

# AZERBAIJAN

**Summative Evaluation of the Project  
“Promoting Access to Justice for Children  
in Azerbaijan through national capacity building  
for State and non-State Actors”**

## **Evaluation Report (vol.2)**

8 December 2017

Prepared for UNICEF Country Office in Azerbaijan by:

Camelia Gheorghe, International Consultant



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference ..... 3  
Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods ..... 14  
Annex 3 – Primary Data Collection Guides and Templates..... 16  
Annex 4 – Evaluation Matrix ..... 27  
Annex 5 – Evaluation Sample ..... 34  
Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation ..... 36  
Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation..... 39  
Annex 8 – Successfully solved cases ..... 41  
Annex 9 – Budget of the Project ..... 42

### 1. Context and Description of Object of the Evaluation

Azerbaijan has changed dramatically in the last ten years, with strong economic and social developments. While there are overall positive tendencies, there are pockets of issues that are still challenge. One such area is access to justice for children who are in contact and conflict with the law. The transition processes after independence from the Soviet Union have brought large-scale legal and judicial reforms in Azerbaijan. As part of UNICEF's regional agenda, juvenile justice reform has been initiated in Azerbaijan since 2007, which resulted in significant improvements for the protection of the rights of juveniles in conflict with law. But there are still risks, challenges and gaps in ensuring access to justice for children, which encompasses a much broader array of issues than juvenile justice.

UNICEF country office in Azerbaijan has been implementing the project on "Promoting access to justice for children Azerbaijan through national Capacity Building for State and non-State Actors" since November 2014 with financial support of Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Azerbaijan. UNICEF Azerbaijan has also been implementing the project of "Provision of Technical Assistance under the Judicial Services and Smart Infrastructure Project (JSSIP)" supported by WB. The project aimed to develop Juvenile Justice Legal and Institutional Assessment Report and based on the assessment, elaborate a proposal for the National Strategy to Strengthen Juvenile Justice in Azerbaijan. The initial idea on elaboration of the Project also benefited from the evaluation report of the UNICEF-led program on legal aid in Azerbaijan and the UNICEF and EU report titled "Juvenile Justice in the CEE/CIS Region: Progress, Challenges, Obstacles, And Opportunities", 2013, which revealed many obstacles that hamper the protection of children in contact and conflict with law, particularly lack of adequate services, "substandard conditions" in pre-trial detention, ill-treatment and torture of children and poor governance in the system.

The goal of the project is to strengthen human rights protection of children at risk through enhancing access to justice mechanisms. This in turn should contribute to democratic reforms, increasing participation of civic organizations and State actors in monitoring the protection of human rights.

While UNICEF lately has been doing more policy advocacy focused work, it is increasingly clear that some areas need more comprehensive intervention rather than only policy advocacy. Therefore, UNICEF tried to employ various methodologies in implementing this project, which involved technical assistance to the State to improve the policies, but also build the capacity of the local NGOs to become effective actors in resolving local child rights issues that have national implications.

Therefore, UNICEF has worked both at the policy advocacy level to change the legislative norms and also social norms through behaviour change methods, and supported NGOs to provide community-level services.

One of the main themes of the Project was to build capacity of the Ombudsman and increase the impact of the independent monitoring mechanism. National Preventive Group of the Ombudsman was selected as one of the stakeholders since it has the mandate to ensure protection of the rights of children in justice system.

The Project facilitated establishment of new legal/support services to enable access to justice for children in five districts of the country. The project activities are supported with the Project funding for 24 months and are implemented by the regional participating NGOs. Each NGO was expected to ensure continuation of the service provision after the Project ends.

### 2. Duty bearers & Right holders

Duty bearers /entities affected by the project are following:

- Ministries of Interior and Justice, Education and Social Protection;
- Ombudsman of the Republic of Azerbaijan;
- Representatives of civil society, 5 NGOs/ Resource Centres in Gabala, Shirvan, Aghjabledy, Mingechevir and Shamkir;
- Members of the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM);

- Penitentiary service facilities;
- Members of National and Local Commissions on minors;
- Parliamentarians;
- Law-enforcement personnel and judges.

The right holders who should benefit from the project in the long term are THE following:

- Children in conflict with law, witnesses and children interacting with administrative and judicial systems;
- 1500 children and families directly will benefit from access to justice services provided by NGOs and state authorities;
- Juveniles held in detention (pre / post-trial);
- Children held in correctional/educational institutions;
- Families and communities of children in conflict with law.

### **3. Purpose of the Evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is to measure the success of the project and summarize good practices and lessons learned for both UNICEF, the donor and the government counterparts for future consideration. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to determine the relevance, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project as an approach to strengthen access to justice for children system in Azerbaijan. As the project ends in August 2017, it was agreed with the donor that the summative evaluation of the project will be carried out at the end of the project.

The primary audience of the evaluation will be UNICEF Azerbaijan CO, Delegation of the European Union, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population, Ministry of Justice, Ombudsman and secondary audience is implementing partner NGOs. The information presented in the final evaluation report should be easy to understand and comprehensible. Recommendations should be based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear.

The results of the evaluation will provide practical recommendations for improving quality of provided service and for the scaling up of such project to the national level.

### **4. Evaluation Objectives**

The objectives of the summative evaluation are to measure the extent to which the project has met its specific GOALS below:

- a. to build and strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations to facilitate better access to justice in line with EU and international principles;
- b. to increase the capacity of the public control organizations (Ombudsman) to facilitate independent monitoring of child rights violations and;
- c. to build and increase the communication capacity of civil society organizations to improve perceptions and attitudes about children at risk in general society.
- d. development and implementation of human rights (gender mainstreaming, child rights, people with disabilities, etc.) based approaches.

### **5. Evaluation Scope**

In addition to project objectives, evaluation should examine if the following six inter-related and coherent outcomes, which should be the main building blocks for achieving the goal of the project have been achieved. Measurement indicators of each outcome are available for evaluation. Evaluation team should consider gender, equity and child rights dimension while conducting project evaluation.

**Outcome 1.** Relevant State Authority has increased capacity to effectively monitor and report on violations of the rights of children in contact and conflict with law.

**Outcome 2.** Increased capacity for CSOs using legal aid and judicial procedures to attain protection of the rights of children.

**Outcome 3.** Improved societal attitudes and perceptions about children through increased capacity of civil society organizations and use of communication strategies.

**Outcome 4:** Effectively functioning child protection system ensuring access to justice for children at risk.

**Outcome 5:** Better informed and well-trained law enforcement professionals facilitating adequate access to justice.

**Outcome 6:** Improved legislative and administrative framework ensuring necessary mechanisms for better access to justice for children.

Evaluation also should measure if the activities below were implemented properly and how much they have contributed to achievement of the project outcomes and objectives.

**Activity 1.** Capacity building for and technical assistance to the National Preventive Group on Ill-treatment and Torture of the Ombudsman to better monitor violations of rights of children in justice, social care and school systems.

**Activity 2.** Capacity building of at least five local/regional NGOs on the concepts and main principles of access to justice for children.

**Activity 3.** Technical support to selected regional NGOs on designing and delivering community-based support mechanisms targeting children and families in need to access to justice services.

**Activity 4.** Change public perceptions through Communication for Development tools.

**Activity 5.** Supporting efforts to bring social work to the justice system.

**Activity 6.** Capacity-building of the law-enforcement personnel working with children in contact with the law, including those allegedly in conflict with it.

**Activity 7.** Revision to the legislative and administrative framework based on lessons learned from results of the Action.

The evaluation should cover the period of project implementation (1<sup>st</sup> December 2015 to 25<sup>th</sup> August 2017) in five districts of Azerbaijan: Mingachevir, Aghjabedi, Shirvan (City), Shamkir and Gabala; and on national level capacity development activities were implemented with the National Preventive Group.

## **6. Evaluation Framework**

The project evaluation questions are formulated as per [OECD-DAC evaluation criteria](#): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. Additional criteria such as coverage, coordination and coherence should also be used in evaluation.

Below are a set of guiding questions that should be responded by the evaluation. However, it is expected that the evaluator may suggest additional questions or sub-questions, and during the evaluation additional information that adds substance to the key questions will be collected and included in the final evaluation report.

### **Relevance**

The extent to which the project meets the needs of target groups and right holders.

- To what extent does the project address underlying causes of exclusion and respond to the needs of the most vulnerable target groups?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?

- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- How relevant is the project to UNICEF Azerbaijan Country Programme Action Plan?
- To what extent is the project implemented by UNICEF relevant or contribute to the overall national juvenile justice framework and to the broader rule of law and justice sector reform agenda implemented in Azerbaijan?
- To what extent have the project complied with the standards of the CRC and other international instruments (Beijing Rules, Riyadh Guidelines, etc.)?
- How does the project fit into the wider context of national child and social protection priorities?
- Was the project designed and implemented in taking into consideration existing policy and regulatory framework and socio-economic environment and needs?
- Do the project outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes and challenges?
- To what extent and how did the project take into account existing institutional and human capacities and results of the previous efforts as a basis for planned interventions?
- Were the project objectives set realistically to be achieved in a given period of time?
- To what extent was the idea of geographical targeting relevant in the country context, taking into account Azerbaijan's centralized governance system?
- To what extent were Government and non-governmental stakeholders as well as other UN agencies were consulted and in agreement with UNICEF's geographical targeting?
- To what extent is the project design relevant vis-à-vis the overall project goal and the achievement of its objectives in the given period of time?
- Was the project designed according to international norms and agreements on Human Rights (HR) and Gender Equality (GE) and in line with national strategies to advance HR & GE?
- Is the appropriate government management structure in place to achieve the expected results?
- Is there another or similar system currently in place? If so, how is this linked to this project?

