk.

Conclusion 7 (UN Comparative Advantage). (Based on Finding 14)

Most respondents agree that the UN’s great comparative advantage is in the normative sphere. The UN has well-leveraged its comparative advantage as an advocate for the SDGs and for other normative values, as a provider of high-level technical expertise; and as an honest broker with strong convening power, to support and influence the realization of Uzbekistan’s development priorities. However, given the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context, a critical self-assessment by the UN of its comparative advantage should be undertaken on a regular basis; and it should be strengthened or built as required to ensure it is fit for purpose to respond to emerging national priorities and challenges.

Conclusion 8 (DaO). (Based on Finding 15) DaO cohesion has been partially achieved during the 2016-2020 UNDAF cycle: one of the five SoPs have been fully realized. Raising the awareness of all UN Uzbekistan staff on this approach and on its implications for operations, programming, financing and partnership, will be key to greater DaO coherence there; and the staff induction process provides one opportunity to do this.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2016-2020 UNDAF offers several emerging results which can inform coordination, financing and implementation during its remaining period and in the forthcoming UNSDCF. Recommendations for Uzbekistan UNCT to build on the results of the 2016-2020 UNDAF during the current cycle and beyond are presented below.

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations
<p>Relevance (findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 14)</p>	<p>When formulating the new UNSDCF, ensure its relevance to the Uzbekistan context and its alignment with UN reforms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an ecosystem approach to strengthen UNSDCF synergies with, and minimize duplication with, other DPs activities • Develop a streamlined results framework with no more than five outcome areas and with clear alignment to national SDGs; both the Uzbekistan MAPS as well as the global Agenda 2030 suggest possible themes for outcomes. Reference UNDAF outputs and output indicators only in JWPs • Formulate an overarching ToC for the UNSDCF as well as Theories of Change for each Outcome Area for greater cohesion. Noting that the current understanding of RBM among the UN team is uneven, it is recommended that external expertise be engaged for both of these tasks. • More explicitly support national priorities on youth employment readiness and job creation by featuring youth prominently in at least one outcome statement, in addition to the planned JP NEET • Pursue more integrated programming approaches for SDG acceleration • Conduct a critical self-assessment of UN comparative advantages to realistically inform planning, programming and financing in the new UNSDCF, as well as to ensure relevance in the rapidly evolving Uzbekistan context

<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>(Findings 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15)</p>	<p>Strengthen the effectiveness of the UNDAF in the areas of:</p> <p>Financing and Partnership:</p> <p>6. Widen the UNDAF’s resource base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the UNCT’s level of understanding on innovative financing options and how they can support SDG, through guidance and training from a recognized UN partnership authority such as the UN Global Compact, the UNOSSC or the UN DESA Financing for Development Office, among others • After the 2019 DFA, co-create an UNDAF/UNSDCF financing strategy in collaboration with the GoU, including forms of development financing beyond traditional multilateral aid such as non-DAC donor funding, SSC, domestic revenue mobilization, private sector partnerships and blended financing options <p>7. Build closer interaction with the private sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map and explore community investment initiatives with local and international private sector actors • Consider initiating an informal private sector advisory committee under the leadership of the RC • Explore establishing a UN-led multi-stakeholder partnership platform such as an SDG Partnership Platform to catalyze and broker partnerships • Leverage current financial and non-financial private sector partnerships for additional financing <p>8. Continue to engage with Government and other relevant stakeholders for the development of a regulatory framework for Islamic finance</p> <p>9. Further strengthen partnerships with IFIs, e.g. through extension of cross-cutting UNDAF thematic groups, for example, by the extension of the UN GTG into a cross-sector GTG with other DPs</p> <p>10. Pursue more pooled funding, including thematic trust funds such as the JP Aral Sea MPHSTF</p> <p>Budget Reporting</p> <p>2. Agencies must continue to lobby their regional and headquarters offices for a harmonized approach to UNDAF budget reporting that is mutually-acceptable to both agencies’ HQs and to DCO.</p> <p>Knowledge Management</p>
--	--

	<p>2. Strengthen UNDAF knowledge management and RCO’s role as an UNDAF One Stop Shop by archiving all UNDAF-related documents not included in the UNINFO system, including RG minutes and joint monitoring reports, with RCO</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>3. Noting agency staff turnovers, provide annual RBM training to programme and M&E staff to ensure that there are necessary competencies in this area</p> <p>4. Noting that the current level of understanding of RBM principles among the UN team is uneven, engage external expertise to guide the development of ToCs for the UNSDCF and for each of its Outcome Areas (see also above, Relevance)</p> <p>UNDAF Coordination-Results Groups</p> <p>2. Introduce co-chairs and rotating chairs for the RGs</p> <p>DaO</p> <p>3. Raise the awareness of all UN staff on this approach and on its implications for operations, programming, financing and partnership through available organizational windows such as the staff induction process</p>
--	--

<p>Efficiency (Findings 11 and 12)</p>	<p>Strengthen the UNDAF’s operational efficiency in the areas of</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>2. Develop and implement a Common Budgetary Framework (CBF) which presents transparent data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized.</p>
---	--

<p>Sustainability (finding 13)</p>	<p>Mitigate sustainability risks:</p> <p>3. Reduce the sustainability risks related to the ongoing restructuring of Government ministries and high Government staff turnover by regularly assessing capacity gaps and by providing capacity development based on identified needs</p> <p>4. Provide a brief explanation of UNDAF aims and coordination structures at the commencement of each Joint RG meeting to ensure new members have a basic understanding of it</p>
---	---

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Sources

Bugnion de Moreta, Christian, *Final External Evaluation of the (2010-2015) United Nations Development Assistance Framework – “UNDAF”- In Uzbekistan*, October 2014.

Esser, Andrea Lee, *UNCT SWAP Scorecard: Assessment Results and Action Plan (for the) United Nations Country Team Uzbekistan*, December 2017.

United Nations Development Programme Uzbekistan, *Country Programme Document (CPD) for Uzbekistan (2016-2020)*, New York, 1 to 4 September 2015.

United Nations Development Programme Uzbekistan, *Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) Uzbekistan 2016*, 13 November 2018.

United Nations Development Programme Uzbekistan, *Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) Uzbekistan 2017*, 13 November 2018.

United Nations Development Programme Uzbekistan, *Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) Uzbekistan 2018*.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Country Office Annual Report (COAR) 2016, Republic of Uzbekistan*.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Country Office Annual Report (COAR) 2017, Republic of Uzbekistan*.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Country Office Annual Report (COAR) 2018, Republic of Uzbekistan*.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Country Office Annual Report (COAR) 2018, Republic of Uzbekistan*.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2016 – 2020, Programme of Cooperation between The Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan and The United Nations Children's Fund*, Tashkent, 2016.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Uzbekistan, *Draft Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016 – 2020*, 8-11 September 2015.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020, *Education Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017*.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020, *Environment Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017*.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,

Governance Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Health Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Livelihoods Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Social Protection Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Environment Joint Work Plan for the Years 2016-2017.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Education Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Environment Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Governance Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Health Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Livelihoods Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF) 2016-2020,
Social Protection Joint Work Plan for the Years 2018-2020.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference for the Joint UN-Government Results Groups on the implementation of United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan 2016-2020 (UNDAF)*, 31 July 2018

United Nations Uzbekistan Communications Group, *Terms of Reference.*

United Nations Uzbekistan Operational Management Team, *Terms of Reference*, 28 November 2017.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference for the Joint Un-Government Results Groups on the implementation of United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan 2016-2020 (UNDAF)*, 31 July 2017.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Education.*

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Environment.*

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Governance.*

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Health*.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Livelihoods*.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Results Group on Social Protection*.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of References of United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF), Monitoring and Evaluation and Data Group*.

United Nations Uzbekistan, *Terms of Reference of Joint United Nations-Government of Uzbekistan United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Uzbekistan (UNDAF), Monitoring and Evaluation Group*.

Published Sources

Asian Development Bank, *Member Factsheet: Uzbekistan*, July 2019

Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, “On measures for implementing National Sustainable Development Goals and Targets for the period up to 2030” 20 October 2018 #841, Tashkent, October 20 2018.

Coordination Council on the implementation of National Sustainable Development Goals and targets in the field of sustainable development for the period up to 2030, *Protocol of the Meetings of the Coordination Council on the implementation of National Sustainable Development Goals and targets in the field of sustainable development for the period up to 2030 on the organization of measures to implement the National Sustainable Development Goals for the period up to 2030*, Tashkent, December 24 2018.

Government of Uzbekistan, *National Action Strategy 2017-2021*

Government of Uzbekistan, *National Innovative Development Strategy 2019-2021*, Decree No. UP-5544, 21 September 2018: <http://lex.uz/ru/docs/3913186> (English)

International Monetary Fund, *Republic of Uzbekistan: Staff Report For The 2019 Article IV Consultation* (IMF Country Report No. 19/129), May 2019: <https://imf.org>media>files>publications>

Ittig, Annette, *SDG Partnership Platform: Islamic Finance Rapid Scoping Study*, Nairobi 2019: https://kenya.un.org/sites/default/files/2019-09/SDGPP%20IF%20Scoping%20Study_final.pdf

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2019*;

United Nations Country Team Uzbekistan, *2016-2020 Uzbekistan United Nations Development Assistance Framework*, Tashkent, 2016.