#### **Effectiveness**

The extent to which a project activities achieve its outcomes. In evaluating the effectiveness of a project, the following questions should be considered:

- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- To what extent and how have the expected outcomes of the programs been achieved?
- Have the planned results been achieved by the end of the project?
- What are the results of interventions in terms of:
  - reported cases of violations of child rights in all types of detention facilities,
  - number of children and families directly benefited from access to justice services provided by NGOs and state authorities,
  - number of district level child rights commissions in at least 10 districts benefits from training activities

- What are the major constraints and limitations in the delivery of programs? What are the facilitating factors?
- To what extent did the project succeed in strengthening capacities of law enforcement officials, child protection officials, National Preventive Group, Ombudsman Regional offices and regional NGOs in realisation of human rights, promoting gender equality and reflecting the equity dimensions?
- Is there a demonstrable improvement in state capacity related to child rights in the target districts?
- To what extent the approach was effective in identifying and addressing the different needs/rights issues of boys and girls?
- HAVE legislative acts and policies improved as a result of UNICEF's approach?
- Are results achieved similar in all 5 districts? Which districts perform better/worse and for what reason?
- To what extent and how has the project contributed to the creation of a coherent legislative and policy framework (Number of new legislative acts have been prepared within the Project life time; and Number of new legislative acts have been adopted by the government.)
- To what extent and how has the project contributed to the establishment of Guidelines on Social Work for Families and Children in Justice System; and Guidelines on Social Work for Families and Children in Child Protection System);
- To what extent the Project contributed to strengthening monitoring and reporting capacities of NPG?
- In what ways and to what extent has the project contributed toward changes in levels of knowledge and awareness of the public and officials about the problems children in conflict and contact with the law?
- How satisfied were the right holders of the services they received through the NGOs?
- In what ways and to what extent has the database developed for the NPG linked to the three-year strategy on child rights monitoring?

### **Efficiency**

The extent the management of the Project ensure timelines and efficient utilization of resources.

When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, the following questions should be considered:

- How well have the financial resources been used / were funds managed in a cost-effective manner / what is the correlation between funds utilized and outputs / results achieved / could the same results be achieved with less resources?
- To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled, how flexible was the project in adapting to changing needs?
- Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar projects to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps? Was it possible to direct all programmes to the target districts? What obstacles were encountered?
- To what extent was UNICEF successful in focusing its resources on the target districts?  
Were UNICEF resources (human, financial) sufficient to implement partnerships at the local level?

- How do local authorities value the quality of the partnership? Is this different among the five target districts?
- To what extent were management and monitoring systems established to track the project results in five districts?
- To what extent have the programme been innovative in access to justice programming? If so, can conclusions be drawn on using these innovations or the approach in general in similar contexts?
- Were there other resources made available apart from UNICEF?

### **Impact**

The extend the project increased system's capacities to ensure that more vulnerable and excluded children benefit from legal-aid and legal representation services. When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, the following questions should be considered:

- Are there any external factors (risks and assumptions) that have affected the impact of the project? Are the factors, if any, sufficiently taken into consideration in adjusting the design of the project?
- Did the project create demand for better protection of the rights of children in detention centres and closed facilities through working with the Ombudsman's National Preventive Group?
- Did the project provide accessible legal aid and legal representation services to children in vulnerable situations?
- To what extent have the project improved the lives of the vulnerable groups in selected districts?
- What was the potential of project activities to lead to improvements in legislation and normative framework related to access to justice, pre-trial detention, child care, support services and child protection?
- Can demonstrable impact on service delivery to children and families be documented in the target districts?
- To what extent have achievements in the target districts fed into national level policy dialogue and supported the environment for implementation of child rights?
- To what extent have achievements in target districts been documented and scaled up to non-target districts?
- In what ways and to what extent has the National Preventive Group contributed to the follow-up and response of child protection cases?
- In what ways and to what extent has the project changed the capacities of partners to prevent, monitor and respond to child protection concerns?
- Were there any unexpected (either positive or negative) outcomes of the project that had not been planned for? If so, which ones?
  - How has coordination and collaboration between relevant local entities changed as a result of the project?

### **Sustainability**

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- What measures have been taken to ensure sustainability of the project? What are the resources (both human and financial) used to sustain the intervention?

- Are the activities likely to be continued when external support is withdrawn, and will it be more widely replicated or adapted?
- What are the next steps to be undertaken in order to scale up this intervention?
- To what extent has UNICEF been successful in ensuring that improvements in local capacity will be sustained beyond the current project cycle?
- What capacities have been built at institutional level and were they sustainable?
- Did the Project design include an appropriate sustainability strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes for the most vulnerable groups after the end of the project?
- To what extent the legislative framework developed and policy documents produced provide a ground for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable children and their families?
- What is the level of ownership of the project by the MoLSPP and local Executive Committees?
- To what extent has the Project promoted strengthening of already existing partnerships and establishment of new ones and to strengthening of inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level?
- What would be the human, financial and technical resource implication(s) to scale the project up to national level/coverage?
- In what ways and to what extent have there been synergy and/or coherence between the project and other organization?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the generation of sub-national and national capacity, such that it will be sustainable if UNICEF funding ceases?

In addition to the 5 main evaluation criteria, the evaluation shall also focus on assessing human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues, coverage, coordination and coherence.

**Cross-cutting:** To what extent are sex and age disaggregated data collected and monitored? In what ways and to what extent has the project integrated an equity based approach into the design and implementation of its interventions? Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of child and women rights, especially the most vulnerable? To what extent and how does the project ensure a non-discrimination and equity focus?

**Coverage:** Was representativeness of coverage ensured by project activities? Which groups have been reached by the project and what is the different impact on those groups? Have vulnerable children been reached, including children with disabilities?

**Coordination:** What was the role of the MoLSPP, SCFWCA, ExComs, NGOs, community and other key actors in the design, coordination and implementation of project activities?

**Coherence:** What were the areas and ways of cooperation with other UN and donor agencies' in regard to development of services for vulnerable children? How does the project relate to the existing national and/or local policy on children under three? Was there coherence across interventions supported by different agencies?

## Methodology

The company or consultant group will be requested to propose a detailed methodology as part of the inception report, which should be guided by the UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy<sup>1</sup>, the Evaluation Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)<sup>2</sup>, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluations and Data Collection and Analysis<sup>3</sup> and UNICEF's reporting standards.

<sup>1</sup> UNICEF revised evaluation policy [https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2013-14-Revised\\_Evaluation\\_Policy\\_UNICEF-18Apr13.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2013-14-Revised_Evaluation_Policy_UNICEF-18Apr13.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> UNEG Norms: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>, UNEG Standards: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT\\_IV-UNICEF\\_Procedure\\_for\\_Ethical\\_Standards.PDF](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF)

## **Evaluability assessment**

Clear project implementation structure, availability of baseline and target data for indicators and routine collection of data from the project districts makes the project evaluable. UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation system will provide support in filling the data gaps to extent possible. Data sources, particularly those containing disaggregated data, are assessed as reliable.

Following existing sources of information are assessed and identified as reliable:

- a. Database of cases
- b. NGOs' monthly reports and Output Evaluation Form for each of local consultant
- c. Monthly report of national Juvenile Justice consultant
- d. Three-year Strategy in National Preventive Group
- e. Law on Social Services
- f. Guidelines on Social Work for Families and Children in Justice System;
- g. Guidelines on Social Work for Families and Children in Child Protection System
- h. Communication Strategy and Action Plan of 5 local legal aid partners
- i. Reports from project international consultants
- j. Minutes of the Task Force Group meetings of Juvenile Justice
- k. Other relevant documents

All of the documents listed, together with a contact list of all for the project relevant professionals, project implementing partners and consultants will be provided to the evaluator team once a contractual agreement has been made.

The evaluation will undertake a transparent and participatory process involving relevant project participants and partners at the national and local levels and employing a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. The process is expected to take place within 4 months timeframe starting in June 2017.

## **Limitations to the evaluation**

There are several imitations to the evaluation which can hinder the process.

- Disaggregated data on local level might not be available, or the quality of available data may not be good.
- Interviewing government counterparts for the evaluation may depend on their availability.
- In two districts project teams have been replaced due to objective reasons. Therefore, new teams may not have enough information about project activities of the previous teams.

The applicants should discuss the above or other potential limitations in their proposal.

The evaluation should include the following steps:

### ***Step 1: Desk review of relevant project documents***

The evaluator or consulting team will review key project documents to understand the project approaches, process and activities since its inception in 2015 to date. The documents could include the relevant national policies, other study reports, project documents, progress and monitoring reports; review meeting documentation, and national Juvenile Justice consultant's report.

### ***Step 2: Preparation of Inception Report that includes evaluation methodology and tools***

The methodology should be prepared to cover all the intended objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation methodology design will be finalized in agreement with the reference group (with UNICEF, EU, MoLSPP,

NPG, NGOs) and inception report should be prepared based on the Evaluation Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group and submitted to reference group.

**Step 3: Data collection**

The application of both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods is expected, which should be human rights based, including child rights based and gender sensitive. The data collected should be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, and location. Field visits to project districts should employ methods ranging from document review, interviews, focus group discussions, surveys, observation depending on the final methodology.

**Step 4: Data analysis**

Collected data should be analysed by using relevant analysis method that should be clearly described in the report.

**Step 5: Sharing preliminary findings and recommendations**

The evaluation team will share preliminary findings and recommendations with the reference group. While feedback will be taken into consideration and incorporated into the draft report, the evaluators are encouraged to guard against validity threats, such as personal bias.

**Step 6: Draft report**

The evaluation team prepares a draft report, with conclusions and recommendations drawn from the data. The report structure should follow UNICEF’s evaluation report guidance.

**Step 7: Finalization of the evaluation report**

The evaluation team will present the final draft evaluation report to the reference group with a power point presentation. Recommendations of the project evaluation report should also be presented. Comments and feedback on the findings and recommendations should be incorporated to finalize the report.

**Workplan and Evaluation Management**

Description of Deliverables	Time estimate	Assessment criteria
Desk-review & Inception report	18 days	<p>All relevant project documents are reviewed and inception report that includes result of desk review, consultation meetings and detailed evaluation methodology that is compliant with UNICEF requirements for inception report. Inception report will be assessed based on Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) review criteria.</p> <p>Among other inception report should include following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluation plan including timelines and activities</li> <li>2. Methodology</li> <li>3. Data collection instruments (quantitative &amp; qualitative)</li> <li>4. Ethical protocols (if relevant)</li> <li>5. Quality control procedures</li> <li>6. Training plan</li> <li>7. Field work plan including team composition, logistics, field monitoring, etc.</li> <li>8. Plans for data analysis (quantitative and qualitative), report preparation and dissemination</li> </ol>
Data collection	14 days (including travels)	Primary data is collected from target groups and partners based on the methodology described in inception report.

Data analysis and first draft report	20 days	Relevant analysis methods applied to analyse primary and secondary data and draft report is prepared.
Presentation of findings	5 days (including travels)	PowerPoint presentation of findings including practical recommendations is presented to reference group and project partners feedbacks recorded to be considered in final report.
Final report	5 days	<p>Final report should be between 30-50 pages and structured as per the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards<sup>4</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Executive summary</li> <li>2. Object of evaluation</li> <li>3. Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope</li> <li>4. Evaluation methodology</li> <li>5. Findings</li> <li>6. Conclusions and lessons learned</li> <li>7. Recommendations</li> <li>8. Gender and human rights including child rights issues to be consolidated and clearly articulated from all report sections.</li> <li>9. Annexes</li> </ol> <p>More detailed information of the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports standard is provided in the UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template, which will be shared at the start of the consultancy. Evaluation report should be adjusted as per feedback of the external quality assurance entity.</p>

#### **Estimated Cost of Consultancy and Payment Conditions**

The financial proposal should include a breakdown of budget amount including fee and number of anticipated working days, travel costs and per-diems. Payments will be processed per the payment conditions aligned with deliverables specified in the ToR, upon satisfactory completion of work assignment as assessed by UNICEF.

#### **Roles and responsibilities**

The will comprise one international consultant who will be mainly responsible for overall evaluation including designing evaluation methodology, developing tools, guiding national consultant in data collection, analysing data, drafting inception and final reports with recommendations.

#### **Dissemination**

The results of evaluation will not be circulated to wider-public. The report will be disseminated to reference group including donor and implementing partners in hard and soft copies. Also, the results of evaluation findings will be disseminated through PowerPoint presentation.

#### **Qualifications**

The key qualifications required for the international consultant are as follows:

- Advanced University degree in social science or law;
- 8-10 years of professional experience in evaluation and assessment of local level projects;
- Previous experience in evaluating projects for child protection and child welfare;
- Demonstrated capacity to analyse the data and to write reports in particularly, evaluation reports;

<sup>4</sup> UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards, July 2010

- Facilitation skills, particularly design of stakeholder consultation exercises as well participatory methods;
- General knowledge of UN evaluation policy, norms and standards, including human rights-based approach to programming and results-based management, including gender equality and child;
- Experience in working with UN / UNICEF and EU donors.
- Excellent mastery of English including in report writing and presentation.

Evaluator must remain in strict adherence with UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct.

### **Application**

Interested individual should submit through e-recruitment: <https://www.unicef.org/about/employ>

- a) Resume
- b) Technical evaluation proposal with detailed budget;
- c) References of previous relevant work;

### **Deadline**

All applications will be treated with strict confidentiality. UNICEF is an equal opportunity employer.

UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.

## Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods

Key informants	Research method	Tool	Notes
<b>CENTRAL LEVEL</b>			
UNICEF CO management and relevant Project staff	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	In Baku with Representative; Deputy Representative; Child Protection Specialist; Child Rights Systems Monitoring Specialist; Financial/Operations Officer; Communication Officer
	Skype interview	Interview guide	Former Child Protection Specialist
UNICEF National consultant	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	In Baku, with the national consultant
World of Law Legal Propaganda NGO and Youth Education Centre (co-applicant NGOs)	Joint interview	Interview guide	In Baku, with representatives of the two co-applicant NGOs who were directly involved in capacity building and advocacy activities of the Project. <sup>5</sup>
Line ministries (justice, interior, labour and social protection); Academies of justice and police	In-depth interview	Interview guide	In Baku, with representatives of stakeholders, nominated by their management to meet the evaluator
National Preventive Group on Ill-Treatment and Torture of the Ombudsman	Group interview	Interview guide	In Baku, with members of the NPG who benefited of technical assistance and training, but who were also engaged in the trainings of law-enforcement staff in the districts
EU Delegation, World Bank	In-depth interview	Interview guide	In Baku, with representatives of the donors and key international development partners
Regional participating NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)	Focus Group	Focus group guide	In Baku. One Focus Group composed of 10 professionals from all five target districts, 2 participants/district.  <i>Recruitment criteria:</i> beneficiaries of trainings provided by the Project; direct providers of legal support services to vulnerable children and parents; involvement in communication/ behaviour change/awareness raising at district level; gender balance to the extent possible
Law enforcement and child protection professionals	E-mail-based interview	Interview guide	Interview questions to be sent by e-mail to all professionals from all target cities and districts, i.e. law-enforcement personnel working with children in contact with the law and child protection staff/officials (social workers, members of district commissions on children's rights) who benefitted of training provided by the Project

<sup>5</sup> As mentioned in the section on limitations of evaluation, the interview with the director of World of Law Legal Propaganda NGO was not possible.

Key informants	Research method	Tool	Notes
<b>IN SAMPLE DISTRICTS</b>			
Regional participating NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)	Group interview	Interview guide	In each sample district. Beneficiaries of trainings and providers of legal aid, legal representation and other services to target population in the respective district. Staff involved in awareness raising activities based on Communication Action Plans.
Representatives of district child rights commissions	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	In each sample district. Professionals who are members of the district commissions and who participated in the trainings organised by the Project.
Parents	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	In each sample district, 4-6 interviews/ district with vulnerable parents/caregivers  <i>Recruitment criteria:</i> beneficiaries of Project services and/or whose children benefitted of such services and/or were involved in justice proceedings; various vulnerability profiles (disability, low education level, unemployed, single-parent family, many children in the family, etc.); gender balance (both mothers and fathers)
Beneficiary children	Face-to-face interview <sup>6</sup>	Interview guide	In the sample districts, 4-6 interviews/ district  <i>Recruitment criteria:</i> beneficiaries of various Project services and/or were involved in justice proceedings; both boys and girls; age: 12-18 years old; children whose parents' consent was obtained prior to the discussion.
Service providers	Participant observation <sup>7</sup>	Site visit	Site visit to the regional NGOs in the sample districts where services are actually delivered.

<sup>6</sup> In case of parents who participated in the interview with their children (with disability, small children), direct observation of children has been also used.

<sup>7</sup> "In situ, non-disruptive observation of the daily activity of actors and/or beneficiary of the evaluated intervention. The researcher tries to understand the situation "from the inside". (EVALSED Guide, 2013)

## Annex 3 – Primary Data Collection Guides and Templates

### General methodological notes:

Each interview and focus group will start with the presentation of the evaluator and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the participants. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the Project will be also done.

The evaluator will confirm the interviewees that participation in the evaluation is voluntary and that their opinions will be confidential and presented in the report in an anonymous manner. They will be also reminded that they could withdraw anytime during the interview or focus group without any obligation to explain the reasons.

The participants in interviews and focus group will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. They will take place in Baku, in the sample districts or by e-mail, as the case. Interviews (individual or in group) will last around 1-1.5 hours each, except those with vulnerable children which will last around 30 minutes; the focus group with professionals from regional NGOs will have a duration of 2 hours.

In line with standard evaluation practices, the interviews and focus group will be attended only by the evaluator, the interviewed stakeholders and the interpreter (if the case).

## GUIDES FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

### **Interview Guide for UNICEF country office**

*(Representative; Deputy Representative; Child Protection Specialist; Child Rights Monitoring Specialist; Financial/Operations officer; Communication officer – multiple interviews; questions will be adapted for each interviewee)*

1. What strategic needs and priorities of the country have been addressed by the Project? How were the target cities and districts selected?
2. What are the major achievements of the Project that you are most proud of? What was the most challenging in achieving these results? Are there any unplanned effects of the Project with significant contribution to improving the access to justice of vulnerable children and families?
3. How do they measure “change in knowledge and attitudes among the target groups”, “increase in knowledge of law enforcement officials on the rights of the children in pre-trial detention” (indicators), “successfully solved cases” (interim report)?
4. Did some target cities/districts perform better than others? If yes, how and why?
5. How would you assess the cost-effectiveness of the legal aid and legal representation services for children in target districts? (as such and compared to similar services delivered by other stakeholders/providers, if the case)
6. How satisfied are you with the overall Project management and implementation i.e. performance of implementing partners and consultants (co-applicant NGOs, regional NGOs), timelines,

efficiency in utilization of financial and human resources, procurement/contracting/small granting for district activities, risks mitigation, coherence with other relevant interventions? How has UNICEF carried out the monitoring of the Project at national and district level? Reporting.