United Nations Country Team Uzbekistan, *Common Country Assessment 2014 Final*, 2014

United Nations Development Group, *Funding to Financing: UNDAF Companion Guidance*, New York, 2017: <https://undg.org/document/funding-to-financing-undaf-companion-guidance/>

United Nations Development Group, *United Nations Development Assistance Guidance*, New York, May 2017: https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-UNDAF_Guidance_01-May-2017.pdf
United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2016*, New York, 2016

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation-Foundation Document*, New York, 2008: www.uneval.org/document/download/548

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations-Guidance Document*, New York, August 2014: www.uneval.org/document/download/1294

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Guidance Note on the Application of Programming Principles to the UNDAF*, 2010

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, New York, 2016: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

United Nations General Assembly, *A life of dignity for all: accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and advancing the United Nations Development agenda beyond 2015*, A report by the Secretary-General, 26 July 2013

United Nations General Assembly - Economic and Social Council, *Funding Compact*, A report by the Secretary-General, 2019

United Nations Uzbekistan and World Bank, *Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in Uzbekistan*, Tashkent, 2018

United Nations Uzbekistan, *National Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Indicators* (draft) April 12 2019

United Nations Uzbekistan, *United Nations Proposals relevant to the forthcoming Resolution on national Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) based on preliminary observations of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) Mission*. (2018)

United Nations Uzbekistan, *United Nations Country Team Action Plan to follow up on the Government's Resolution on National Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS)*, February 25 2019.

World Bank, *Uzbekistan Country Snapshot*, April 2019: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/388901555362919729/Uzbekistan-Snapshot-April2019.pdf>

ANNEX 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. Job Information	
Job title:	International Consultant on UNDAF 2016-2020 Evaluation
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Project Title/Department:	UN RC Office in Uzbekistan
Duration of the service:	August - November 2019 (35 working days, including 10-day mission to Tashkent)
Work Status:	Full time
Duty station:	Home based and Tashkent city, Uzbekistan
Expected places of travel:	Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Reports to:	UN Development Coordination Officer on Data and Monitoring/Reporting
II. Background Information	
<p>The UN system in Uzbekistan is entering the final stage of implementation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) cycle which covers the period of 2016-2020. The current UNDAF is the result of a consultative process to analyse how the United Nations (UN) can most effectively respond to Uzbekistan’s national priorities and needs and draws on the full range of knowledge and resources of the United Nations system to deliver development results.</p> <p>Being the strategic programme framework the UNDAF represents a joint commitment by the Government of Uzbekistan and the UN System to work together and a shared intention to promote progress in human development of all people living in the country, especially the most vulnerable and disadvantaged, and is linked to Uzbekistan’s obligations under its ratification of various international human rights instruments. The UNDAF 2016-2020 has become the central planning document of the UN system in the country, while its implementation architecture is expected to advance UN system cooperation towards Delivering as One in the country.</p> <p>Through an intensive consultation process with the Government and key national stakeholders, eight UNDAF Outcomes in four strategic focus areas that respond to national needs and make use of United Nations’ comparative advantages have been selected. The focus areas were identified through an intensive consultation process with the Government and other implementing national partners, and include (i) Inclusive economic development, with a focus on employment and social protection; (ii) Quality health and education, to fully realize human potential; (iii) Environmental protection, to ensure sustainable development; and (iv) Effective governance, to enhance public service delivery and the protection of rights.</p>	

The UNDAF is fully aligned with Sustainable Development Goals and national development priorities. It does largely correspond to the Government's Actions Strategy for 2017-2021 that was adopted by the Government in February 2017, on the second year of the UNDAF implementation.

The UNDAF is operationalized through Joint Work Plans (JWPs) that define output-level results and contribution of United Nations Agencies to overall UNDAF Outcomes and, hence, to national priorities. The joint work plans have been developed for each Outcome area consecutively, starting with the biennial workplans for 2016-2017 and followed by the roll-out JWPs for 2018-2020.

Refinements and adjustments to the UNDAF are made in discussion with the Government and national partners, based on UNDAF annual reviews and taking into account changes in the country context and progress of the UN system programmes. The UNDAF annual reviews help ensure continuing relevance of the UNDAF and keep it as a living framework. The UNDAF annual review is conducted through the UNDAF Results Groups, with engagement of national counterparts, and with substantive support by the UN M&E and Data Group. The M&ED group is established as a quality assurance group assigned with responsibilities to provide technical advice and support on all aspects of Results Based Management to the UN Country Team and to Results Groups.

Pursuant to the UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation plan, the UNCT Uzbekistan has agreed on to carry out a final independent UNDAF Evaluation in 2019 in order to assess the overall achievement of the expected UNDAF results in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The UNDAF evaluation serves as the central independent assessment of the UN system at country level to support accountability, learning and decision-making towards the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, using the Common Country Analysis as a benchmark. UNDAF evaluations provide important information for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations (UN) coordination at the country level.