7. How would you describe UNICEF's cooperation with Ombudsman, NPG, line ministries, JJTF Group? What about cooperation with stakeholders at district level (local authorities, district child rights commissions, NGOs, etc.)? What went well? What could have been done better?
8. What was the strategy used by UNICEF to ensure that vulnerable children and families have access to legal aid and legal representation? What was 'vulnerability' defined by the Project?
9. What difference has UNICEF made via this Project for vulnerable children (*which?*) and their parents/caregivers in terms of: a) access to child-friendly justice mechanisms; b) parents' empowerment; c) reducing equity gaps; d) increased state allocation for services in the justice and child protection sectors?, e) changing/challenging negative social norms? What was the effect of the Project upon children in detention and/or in closed institutions?
10. Looking ahead, which of the achievements of the Project are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them will require further support? What measures have you taken to ensure sustainability?
11. In your view, what is the likelihood that the Government in Azerbaijan will set up/expand the services ensuring access to justice for vulnerable children, based on the model developed by UNICEF? What are the favouring/blocking factors?
12. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing them?

### **Interview Guide for former UNICEF Child Protection Specialist (by skype)**

1. What strategic needs and priorities of the country were foreseen to be addressed by the Project?
2. How was the Project designed? Who participated in the development of the grant application?
3. Please explain how have you set the baselines and targets.
4. To what extent is the Project coherent with similar initiatives of UNICEF and other development partners?
5. How were the target cities and districts selected? How were the co-applicant NGOs selected?
6. Please explain the implementation arrangements foreseen for the Project. Were there any adjustments needed to the initial plans?
7. Was there any risk mitigation strategy envisaged to ensure a smooth implementation of the Project and the sustainability of services provided to vulnerable children and families?
8. What was the strategy envisaged by UNICEF to ensure that vulnerable children and families have access to legal aid and legal representation? What was 'vulnerability' defined by the Project?

9. If you were to design the Project again, what would you change and why?
10. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities to increase the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing them?

### **Interview Guide for co-applicant NGOs (joint interview)**

*(World of Law Legal Propaganda NGO and Youth Education Centre)*

1. What kind of assistance is your organisation providing in Azerbaijan in the field of access of children to justice in Azerbaijan? (themes, outreach, beneficiaries)
2. What was your role in the design and implementation of the Project? (capacity building, advocacy, etc.) Did you have any role in the selection of the target districts and cities?
3. Which are the achievements that you are most proud of? What was the most challenging in your work as implementing partner?
4. What difference has UNICEF made via this Project for vulnerable children and their parents/caregivers in terms of: a) access to child-friendly justice mechanisms; b) parents' empowerment; c) reducing equity gaps; d) increased state allocation for services in the justice and child protection sectors?, e) changing/challenging negative social norms? What was the effect of the Project upon children in detention and/or in closed institutions?
5. To the best of your knowledge, has the support provided by UNICEF to improve access of children to justice been efficient? (management, monitoring system, efficiency of resources utilization, cost-effectiveness, synergy with governmental projects and similar initiatives of other donors/development partners, cross-sector coordination, etc.)?
6. In your view, what would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for scaling up the services developed by the Project?
7. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF and of your organisation in addressing these needs?

### **Interview Guide for UNICEF National Consultant**

1. What was your role in the Project?
2. Which are the most significant achievements of the Project that you contributed to? What was the most challenging in your work as national consultant?
3. How would you define "successfully solved cases"? (interim report)
4. Please explain your role in the monitoring of the Project compared to that of UNICEF CO. Reporting.
5. In your opinion, did some target districts perform better than others? If yes, how and why?

6. How would you describe the cooperation with stakeholders at district level (local authorities, district child rights commissions, NGOs, etc.)? What went well? What could have been done better?
7. What was the strategy used at district level to ensure that vulnerable children and families have access to legal aid and legal representation? What was 'vulnerability' defined by the Project?
8. In your view, what difference has the Project made for vulnerable children (*which?*) and their parents/caregivers in terms of: a) access to child-friendly justice mechanisms; b) parents' empowerment; c) reducing equity gaps; d) changing/challenging negative social norms?
9. In your opinion, which of the achievements of the Project are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? What measures have you taken at district level to ensure sustainability?
10. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years?

### **Interview Guide for Ombudsman, NPG, line ministries, justice and police academies**

1. To what extent is the UNICEF Project "*Promoting Access to Justice for Children in Azerbaijan through national capacity building for State and non-State Actors*" aligned with country priorities and its international human rights commitments? What needs of children and parents/caregivers has the Project addressed, in particular of the most vulnerable?
2. What was the role of your organisation in the implementation/monitoring of the Project? Did you have any role in the selection of the target districts and cities?
3. What are the major achievements of the Project ? (in terms of e.g. legal framework, capacity building, services for vulnerable children and families, changing perceptions and attitudes, etc.). What was the most challenging in achieving these results? Are there any unplanned effects that you are aware of (e.g. employment creation for teachers)?
4. What is your assessment of the quality of the services developed by Project in the five districts aimed at improving the access of children to justice? (relevance; expertise; targeting of the most vulnerable; timeliness; premises; quality assurance, etc.?)
5. What difference has UNICEF made via this Project for *vulnerable children (which?)* and their parents/caregivers in terms of: a) access to child-friendly justice mechanisms; b) parents' empowerment; c) reducing equity gaps; d) increased state allocation for services in the justice and child protection sectors?, e) changing/challenging negative social norms? What was the effect of the Project upon children in detention and/or in closed institutions?
6. Looking ahead, in your view which of these achievements are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support (including scaling up of services)? Which of them would require further support?
7. What would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for scaling up the results of the Project at national level?

8. To the best of your knowledge, has the support provided by UNICEF to improve access of children to justice been efficient? (management, monitoring system, efficiency of resources utilization, cost-effectiveness, synergy with governmental projects and similar initiatives of other donors/development partners, cross-sector coordination, etc.)?
9. Are you satisfied about the partnership with UNICEF? What went well? What could have been done better?
10. In your view, what is the comparative advantage of UNICEF compared to other international development partners active in Azerbaijan as far as juvenile justice is concerned?
11. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF and of your organisation in addressing these needs?

*Additional issues to be discussed:* Ministry of Labour and Social Protection - guidelines on social work and recruitment of social workers; NPG/Ombudsman - 3-year strategy, MIS, effects of the Project on Ombudsman's Regional offices

### **Interview Guide for donor**

*(EU Delegation in Azerbaijan)*

1. How does the Project align with EU policies in the field of juvenile justice? What kind of assistance is your institution providing in Azerbaijan in the field of justice for children?
2. To what extent is this Project relevant for country's needs and priorities? What about the needs of the target districts?
3. In your view, what are the major achievements of this Project? What was most challenging in achieving these results?
4. How would you assess the cost-effectiveness of the legal aid and legal representation services in the target districts?
5. How satisfied are you with the overall management and implementation of the Project?
6. What difference has the Project made for vulnerable children?
7. To what extent do you think the achievements of the Project are likely to be sustained and scaled up? What would be needed to make this happen?
8. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing these needs?

### **Interview Guide for international development partners (joint interview)**

*(World Bank, other UN agencies as advised by UNICEF CO)*

1. What kind of assistance is your institution providing in Azerbaijan in the field of justice for children?

2. Are you aware of UNICEF's initiative to increase the access of children to child-friendly justice mechanisms and build the capacity of law enforcement, justice and child protection professionals?
3. What is your opinion about this initiative in terms of relevance for children and their parents/caregivers and of its results?
4. Is this UNICEF initiative complementary to your work in the field of juvenile justice? Were there any coordination meetings?
5. In your opinion, is UNICEF's initiative relevant for the priorities of the country and its international commitments? Please motivate your answer.
6. According to the best of your knowledge, what would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for scaling up the results of the Project at national level?
7. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities for increasing the access of children to justice in Azerbaijan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF and of your organisation in addressing these needs?

### **Interview Guide for professionals (e-mail-based)**

*(law-enforcement personnel working with children in contact with the law and child protection staff/officials (social workers, members of district commissions on children's rights) who benefited of training)*

1. What is your position and role in your organisation?
2. Which new skills and knowledge do you retain following the trainings delivered by the Project? Please provide 1-2 examples.
3. Do you apply new skills and approaches in your work with children and parents?
4. Do you have further needs for capacity building? In which area?
5. What is the profile of children that you have dealt with/are dealing with? (residence, occupation of parents, socio-economic status of the family, disability, etc.)
6. How do you see your role in the process of improving the access to justice of children from vulnerable families? What is most challenging?
7. What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the UNICEF-supported legal aid and legal representation services in terms of access of vulnerable children to justice?
8. Would have it been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without this support?
9. Could you indicate examples of justice proceedings which respected the human rights of children, but did not before the Project?
10. What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them? Do you see any particular role for you in this process?

### **Interview Guide for members of child rights commissions (in sample districts)**

*(professionals who are members of the district commissions in the sample districts and who participated in the trainings organised by the Project)*

1. What is your position and role in the child district commission?
2. What are the most frequent cases that you discuss in the commission, in particular related to children in contact and conflict with the law?
3. What is the most challenging in the work of the commission as far as improving the access to justice of children from vulnerable families is concerned?
4. Which new skills and knowledge do you retain following the trainings delivered by the Project? Please provide 1-2 examples.
5. Do you apply new skills and approaches in your work with children and parents?
6. To what extent do you think that UNICEF-supported legal aid and legal representation services which were provided in your district were relevant to the needs of vulnerable children and families?
7. In your view, to what extent are these services sustainable? What are the prerequisites for these services to scaled up country-wide?
8. Could you indicate examples of justice proceedings which respected the human rights of children, but did not before the Project?
9. How would you assess the cooperation with UNICEF, consultants and regional NGOs in the implementation of new services for children and families?
10. What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them? Do you see any particular role for you in this process?

### **Interview Guide for vulnerable parents/caregivers (in sample districts)**

*(parents/caregivers at risk, from sample districts, who benefitted from the new services set up and run by the regional participating NGOs or whose children benefitted from these services and/or were involved in justice proceedings )*

1. Would you be so kind and tell us a bit about yourself and your family? (*civil status, occupation, family size, no. of children/age, etc.*)
2. How did you learn about the new legal support services available in your community?
3. Who were in need of those services? (you, your partner, your child)? Have any of you faced challenges in getting these services?
4. Would you have requested these services for yourself, your partner or your child if you were requested to pay a fee?

5. Are you/Have you been satisfied with the quality of the services? Why? (or Why not?) What was the most tangible benefit to your child and family life that you would highlight as a result of benefitting of these services?
6. Have your child/children been ever involved in justice proceedings? When did it happen? What would you tell us about your experience on this?
7. Do you have any particular additional needs in relation to your child (children)? If yes, how could you be supported to address them in the future?

### **Interviews with children (in sample districts)**

*(children who benefitted of Project services in the sample districts; age 12-18; they should include vulnerable children)*

*Note:* The interview guide will be developed based on a prior discussion with UNICEF CO and the regional NGO that provided services to the respective children to understand the circumstances which required assistance, the type of assistance, etc. and thus adapt the questions accordingly, avoiding any sensitive questions and discomfort of interviewed children.

## **GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP**

### **Guide for Focus Groups with regional participating NGOs (in Baku)**

*(Training and Resource Centres and Youth Education Centre local offices in sample districts: project coordinators and lawyers)*

#### **Introduction**

- Introduction of the evaluator to the group
- Presentation of participants
- Provision of background information to the focus group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the focus group approach
- Answering any questions participants might have.

#### **Discussion**

##### **1. Exploring actual learning experience**

- Which new skills and knowledge do you retain following the trainings delivered by the Project? What have you learned new that you did not know before? Please provide 1-2 examples.
- Do you apply new skills and approaches in your work with children and parents?
- Do you have further needs for capacity building? In which area?

##### **2. Exploring actual changes in behaviours and attitudes**

- What is the profile of children and families whom you provide the services supported by the Project? (residence, occupation of parents, socio-economic status of the family, disability,

etc.). Have you been told by UNICEF which vulnerable children and families to target with priority?

- To what extent was the Project relevant to your city/district needs?
- What challenges have you faced in setting up and running the legal aid and legal representation services?
- What services are the most required and why? What is most challenging in your work? (e.g. providing services in remote areas)
- What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the UNICEF-supported legal aid and legal representation services in terms of access of vulnerable children to justice?
- Would have it been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without this support?
- Would you say that your NGO is now a 'hub of child rights discussion platforms for local civil society and community' as a result of the Project?
- How do you know that the public awareness events that you organised as part of your communication plans supported by the Project have eventually met their goal? What attitudes/perceptions have you managed to change?
- Could you indicate examples of justice proceedings which respected the human rights of children, but did not before the Project?
- What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them? Do you see any particular role for you in this process?

#### End of Discussion

- Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.

## MAPPING TEMPLATES

### Legal and policy framework (*template*)

Title of the document*	Project contribution**	Stage of adoption by the Government/Parliament at 31 July 2017***

\* law, strategy, policy paper, other (pls specify)

\*\*e.g. critical review, recommendations for improvement, participation in expert groups, consultations, development of a draft, other (pls specify)

\*\*\* A=adopted, U=under adoption process, S=submitted for adoption (if adopted, pls explain to what extent project recommendations have been considered)

### Training courses delivered (*template*)

Title of the course	Training provider	Main training topics	Period location and	No. of training hours/course	Target audience	No. of trainees	
						Male	Female

### Curricula, Manuals and Studies produced with the support of the Project (*template*)

Title and author of the document	Type*	Year of publication/release/finalization

\* M=Manual, T=Toolkit, S=Study, R=Review, C=Curriculum, C4D- communication for development tools, O=Other (pls specify)

### Beneficiary children of the Project (*template*)

District	Types of services	No. of children /type of service (planned)	No. of children /type of service (benefited)	By residence:		By sex:		By vulnerability:		
				Urban	Rural	girls	boys	Poor children	Children with disability	Other vulnerable children ( <i>pls specify which</i> )*
Gabala										
Aghjabedy										
Shamkir										
Shirvan										
Mingechevir										

\* e.g. family with one or two parents unemployed; one-parent family; children left behind by migrant parents; divorced parents; parents in detention; out of school; children victims of domestic violence, children victims or witnesses of crimes; children in conflict with the law; children held in correctional/educational institutions; children with mental health issues in long-term residential facilities; children held in detention (pre / post-trial).

### Beneficiary parents of the Project (*template*)

District	Types of services	No. of parents (planned)	No. of parents (benefited)	By residence:		By sex: <i>Male-M</i> <i>Female-F</i>	Marital status:			By education level:		By employment:	
				<i>Urban-U</i>	<i>Rural-R</i>		<i>Not married-NM</i>	<i>Married-M</i>	<i>Divorced-D</i>	<i>No education-NE</i>	<i>Secondary-S</i>	<i>Higher-H</i>	<i>Employed-E</i>
Gabala													
Aghjabedy													
Shamkir													
Shirvan													
Mingechevir													