The **overall purposes** of the UNDAF evaluation are:

- To support greater institutional learning, about what works, what doesn't and why in the context of an UNDAF
- To promote greater accountability of the UNCT to UNDAF stakeholders

The specific **objectives** of the evaluation are:

- Assess the contribution made by the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF to national development results in the context of the SDGs through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability).
- Identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning).
- Evaluate the results of the cross-cutting programming and "leave no one behind" principles in the current UNDAF: assess the differential progress on vulnerable groups (women, children, persons with disabilities, Roma community, youth, older persons, low income families, etc).
- Assess the extent to which the UNDAF and coordination mechanisms have contributed to advance and streamline Results-based Management, Gender Equality and Human Rights Based Approach in UN agencies' programming.
- Advise on the suitability of indicators and other verification tools used to measure progress towards outcomes and outputs.
- Reach conclusions concerning the UN's contribution across the scope being examined.
- Provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT's contribution, especially for incorporation into the new Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (the new name of the UNDAF). These

recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation.

Evaluation-based evidence and recommendations will be also used for resource leveraging and partnerships. The primary users of the evaluations will be the decision-makers within the UNCT, including non-resident UN agencies, key government counterparts, civil society and respective executive boards. In addition, bilateral and multilateral donors in programme countries, and the broader development partners are also seen as important audience of the evaluation.

The **scope** covered by the UNDAF evaluation should include the overall results framework of the UNDAF 2016-2020 and its implementation instruments, specifically the Joint Work Plans 2016-2017 and 2018-2020. The evaluation should pay special attention to the systemic and intersectional assessment of the mainstreaming the UNDAF programming principles and the key cross-cutting issues of the 2030 Agenda. Leave no one behind (LNOB) is at the core, and underpinned by three other programming principles: human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment; sustainability and resilience; and accountability. These principles are grounded in the norms and standards that the United Nations.

The UNDAF Evaluation will be undertaken by an Evaluation Team to consist of one International Expert as a Team leader and one national consultant as a team member. The Evaluation Team will have to work in full independence from the evaluation commissioners in line with below responsibilities.

III. Functions / Scope of work

Under overall supervision of the Development Coordination Officer on Data and Monitoring/Reporting the **evaluation team leader** will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with all the UNDAF Evaluation Management Team.

He/she will conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the Evaluation Management Group on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The team leader will be responsible for the following:

- Review the Terms of Reference for the UNDAF Evaluation, including an Evaluation work plan, and all relevant materials and documents, including the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards for Evaluation, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, UNEG Guidance on *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation*.
- Refine the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, and provide a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology.
- Prepare an inception report and present to the UN Country Team and EMG to clarify the understanding and expectations of how the evaluation will be undertaken. The report should include the results of desk review, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach, data collection tools, data analysis methods, key informants, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements.
- Conduct desk review focusing on UNDAF planning documents, annual UNDAF progress reviews and annual reports, agencies' evaluation reports (including those on projects and small-scale initiatives), strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents. These should include reports on the progress against national and international commitments.

- Undertake data collection mission to the country to collect data linked to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that are included within the scope of the evaluation. This exercise will employ various data collection methods agreed upon in the Inception Report.
- Based on the desk review and professional knowledge of the issues, conduct a stakeholder analysis.
- Analyze the data, prepare a draft report and deliver a presentation on the evaluation preliminary findings to the UNCT and EMG and refine the report based on the feedback.
- Prepare the final report in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards, in line with the agreed-on structure outlined in the ToR for the UNDAF Evaluation. The report has to be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations.
- Assist UNCT in developing a Follow-up plan002E

The final report will include an Executive Summary and must be kept short (50-75 pages maximum excluding annexes). More detailed information on the context, the programme or the comprehensive aspects of the methodology and of the analysis will be placed in the annexes. The report will be prepared in accordance with UNEG guidance (Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports). The UNDAF evaluation report will be publicly disclosed documents and therefore should adhere to ethical norms and standards for data protection.

IV. Deliverables and Deadlines

- An Evaluation Work Plan, which defines the specific evaluation design, tools and procedures, outlining specific dates for key deliverables;
- An inception report outlining the evaluation team’s understanding of the issues under review including a review framework and a detailed work plan. It further refines the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology;
- A presentation with preliminary findings to be shared with the ESC/UNCT and The UNDAF Result groups;
- A draft report for circulation and identification of factual corrections from stakeholders and for quality assurance;
- A final review report and presentation.
- Inputs to the Evaluation Follow-up plan.

Structure of the Evaluation Report

The results of the UNDAF Evaluation will be presented in the UNDAF Evaluation Report as per a below standard outline.

- Chapter 1: Introduction (objectives, scope and methodology, limitations)
- Chapter 2: National development context
- Chapter 3: Evaluation Findings (corresponding to the UNDAF outcomes with each analysed by evaluation criteria)
- Chapter 4: Conclusions and Recommendations

This outline should be considered during the inception phase and taking account of the specific scope and focus of the evaluation, a detailed outline of the UNDAF evaluation report should be included in the inception report.