## Annex 4 – Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information	
<b>RELEVANCE: alignment of the Project to Azerbaijan’s priorities, international commitments and needs of target groups and beneficiaries (rights-holders)</b>				
EQ1	<p>To what extent was the Project <b>aligned with the country policies, strategies and priorities</b> in the area of juvenile justice? Has it preserved its relevance in time?</p>	<p>Evidence of consistency between the outcomes and specific interventions of the Project <u>and</u> the national needs and priorities of the juvenile justice, identified in the situation analyses and country policy papers and strategies aimed to guide and advance the broader rule of law and justice sector reform agenda and advancement of children’s rights and gender equality</p> <p>Common understanding amongst stakeholders about the expected and actual links between the Project results and selected national priorities</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify actual or potential areas of divergence between the national strategies and the Project results and strategies</p> <p>Evidence that the Project objectives have remained valid and relevant during the implementation period</p>	<p>Mapping of situation and contextual analyses Documentary review focused on links between the situation analyses, studies, key national strategies and Project objectives and planned results</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, Government, International development partners</p>
EQ2	<p>Has the Project been relevant in terms of <b>internationally agreed goals and commitments of the country?</b> Was it aligned to <b>UNICEF country programme</b> in Azerbaijan?</p>	<p>Evidence of alignment of Project objectives and specific interventions with the international human rights standards (CRC, Beijing Rules, Riyadh Guidelines) and UNICEF Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)</p> <p>Clear identification of specific issues and recommendations from treaty body reports and CPAP in the Project DoE and Logical Framework</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify specific Project results and strategies addressing issues and recommendations from treaty body reports</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify actual or potential areas of divergence between recommendations from treaty bodies, and results and strategies of the Project</p>	<p>Documentary review and structured desk analysis focused on relevant treaty body reports, concluding observations and recommendations, UNICEF annual reports <u>and</u> linkages with Project objectives and planned results</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners</p>
EQ3	<p>Has the Project addressed the <b>underlying causes of exclusion and vulnerability</b> of children in contact and conflict with the law? Has it</p>	<p>Level of adequacy of Project design to the needs of vulnerable children (children with disability, children in disadvantaged socio-economic situation, children in detention/closed institutions, etc.) and their families</p>	<p>Stakeholders mapping (vulnerable children) Mapping of available situation and contextual analyses Documentary review and structured desk</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
	<p>responded to the needs of children and their families, especially of the most vulnerable ones, from the perspective of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equity</li> <li>- Human rights principles (non-discrimination, participation, etc.)</li> <li>- Gender equality</li> </ul>	<p>identified in reliable assessments, studies, reviews of juvenile justice, poverty, social exclusion, vulnerability and deprivation in Azerbaijan</p> <p>Evidence of consistency between the needs and priorities for broadening access to justice of vulnerable children, the strategy implemented by the Project and the overarching principles of equity, anti-discrimination, gender equality, participation and progressive realisation of children's rights</p> <p>Examples of most effective/ineffective approaches and strategies for addressing the key causes of inequality and discrimination hindering the access of children to justice in the reference period</p> <p>Presence of equity, HRBA and gender equality as cross-cutting issues within the Project DoE, Logical Framework, implementation strategies, accountability (results) frameworks (including indicators) and reporting</p>	<p>analysis focused on the links between the analytical literature, Project DoA, Logical Framework and implementation strategies, and human rights principles, equity and gender equality</p> <p>Testing of the ToC</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p> <p>Site visits, participant observation</p>	<p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p> <p>NGO service delivery setting in the sampled districts</p>
<b>EFFECTIVENESS: the extent to which the Project results contributed to the attainment of planned objectives</b>				
<b>EQ4</b>	<p>What is the <b>achievement level of planned results</b> (quantitative and qualitative) compared to stated objectives?</p>	<p>The Project has a well-defined intervention logic, demonstrating how the outputs will produce the intended outcomes</p> <p>Objective comparison of actual outputs achieved against the set targets, including consideration of annual adjustments</p> <p>The outputs produced the intended outcomes (quantitative and qualitative)</p> <p>Intended outcomes (i) have been achieved, (ii) have been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) have not been achieved to date</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the Logical Framework, ToC and progress reports</p> <p>Mapping of achieved results against baselines and targets in the logical model of the Project, using the internal M&amp;E systems and data available at national and district levels</p> <p>Contribution analysis to determine progress against intended results and pathways generated</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p> <p>Site visits, participant observation</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p> <p>NGO service delivery setting in the sampled districts</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
<p><b>EQ5</b></p> <p>To what extent did the Project interventions contribute to <b>increasing access of children in contact and conflict with the law to justice</b> in Azerbaijan and reducing <b>bottlenecks and barriers</b> in the access of children to child-friendly justice mechanisms, especially of the most vulnerable ones, having in view the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legislation and policies</li> <li>- Strategy, MIS and capacity of NPG</li> <li>- Reported cases of violation of child rights in detention facilities</li> <li>- Capacity of law enforcement personnel and district level child rights commissions</li> <li>- Capacity of partners to prevent, monitor and respond to child protection concerns</li> <li>- Knowledge and awareness of the public and officials on the problems of children in contact and conflict with the law</li> </ul>	<p>Outcome indicators (see Annex 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•No. of vulnerable children and families who have access to child-friendly justice mechanisms</li> <li>•Decrease in the no. of children reporting violation of rights in pre-trial and post-trial detention</li> <li>•No. of children and families benefitting from the legal aid and legal representation services</li> <li>•No. of rural children and families directly benefiting from justice services provided by NGOs and state authorities</li> <li>•No. of families and children living in rural districts benefiting from mobile and phone-based services offered by NGOs</li> <li>•Change in knowledge and attitude among target groups</li> </ul> <p>Bottlenecks and barriers identified and analysed in relation to their effect on the access of children to justice</p> <p>Evidence of measures taken to cope with barriers and overcome challenges and bottlenecks upon the realisation of children's rights to child-friendly justice mechanisms, in particular of vulnerable children</p> <p>Evidence of successful/ unsuccessful effects of risks mitigation measures and strategies</p>	<p>Mapping of bottlenecks and barriers</p> <p>Documentary review focused on progress reports, monitoring reports, Project strategies and deliverables, online database with beneficiary children and families in the target districts, MIS of NPG, training reports, etc.</p> <p>Contribution analysis to determine factors which promoted or blocked the progress against intended results</p> <p>Mapping of risk analyses and mitigation strategies</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p>
<p><b>EQ6</b></p> <p>Are results achieved similar in all districts? Which districts perform better/worse and for what reason?</p>	<p>The Project achieved better results in several districts</p> <p>There was lower progress in other districts</p> <p>Ranking districts according to various degrees of progress against some performance indicators</p> <p>Explanatory factors for success, respectively low level of results arising from the analysis</p>	<p>Documentary review</p> <p>Analysis of results from UNICEF M&amp;E systems, monthly reports of regional consultants, reports of national consultant, site visit/monitoring reports of UNICEF CO, online database with beneficiary children and families</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, district child rights commissions</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p>
<p><b>EQ7</b></p> <p>What were the main <b>factors</b> which contributed or hindered the achievement of the intended Project outcomes?</p>	<p>Factors identified and rated as promoting or diminishing the effectiveness of the Project</p> <p>Evidence of UNICEF of making good use of facilitating factors and country context (operating space) to achieve outputs</p>	<p>Mapping of factors which promoted or impeded the progress against intended results for contribution analysis</p> <p>Documentary review focused on progress and monitoring reports (UNICEF and consultants),</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		and outcomes	risks and assumptions, risks analyses  Interviews  Interviews (e-mail-based)	UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)  Professionals (beneficiaries of training)
<b>EQ8</b>	Has the implementation of the Project produced any <b>additional, unplanned</b> effect (positive or negative)?	Evidence through examples of additional results/effects and their appraisal  Effects (positive or negative) of identified results	Documentary review focused on progress reports (UNICEF, consultants), third party researches, studies and assessments, data from M&E systems  Interviews  Focus group  Interviews (e-mail-based)	Reference materials for evaluation  UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)  Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)  Professionals (beneficiaries of training)
<b>EFFICIENCY: extent to which the management of the Project ensured timelines and an efficient utilization of resources to achieve its objectives</b>				
<b>EQ9</b>	How well has the implementation of the Project been <b>managed</b> ? What <b>monitoring and reporting systems</b> and tools have been used and how did they contribute to the Project management process?	Management of the Project ensured timeliness and quality of outputs and efficient use of resources  Chosen management and implementation modalities are in line with best practices of other UNICEF or donors' interventions  Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in the Project implementation  Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in implementation  Stakeholder perceptions about the efficiency of the overall Project management	Document review and system analysis focused on the Project management, monitoring and quality assurance arrangements and responsibilities Systematic data review, particularly of UNICEF M&E systems and data  Interviews  Focus group	Reference materials for evaluation  UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, donor, regional NGOs (during site visits)  Regional NGOs
<b>EQ10</b>	Were financial <b>resources</b> used appropriately? Were funds managed	Financial resources are broadly in line with scale and scope of expected results	System analysis of management strategies Documentary review of resource utilization	Reference materials for evaluation

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
	in a cost-effective manner to achieve expected results? Could the same results have been achieved with fewer resources?	<p>Perceptions about costs vs. benefits of Project results and the efficiency of implementation modalities used (avoiding waste and duplication)</p> <p>Perceptions about the financial costs of UNICEF programmatic assistance vs. those of other international partners</p> <p>Examples of Project activities with a good/poor cost-effectiveness level</p> <p>Evidence of efforts made to achieve efficiency gains and savings</p> <p>Value for money</p>	<p>reports, delivery mechanism, costing scenarios, benchmarking studies</p> <p>Systematic data review, particularly of UNICEF M&amp;E systems and data and of implementing partners (RWPs, PCAs, DCTs)</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p>	<p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, donor, regional NGOs (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs</p>
EQ11	Did the Project ensure <b>coherence</b> with other relevant interventions supported by different agencies to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps? What were the areas and ways of cooperation with other UN and donor agencies concerning the development of services for vulnerable children?	<p>Judgement will be based on the examination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objectives of similar interventions</li> <li>▪ Complementarity with the Project</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of assistance</li> </ul> <p>Demonstrable effects of complementarity or/and overlaps, both upstream on the level of UN/donor coordination and downstream on Project implementation level</p>	<p>Mapping of interventions of other agencies, UN and donor organisations</p> <p>Documentary review of similar interventions (concept notes, reports, evaluations)</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, donor, international development partners</p>
EQ12	To what extent has the Project promoted <b>partnerships</b> in justice for children and strengthen cross-sectoral <b>cooperation</b> at both national and local level to improve its performance? What was the role of line ministries, NGOs and communities in the <b>coordination</b> and implementation of Project activities?	<p>Evidence that the Project promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances around its main outcome areas (e.g. within the government, civil society, target districts, international development partners)</p> <p>Stakeholders consider partnerships established for the implementation of the Project to be both an essential prerequisite and modality of achieving successful results</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to provide examples of successful results obtained through partnership, cross-sectoral cooperation and coordination at national and local level</p>	<p>Stakeholder (partners) mapping</p> <p>Documentary review focused on the Project-related partnership agreements, donor reports, joint projects reports, minutes of coordination meetings</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p>
<b>IMPACT: long-term effects produced by the Project interventions upon the vulnerable children and progressive realisation of children's rights</b>				
EQ 13	To what extent has the Project contributed to the strengthening the	Evidence and examples of positive effects and benefits of the Project (through services, awareness raising, capacity	Mapping of progress against recommendations from treaty bodies	Reference materials for evaluation

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
	protection of human rights of children at risk (in contact and conflict with the law) in justice proceedings and improved their lives?	<p>building, change in legislation, etc.) on beneficiary children in target districts</p> <p>Indicators (see Annex 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction level of parents/caregivers concerning the available support services and treatment of their children in justice proceedings</li> <li>• Professionals in contact with children at risk from target districts are able to indicate at least 3 examples of justice proceedings which respected the human rights of children, but did not before the Project</li> <li>• Level of contribution of the Project to the progressive realisation of children's rights in contact and conflict with the law in targeted districts (none/modest/significant)</li> </ul>	<p>Documentary review and structured desk analysis focused on progress reports, field monitoring reports, training reports Testing of the ToC</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p> <p>Site visits, participant observation</p>	<p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits), vulnerable children and parents (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p> <p>NGO service delivery setting in the sampled districts</p>
EQ14	To what extent have achievements in the target districts fed into national level policy dialogue and supported the environment for implementation of child rights?	<p>Evidence of changes in policy documents or new policy documents/strategies triggered/informed by the Project</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to provide examples of Project results which informed policy debate and/or changes in policies and decision-making processes</p>	<p>Mapping of policies and strategies Document review focused on policy papers and strategic documents (adopted or under Government/Parliament debate) in relation to results achieved by the Project Analysis of changes (if any) in the policy framework over the last two years</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners</p>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY: extent to which the benefits (results) achieved by the Project are sustainable (likely to continue beyond the intervention cycle)</b>				
EQ15	To what extent are the results (benefits) from the Project <b>sustainable</b> or likely to be maintained over time?	<p>Evidence of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concrete changes in national policy and strategic framework that can sustain the Project results</li> <li>Still functioning services set up in the target districts after the end of Project financing, at the same quality level (number of beneficiary children/families, typology, staffing, premises, etc.)</li> <li>Scaling-up of these services to non-target districts</li> <li>Allocations of funds in government budgets for the functioning of services supported by the Project</li> <li>Institutional capacity in place to sustain levels of achievement or a strategy/plan exists to indicate how it will be developed and funded</li> <li>Ownership of the Project results within Ombudsman's</li> </ol>	<p>Mapping of policies and strategies Document review focused on Project deliverables and results Analysis of the legal, policy and institutional framework in place that will help to sustain the Project results/benefits and of budget allocations for the continuation of service delivery in the districts (State NGO Support Fund and Youth Fund)</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, co-applicant NGOs, Ombudsman, NPG, Government, International development partners, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits)</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		<p>NPG, the Government and local authorities (child rights commissions)</p> <p>Indicators (selection, Annex 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New legislation acts prepared within the Project life time</li> <li>• Three-year strategy on child rights monitoring of the Ombudsman's NPG put into action</li> <li>• NPG's MIS ready and used</li> <li>• No. of staff members of Ombudsman Regional offices having the necessary skills and expertise to support NPG in monitoring child rights violations in all types of detention facilities</li> <li>• Increase in knowledge of law enforcement officials on the rights of children in pre-trial detention (and start effectively using the knowledge)</li> <li>• No. of NGO legal support centres outside of Baku</li> <li>• No. of Regional NGO Training and Resource Centres that become hubs of child rights discussion platforms for local civil society and community</li> <li>• No. of regional/local NGOs having functional support legal aid programmes for children and families in need of such services</li> <li>• Social workers hired by the child protection system</li> </ul> <p>Triangulation of perceptions about the sustainability of the Project results/benefits</p>	<p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p> <p>Site visits</p>	<p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p> <p>NGO service delivery setting in the sampled districts</p>
EQ16	What <b>measures</b> has UNICEF undertaken to ensure that results to which it contributed are sustainable?	<p>Evidence of exit strategies and measures undertaken by UNICEF to ensure ownership and sustainability of results (legal/policy, financial and institutional/capacities)</p> <p>Ensuring sustainability is a subject matter regularly discussed by the UNICEF and the Government</p> <p>Risks to the sustainability of the Project results have been identified and addressed</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on exit strategies, minutes of meetings between UNICEF and national counterparts</p> <p>Mapping of risks and systemic barriers to sustainability, risks mitigation strategies</p> <p>Analysis of mitigation measures</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group</p> <p>Interviews (e-mail-based)</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNICEF, Government, donor, district child rights commissions, regional NGOs (during site visits)</p> <p>Regional NGOs (coordinators and lawyers)</p> <p>Professionals (beneficiaries of training)</p>

## Annex 5 – Evaluation Sample

Apart from desk review of relevant documentation, interviews with key informants and focus groups, the evaluation methodology includes site visits to a sample of target districts for in-depth review.

The sample suggested by UNICEF CO has been screened by the International Consultant against several sampling criteria to check its representativeness for the overall number of districts targeted by the Project and its learning potential. More specifically, the following sampling criteria have been used:

- 1) *Rural/Urban regional balance*: it was considered useful to ensure that the sample includes a city and a predominantly rural district given the significant differences in terms of available service provision, perceptions and attitudes towards children at risk, etc. that will need to be analysed by the evaluation.
- 2) *Vulnerability profile of beneficiary children*: the Project has mainly aimed at promoting an improved access of vulnerable children to child-friendly justice mechanisms and services; the sample has been thus constructed to include the districts where some of the most disadvantaged children have been ‘served’ by the Project (children with disability, internally-displaced children<sup>8</sup>).
- 3) *Typology of Project interventions*: given the scope of the evaluation, the sample included districts where the whole range of supported services have been developed and provided to children and families in need.
- 4) *Implementing partners*: the regional interventions have been implemented by Resource and Training Centres and by Youth Education Centre. In order to learn from successes and challenges, various practices and approaches used by NGO partners in terms of outreach, efficiency, etc., the sample included districts where implementation has been done by different organisations.

**The Sample which resulted after the review of key Project documentation, analysis against sampling criteria and discussion with UNICEF CO is composed of 1 city and 1 district, representing 40% of the total number of cities and districts targeted by the Project and around 43% of children assisted by the Project (June 2017).** The table below provides an overview of the sampling criteria and compliance of the sampled cities and districts.

### Sampling Criteria and Evaluation Sample

Sampling criteria	Shirvan	Aghjabedy
<b>Urban/Rural regional balance</b>		
• predominantly rural	-	yes
• predominantly urban	yes (city)	-

<sup>8</sup> There are no available data on poor children disaggregated at district level; thus poverty was not specifically considered in the sampling process.

Sampling criteria	Shirvan	Aghjabedy
<b>Vulnerability profile of beneficiary children<sup>9</sup></b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>children with disability</li> <li>internally displaced children</li> </ul>	yes (21, second after Aghjabedy)  yes (12)	yes (105, the highest of all target districts) yes (39, the second after Gabala district)
<b>Typology of Project interventions</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>legal aid and legal representation services</li> <li>communication/behaviour change actions</li> </ul>	yes  yes	yes  yes
<b>Implementing partner</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training and Resource Centre NGO<sup>10</sup></li> <li>Youth Education Centre</li> </ul>	yes (challenges in implementation)  -	-  yes (reportedly good performance)

<sup>9</sup> Based on June 2017 data provided by UNICEF CO

<sup>10</sup> Later replaced by UNICEF CO with the Youth Education Centre, due to bad performance in Project implementation. Details are to be found in volume 1 of the Evaluation Report.

## Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation

- Committee against Torture (2009), “Concluding Observations Azerbaijan”, Forty-third session, CAT/C/AZE/CO/3
- Committee against Torture (2016), “Concluding Observations on the fourth periodic report of Azerbaijan”, CAT/C/AZE/CO/4
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (2015), “Concluding observations on the fifth periodic report of Azerbaijan”, CEDAW/C/AZE/CO/5
- Committee on the Rights of the Child (2012), “Concluding Observations: Azerbaijan”, CRC/C/AZE/CO/3-4
- EU-Azerbaijan Action Plan
- EU and UNICEF (2015), “Analysis of the legislation of Azerbaijan in respect of access to justice for children”
- European Commission (2015), “Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in Azerbaijan. Progress in 2014 and recommendations for actions”, JOINT STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT, SWD(2015) 64 final, Brussels, 25.3.2015
- Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan – UNICEF, “Azerbaijan Country Programme Action Plan 2016-2020”
- Hamilton, C., Yarrow, E., Anderson, K. (2016), “ASSESSMENT OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM IN AZERBAIJAN AS IT RELATES TO CHILDREN IN CONFLICT WITH THE LAW”, Coram International at Coram Children’s Legal Centre
- Harun Onder (2013), “Azerbaijan: Inclusive Growth in a Resource-Rich Economy”, World Bank, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/12228/NonAsciiFileName0.pdf?sequence=1>
- Maestral (2015), “Capacity Needs Assessment of the National Preventive Group under the Human Rights Commissioner of Azerbaijan”. Report
- National Preventive Mechanism on Torture under the Human Rights Commissioner of Azerbaijan, “Strategic Plan 2016-2019”
- Novak, A. (2015), “Multi-country evaluation of the impact of juvenile justice system reforms on children in conflict with the law (2006-2012)”, UNICEF Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Final Report
- State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2017), “2017 Children in Azerbaijan”, Statistical Yearbook, Baku, State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2017), “Crime and Offence in Azerbaijan”, Baku
- State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2017), “Demographic Indicators of Azerbaijan”, Statistical Yearbook, Baku
- State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2017), “Statistical Yearbook of Azerbaijan 2017”
- Stern et al (2012), “Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations”, DFID, Working Paper 38
- The World Bank (2014), “Project Appraisal Document on a proposed loan in the amount of US\$100 million to the Republic of Azerbaijan for a Judicial Services and Smart Infrastructure”
- The World Bank (2015), “Azerbaijan Partnership Program Snapshot”, <http://www.rec-expo.net/document/azerbajiansnapshot.pdf>
- The World Bank in Azerbaijan (2017), “Country Snapshot”, October 2017
- UNDP (2016), “Human Development Report 2016. Human Development for Everyone”, New York, [www.stat.gov.az/source/budget\\_households/az/5.4.xls](http://www.stat.gov.az/source/budget_households/az/5.4.xls)