Activity	Tentative Timeframe	Place	Expected output
Desk review (home-based): August - September 2019			

Initial Desk review of reference documents	3 rd week of August 2019	Home-based	Reference documents reviewed
Development of an evaluation work plan	4 th week of August 2019	Home-based	Operational plan developed
Drafting/ finalizing Inception Report, outlining evaluation design, initial synthesis and detailed additional data collection plan	1 st week of September 2019	Home-based	Inception Report draft presented
Mission to Tashkent/Uzbekistan for data collection: September 2019 (10 working days)			
Meeting with RC and the UNCT, presenting Final Inception Report	2 nd week of September 2019	Tashkent, Uzbekistan	Results of the desk review discussed, Final Inception Report presented
Meetings with UNDAF Results groups, key national partners and donors, focus group discussions	2 nd and 3 rd weeks of September 2019	Tashkent, Uzbekistan	Qualitative data collected
Preparation of the debriefing presentation document on preliminary findings for the exit meeting	3 rd week of September 2019	Tashkent, Uzbekistan	Debriefing presentation documents (Power Point and 2-3 pages overview) prepared
Exit meeting with key national partners and donors to discuss the preliminary findings and obtain feedback from the stakeholders	3 rd week of September 2019	Tashkent, Uzbekistan	Feedback of the stakeholders on the preliminary findings obtained
Desk-review (home-based): September - October 2019			
Further data analysis based on all information collected, including the elaboration on feedback obtained in exit meetings,	By the end of September 2019	Home-based	Draft evaluation report prepared
Preparation of the draft evaluation report and submission to the UNCT for factual corrections and feedback	2 nd week of October 2019	Home-based	Draft report reviewed by the UNCT, comments made
Consolidating the UNCT comments and preparation of the final draft of the report	By the end of October 2019	Home-based	UNCT comments incorporated into the report; Evaluation report prepared

Duration of the work and duty station

The initial length of the assignment for the International Consultant is 10 working days onsite and 25 working days offsite. The consultancy will start in July 2019 and must be completed before end of September 2019 with the submission of a final report

Deliverables/Output	Installment	Deadlines
Inception Report	25%	August 2019
Presentation of preliminary findings	25%	September 2019
First draft of the UNDAF evaluation report	25%	October 2019

Final report on UNDAF evaluation that takes into account UNCT's feedback and comments	25%	November 2019
<p>The output should be submitted by the Consultant to supervisor and to be considered as accepted upon written confirmation from the UN Resident Coordinator.</p>		
<p>This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy; payment will be released upon satisfactory provision of respective output and acceptance by the Supervisor and Resident Coordinator.</p>		
<p>The USD lump sum amount will be paid in four installments upon completion and acceptance by the UN Coordination Officer of the above indicated outputs by the due dates.</p>		
<p>V. Monitoring and control</p>		
<p>Activities and progress will be monitored through regular contacts and review of the deliverable by UNCT, EMG and other relevant partners. Consultant is requested to inform UN RCO on progress by e-mail every week.</p>		
<p>In case the deliverable is deemed to have been completed to a standard that does not fully satisfy UN performance criteria, the UN reserves the right to withhold the payment in part or in full. No interim payments will be executed.</p>		
<p>VI. Qualification Requirements</p>		
Education:	Advanced degree in social sciences, preferably economics, political science, international development, public or business administration, human rights or similar;	
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 years of professional experience in evaluation of UN's strategic documents and UN agency country programmes; • Previous experience in conducting UNDAF evaluations required; • Knowledge of country context is highly desirable; • Experience in M&E systems and joint programmes within the UN an advantage. 	
Language Requirements:	Excellent knowledge of the English language, spoken and written. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage	
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proven experience with organization, facilitation and engagement of multiple partners in consultative processes; • Knowledge and experience in monitoring and evaluation programs; • Familiarity with UNDAF processes and UN inter-agency coordination processes; • Experience working with UN and other international development agencies is an asset; • Knowledge of relevant human rights issues and ability to identify related problems in their political, ethnic, racial, gender equality and socio-economic dimensions • Ability to evaluate and integrate information from a variety of sources and assess impact on the human rights and gender equality. Ability to incorporate gender perspectives in all aspects of the evaluation report 	

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proven experience as an evaluation team leader with ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.• Excellent analytical, writing and communication skills;• Ability to work independently as well as part of a team;• Initiative, sound judgment and demonstrated ability to work harmoniously with staff members of different national and cultural backgrounds. |
|--|--|

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified female candidates, people with disabilities, and minorities are highly encouraged to apply. UNDP Gender Balance in Management Policy promotes achievement of gender balance among its staff at all levels.

ANNEX 2
FIELDWORK SCHEDULE

Date	Time	Name/Group/Institution	Location	Persons Met
Wednesday, 11 September	International Consultant arrives in Tashkent			
	5.30-7.30	Planning the evaluation	Grand Capital Hotel	Team Leader Annette Ittig, Team Member Regina Safarova
Thursday, 12 September	9.45-11.00	Briefing with the RC	RC office	Helena Fraser, Annette Ittig, Matluba Umurzakova
	14:30-16:30	FGD with UNCT	UNDP office	Helena Fraser, Sasha Graumann, Matlyuba Umurzakova, Zulfiya Gafurova, Bakhtiyor Namazov, Sherzod Hoshimov, Zarif Jumaev, Doina Munteanu, Hurshid Rustamov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	16:30-17:30	Meeting with M&E and SDG Working Groups	UNDP office	Matlyuba Umurzakova, Zulfiya Gafurova, Bakhtiyor Namazov, Sherzod Hoshimov, Zarif Jumaev, Doina Munteanu, Hurshid Rustamov, Zokir Nazarov. Participants of M&E and SDG Working Groups. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Friday, 13 September	9:30 – 11:00	Meeting with the Gender theme group	UNFPA office	Sherzod Hoshimov, UNODC; Guljakhon Amanova, OHCHR; Kamolkhon Inomkhodjaev, UNFPA; Pedro Pablo Villanueva, UNFPA RR; Abdugani Bazarov, UNESCO; Liya Khalikova, RCO. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	11:30 – 12:30	Meeting with UNFPA Rep	UNFPA office	Pedro Pablo Villanueva, Kamolkhon Inomkhodjaev. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:30 – 15:30	Meeting with Representatives of Ministry of Economy and Industry, UNDAF focal point from Government team	Ministry of Economy	Yadgar Fayzullaev, Yulduz Abduganieva. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	16:00 – 17:30	Meeting with the State Statistics Committee	State Statistics Committee Office	Odiljon Mamadaliev, Habibilla Murodhujaev, Jahongir Yuldashev, Akrom Sultanov, Kobil Berdikulov, Olga Aleshunina. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Monday, 16 September	10:00 – 11:00	NHRC	UN office	Abdulhai Muminov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.

	11:30 – 13:00	Meeting with NGOs, Civil society	Yuksalish center	Representatives from Civil Society. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:00 – 16:00	Interview with UNDP RR, Co-chair of UNDAF RGs on Livelihoods, Environment and Governance	UNDP office	Matilda Dimovska, Kamila Mukhamedkhanova, Doina Munteanu, Hurshid Rustamov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Tuesday, 17 September	9:00 – 10:00	Ministry of Investments and International Trade	Ministry of Investments and International Trade Office	Hurram Teshabaev, Badriddin Abidov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	11:30 – 13:00	Meeting with Social Protection RG and Disability Task Force	Yuksalish center	Participants of Social Protection RG and Disability Task Force. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Health RG	WHO Office	Participants of Health RG. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	16:30 – 17:30	Meeting with Minister of Health/Deputy Minister	Ministry of Health Officer	DPM Bakhodir Nizomov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Wednesday, 18 September	9:15 – 10:15	Interview with UNICEF Representative	UNICEF Office	Sasha Graumann. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	10:30 – 12:30	Meeting with Education RG	UNICEF Office	Participants of Education RG. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:00 – 16:30	Meeting with Environment RG together with <i>State Committee for Ecology and Environment Protection</i>	UNDP Office	Participants of Environment RG. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Thursday, 19 September	10:00 – 11:30	Meeting with Governance RG	UNDP Office	Participants of Governance RG; Annette; Regina
	14:30 – 15:30	Women Committee	Women Committee Office	Gulnara Marufova. Regina Safarova.
	16.30 – 17.30	Republican Training Center on the Basis of Entrepreneurial Activity.	UN office.	Djahongir Imamnazarov. Regina Safarova.
Friday, 20 September	10:00 – 12:00	Meeting with donors and development partners	UNDP Office	Abdukakhkhor Kodirov (Islamic Development Bank), Goran Klemencic, Petra Gorjup (Regional dialogue),

				Mehmet Kaan Bakkalbaşı (Turkish Embassy), Begzod Djalilov (Asian Development Bank), Alessandro Liamine (European Union), Ildar Fayzullin (OSCE), Ms. Mi Park, Ms. Kim Heejin (KOICA), Kristine Kore-Perkone (GIZ), David Genzel (German Embassy). Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:30 – 16:00	Meeting with Livelihoods RG (also invite UN JP on Aral Sea)	UNDP Office	Participants of Livelihoods RG. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	17:00 – 18:00	Meeting with UNCG	UNDP Office	Anvar Meliboev, Feruza Nomozova, Atul Kumar, Doniyor Umarkhujaev, Alisher Shukurov. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Saturday, 21 September	18.00 – 19.00	Debrief to RC	Tashkent, New York (Skype)	Helena Fraser, Annette Ittig.
Monday, 23 September	11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with General Prosecutor's Office.	GPO	Sh Zufarova, D. Ogay. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	14:30 – 15:30	Informal UNCT debrief	UNDP	UNCT members. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
	16:30 – 17:30	OMT	UNDP	Aleksandr Tsiplakov, Azamat Makhmudov, Veaceslav Ghitu. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Tuesday, 24 September	11.00 – 12.30	Presentation of Preliminary Findings	City Palace Hotel	UNCT, UN agencies, representatives of national partners, CSOs. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Tuesday, 24 September	14:00 – 15:00	UK Aid	British Embassy	Saithojaeva Nodira, Artikova Evelina, Kilicheva Chekhros. Annette Ittig, Regina Safarova.
Tuesday, 24 September	17.00 – 18.00	UNDP	UNDP	Azizkhon Bakhadirov, Guzal Adilova Regina Safarova
Wednesday, 25 September	10.00-11.00	USAID	American Embassy	Gary Robins, Director; Annette; Regina
	11.30-12.30	World Bank	World Bank	Vinayak (Vinny) Nagaraj, Senior Country Economist; Annette; Regina
Friday, 27 September	17.00-17.30	PSG	By Skype	Robert Bernardo, UNDP IRH, Annette
Thursday, 3 October	12:30 – 13:30	Youth task force	UNDP	Kamolkhon Inomkhodjaev, UNFPA; Regina
	14:30 – 15:30	Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations	Ministry of Employment and Labour	Shakhnoza Rustamova, Shakhnoza Ravshanova, Nargiza Mukhtorova; Regina

			Relations Office	
--	--	--	---------------------	--

ANNEX 3

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Institution	Name	Title
Government		
Ministry of Economy	Ms. Yulduz Abduganieva	Deputy Head of the Consolidated Office of Demography, Employment and the Standard of Living of the Population
Ministry of Economy	Mr. YadgarFayzullaev	Head of Department, Forecasting and Monitoring of Macroeconomic Indicators
Ministry of Investment and Foreign Trade	Mr. Badriddin Abidov	Deputy of the Minister of Investment and Foreign Trade
Ministry of Investment and Foreign Trade	Mr. Hurram Teshabaev	Head of the Investment Project Development Center under the Ministry of Investment and Foreign Trade
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Mr. Odiljon Mamadaliev.	Head of the Department on Information Dissemination, International Cooperation and Information Exchange.
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Mr. Habibilla Murodhujaev.	Head of the Department on Statistics of Social Sphere and Sustainable Development.
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Mr. Jahongir Yuldashev.	Head of the Department on Statistics of Standard of Living and Survey of Population.
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Mr. Akrom Sultanov.	Head of Department on Monitoring and Coordination of Web Portal of Open Data Functioning.
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Mr. Kobil Berdikulov.	Head of the Department on statistics of demography and Labour.
State Statistics Committee (SSC)	Ms. Olga Aleshunina.	Deputy Head of the Department on Preparation of a Combined Analytical Information on Statistics of Sustainable Development and Social Sphere.
Ministry of Health	Mr. Bakhodir Nizomov.	Deputy Minister
Academy of General Prosecutor Office	Ms. Sh. Zufarova.	International Department Officer
Academy of General Prosecutor Office	Mr. Khamraev D.	International Department Officer
General Prosecutor Office	Mr. D. Ogay	Senior Prosecutor of the International Legal Department
National Human Rights Center of the Republic of Uzbekistan	Mr. Abdulhay R. Muminov	Head of the Department of Implementation
Republican Training Center on the Basis of Entrepreneurial Activity.	Mr. Djahongir Imamnazarov	Deputy Director
UN Agencies		
UNRCO	Ms. Helena Fraser	UN Resident Coordinator
UNRCO	Ms. Matluba Umurzakova	Head of the Resident Coordinator's Office
UNRCO	Mr. Zarif Jumaev	UN Coordination Analyst Resident Coordinator's Office
UNODC	Mr. Tsiplakov Aleksandr	Procurement Officer
UNICEF	Mr. Wood Duncan	Chief of Operations
UNRCO	Mr. Meliboev Anvar	National Public Information Officer
UNICEF	Mr. Umarkhujaev Doniyor	Communications consultant

UNICEF	Mr. Kumar Atul	Chief of communications
OHCHR	Ms. Guljakhon Amanova.	National Programme Officer
UNICEF	Mr. Sasha Graumann	Resident Representative
WHO	Mr. Ghitu Veaceslav	Administrative Officer
FAO	Mr. Shukurov Alisher	Assistant FAO Representative
FAO	Mr. Azamat Makhmudov	Admin officer
UNDP	Mr. Bakhadirov Azizkhon	Programme Analyst on Rule of Law
UNDP	Mr. Adilova Guzal	Project Manager
UNDP	Ms. Mathilda Dimovska	Resident Representative
UNDP	Ms. Doina Munteanu	Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP	Mr. Hurshid Rustamov	Head of Sustainable Development Cluster
UNDP	Ms. Kamila Mukhamedkhanova	Head of Good governance cluster
UNAIDS	Ms. Charos Maksudova	Programme Officer
UNFPA	Mr. Pedro Pablo Villanueva	Representative in Uzbekistan and Country Director for Tajikistan a.i.
UNFPA	Mr. Kamolkhon Inomkhodjayev	Assistant Representative
UNESCO	Mr. Bakhtiyor Namazov	Programme Officer in Education
UNESCO	Mr. Abdugani Bazarov	Programme Assistant on ICT in Education
UNODC	Mr. Sherzod Hoshimov	Programme Officer/Coordinator
NGOs		
Womens Committee	Ms. Marufova Gulnaraa Mahmudovna	Deputy Chair
Chamber of Commerce	Ms. Eliko Margishvili	International Department Officer
Private Sector		
Donors		
World Bank Group	Mr. Vinayak (Vinny) Nagaraj	Senior Country Economist
European Union	Mr. Alessandro Liamine Salvagni	Regional Political Adviser
USAID	Mr. Gary Robbins	Director, Uzbekistan Country Office
GIZ	Ms. Kristine Kore-Perkone	Project Manager in Uzbekistan (Regional Programme 'Promotion of the Rule of Law in Central Asia')
German Embassy	Mr. David Genzel	Third Secretary, Section for economy and economic cooperation
UK AID	Ms. Saithojaeva Nodira	GBF Programme Support Officer
UK AID	Ms. Artikova Evelina	Head of Programmes Team
UK AID	Ms. Kilicheva Chekhros	CSSF Programme Support Officer
Islamic Development Bank	Mr. Abdukakhor B. Kodirov	Field Representative
Regional dialogue	Mr. Goran Klemencic	Legal Expert at Regional Dialogue
Regional dialogue	Ms. Petra Gorjup	Head of Branch Office in Uzbekistan
Turkish Embassy	Mr. Mehmet Kaan Bakkalbaşı	Diplomat, Third Secretary
Asian Development Bank	Mr. Begzod Djalilov	Senior Economics officer
OSCE	Mr. Ildar Fayzullin	Project Officer
KOICA	Ms. Mi Park	Deputy Director
KOICA	Ms. Kim Heejin	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

ANNEX 4

Main Stakeholders in the UNDAF and Their Roles

The UN has engaged a wide variety of stakeholders, including both duty bearers and rights holders, in the formulation and implementation of the 2016-2020 UNDAF. An overview of these stakeholders and their respective roles and activities is presented in the table below:

Stakeholder Role	Stakeholders	Activities
Representatives of Target Groups and Rights Holders	Citizens of Uzbekistan, including women, girls, men, boys; NGOs; CSOs; the private sector	Beneficiaries, Implementing Partners
Primary Duty Bearers	MoE; MoH; MoIFT; MoHE; GPO;	Policy implementation and service delivery
Intra-Governmental/UN	UNDP; UNICEF; UNFPA; UNESCO; FAO; ILO; WHO; UNV; UNODC; UNAIDS; UNWomen; UNECE; UNCTAD; IAEA	Coordination, implementation of UNDAF programmes
Funders and financing	USAID; Global Fund; EU; World Bank; UK Aid;	Partnership for resource mobilization

ANNEX 5

EVALUATORS' PROFILES

The international consultant for the UNDAF evaluation is Dr. Annette Ittig. Dr. Ittig is an evaluation and partnership expert with extensive experience in both staff and contractor roles in donor, UN agency and private sector assignments, including with the World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, WFP, DPKO, UN-Habitat and the MasterCard Foundation in Tajikistan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Iraq, Afghanistan, the UAE, Nepal and elsewhere. Her UNDAF experience includes the evaluations of the 2014-2018 Kenya, 2012-2015 Zimbabwe and 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAFs, as well as the narrative for the 2018-2022 Nepal UNDAF document. Her partnership experience includes the 2019 UN Kenya SDG Partnership Platform “Strategic Islamic Financing Options Scoping Study”, and the design for the Kurdistan Education Trust Fund for Sector Infrastructure as a Government/extractives firms PPP concept for UN-Habitat Iraq. Dr. Ittig received her doctorate from the University of Oxford.

The national consultant for the UNDAF evaluation is Ms. Regina Safarova. Ms. Safarova is an individual consultant and trainer on evaluation, institutional capacity development, education, social projects/programmes, and civil society organizations development. R. Safarova has worked for international organizations since 1997 and as individual consultant and researcher since 2006. The work for international organizations (about 10 years in the USAID funded Eurasia Foundation (USA grant-making organization) and about 10 years in Friedrich Ebert Foundation (German CSOs' supportive organization) helped to develop analytical and evaluating skills. This experience was further used in research and evaluation project/programmes for UNDP, UNICEF, Asian Development Bank, International Labour Organization, Global Environment Facility, and others. R. Safarova supervised the programme on evaluation capacity development in Uzbekistan. R. Safarova has MS on Economics and on Pedagogy. R. Safarova has experience on working with projects/programmes in all countries of Central Asia as well as in Armenia, Russia and Afghanistan. R. Safarova is an author of a number of articles on popularization of monitoring and evaluation and development of civil society.