- UNEG (2008), "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation", <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>
- UNEG (2014), "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations", <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>
- UNICEF Azerbaijan (2014), "Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Study among Local Government and Justice/Law Enforcement Professionals about the Access to Justice for Children Reforms in Azerbaijan", Baku
- UNICEF Azerbaijan Annual Report 2016
- United Nations Children's Fund (2010), "The Development of Juvenile Justice Systems in Eastern European Neighbourhood Policy Countries, Reform achievements and challenges in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine", UNICEF Regional Office for CEE/CIS, Geneva
- UNICEF Evaluation Office (2004), "UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards"
- UNICEF Evaluation Office (2004), "UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards"
- UNICEF (2009), "Country Programme Document: Azerbaijan 2011-2015", [http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/Azerbaijan\\_final\\_approved\\_CPD\\_9\\_September\\_2010.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/Azerbaijan_final_approved_CPD_9_September_2010.pdf)
- UNICEF (2010), "Working for an Equal Future. UNICEF Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Girls and Women", New York
- UNICEF and EU (2013), "Juvenile Justice in the CEE/CIS Region: Progress, Challenges, Obstacles, And Opportunities", report
- UNICEF Azerbaijan Country Project Action Plan 2016-2020
- UNICEF (2017), "Assessment of the situation of children and women in Azerbaijan" (draft)

#### **Project documentation:**

- Description of Action, Logical Framework, activity plan and budget; progress reports to donor; financial reports; draft final report to donor; field monitoring reports; internal notes of UNICEF CO; consultants' ToR and monthly reports; Project deliverables; reports of training courses; report on the implementation of communication and awareness raising activities; KAP survey; Project monitoring data; Rolling Workplans agreed between UNICEF, line ministries and Ombudsman; minutes of JJTF meetings; national legislation, strategies and action plans; UNICEF annual reports.

#### **Internet resources:**

- [https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT\\_IV-UNICEF\\_Procedure\\_for\\_Ethical\\_Standards.PDF](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF)
- [http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/azerbaijan\\_statistics.html](http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/azerbaijan_statistics.html)
- <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/aj.html>
- <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups>
- [http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/06-11\\_rep\\_dangersofdetention\\_jj.pdf](http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/06-11_rep_dangersofdetention_jj.pdf)
- <http://www.mfa.gov.az/en/content/117>
- <http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/web/rural-poverty-portal/country/home/tags/azerbaijan>
- <http://www.stat.gov.az/source/healthcare/>
- [https://www.stat.gov.az/source/system\\_nat\\_accounts/?lang=en](https://www.stat.gov.az/source/system_nat_accounts/?lang=en)

- <https://www.stat.gov.az/source/labour/?lang=en>
- <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/01/06/jobs-challenge-in-the-south-caucasus-azerbaijan>
- <http://scfwca.gov.az/en/page/about-the-sommittee>
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Administrative\\_divisions\\_of\\_Azerbaijan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Administrative_divisions_of_Azerbaijan)
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nagorno-Karabakh\\_conflict](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nagorno-Karabakh_conflict)

## Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation

No.	Name	Position/Function	Institution/Organisation
<b>UNICEF</b>			
1.	Edward Carwardine	Representative	UNICEF Azerbaijan
2.	Min Yuan	Deputy Representative	UNICEF Azerbaijan
3.	Vugar Salmanov	Child Protection Specialist	UNICEF Azerbaijan
4.	Tamerlan Rajabov	Child Rights Systems Monitoring Specialist	UNICEF Azerbaijan
5.	Fatima Jafarova	Program Assistant	UNICEF Azerbaijan
6.	Jeyhun Mirzayev	Operations manager	UNICEF Azerbaijan
7.	Leyla Ahmadova	Finance/HR assistant	UNICEF Azerbaijan
8.	Elman Bayramov	Administrative assistant	UNICEF Azerbaijan
9.	Elza Ibrahimova	Communication for Social Change Officer	UNICEF Azerbaijan
10.	Ramil Iskandarli	UNICEF National Project consultant	UNICEF Azerbaijan
11.	Ramiz Behbudov	former Child Protection Specialist	UNICEF Sri Lanka
<b>Ministries</b>			
12.	Vugar Aghayev	Senior Adviser organisation and supervision of general department	Ministry of Justice
13.	Fuad Huseynov	Head of Department of social protection policy	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population
14.	Adigozel Adigozelov	Chief of the Public Security Department	Ministry of Internal Affairs
<b>Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman)</b>			
15.	Rashid Rumzada	Head of the Monitoring Unit, Head of the National Preventive Group	Department for Prevention of Torture
16.	Faig Agayev	Head of Department, member of the National Preventive Group	Legal Education Department
17.	Vafa Verdiyeva	Head of the Unit of Protection of the Rights of Detainees and Prisoners, member of the National Preventive Group	Human Rights Protection Department
18.	Aflatun Bakhishov	Senior adviser, Monitoring Unit, member of the National Preventive Group	Department for Prevention of Torture
<b>International development partners</b>			
19.	Maryam Haji-Ismayilova	International Aid & Cooperation Officer, Cooperation	Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of

		Section	Azerbaijan
20.	Nigar Sadikhova	Governance Global Practice	World Bank Country Office in Azerbaijan
<b>Education institutions (project implementation partners)</b>			
21.	Matanat Askerova	Lecturer	Academy of Justice
22.	Vugar Mansurov	Lecturer	Academy of Police
<b>Regional NGOs (Project implementing partners at district level)</b>			
23.	Fakhraddin Hasanzade	Director	Youth Education Centre (Headquarters Baku)
24.	Yusif Poladov	Project Coordinator	Youth Education Centre Shirvan <sup>11</sup>
25.	Kanan Abdurahmanov	Lawyer	Youth Education Centre Shirvan <sup>12</sup>
26.	Rada Gafarova	Project Coordinator	Youth Education Centre Aghjabedy
27.	Rasad Abbasov	Lawyer	Youth Education Centre Aghjabedy
28.	Tural Karimov	Project Coordinator	Youth Education Centre Mingechevir
29.	Arifa Mammadova	Lawyer	Youth Education Centre Mingechevir
30.	Raul Ismaylov	Lawyer	Heydar Aliyev Centre Shamkir <sup>13</sup>
31.	Umudvar Hasanov	Project Coordinator	Training and Resource Centre Gabala
32.	Vusal XXX	Lawyer	Training and Resource Centre Gabala
<b>Local authorities</b>			
33.	Zamig ...	Chief Inspector of Public Safety Department	Police Department Shirvan
34.	Elchin ...	Head of Drugs Department	Police Department Shirvan
35.	Rafael Nasirov	Secretary of the District child rights commission	Executive Committee Shirvan
36.	Famil Gasimov	Chief Inspector of Public Safety Department	Police Department Aghjabedy
37.	Nijat Akhundov	Senior advisor of the District child rights commission	Executive Committee Aghjabedy
38.	Vusala Mammadova	Psychologist and Advisor in the District child rights commission	Executive Committee Aghjabedy

**Note:**

The list above does not include the children and parents from the sample districts who were interviewed nor the professionals who responded to the e-mail-based questionnaire. It does not include the stakeholders who are invited to participate in the validation workshop on 14 December 2017.

<sup>11</sup> It replaced the NGO Training and Resource Centre which was the initial regional partner in Shirvan for reasons explained in the report, volume 1.

<sup>12</sup> ibid

<sup>13</sup> ibid

## Annex 8 – Successfully solved cases

Target district/ Neighbouring district	Cases (applications)			No. of children involved in successfully solved/completed cases
	Total number of cases	Successfully solved/completed cases	%	
<b>Gabala</b> Oghuz	441	211	48%	271
<b>Aghjabedy</b> Barda	571	106	19%	160
<b>Shamkir</b> Tovuz	124	22	18%	33
<b>Shirvan</b> Sabirabad	336	114	34%	182
<b>Mingechevir</b> Yevlakh	641	95	15%	153
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,113</b>	<b>548 cases</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>799 children</b>

Source: Project data

## Annex 9 – Budget of the Project

Description	Planned				Spent
	Unit	# Units	Unit value (in €)	Total Cost (in €)	Total expenditures (in €)
<b>1. Human Resources</b>					
1.1 Salaries (gross amounts, local staff)					
1.1.1 Project Coordinator/CP Specialist (30%)	Per month	28	1500	42000	42.000,00
1.1.2 National Consultant on A2J (100%)	Per month	24	2000	48000	33.889,00
1.1.3 M&E Specialist (10%)	Per month	18	865	15570	15.570,00
1.1.4 Finance Manager (5%)	Per month	26	500	13000	13.000,00
1.1.5 Project Assistant (20%)	Per month	26	460	11960	11.960,00
1.1.6 International Consultants	Per day	17	400	6800	39.200,00
1.1.7 National Trainers	Per day	220	100	22000	7.746,82
1.1.8 Communication for Development Specialist (20%)	Per month	18	1030	18540	9.270,00
1.2 Per diems for missions/travel					0,00
1.2.1 International consultants	Per diem	20	180	3600	1.965,00
1.2.2 Local (staff assigned to the Action)	Per diem	50	124	6200	13.060,00
<b>Subtotal Human Resources</b>				<b>187.670</b>	<b>187.660,82</b>
<b>2. Travel</b>					
2.1 International travel	Per flight	3	700	2100	2.100,00
2.2 Local transportation	Per month			0	
<b>Subtotal Travel</b>				<b>2.100</b>	<b>2.100,00</b>
<b>3. Equipment and supplies</b>					
3.1 Purchase or rent of vehicles	Per vehicle				
3.2 Computer database	Per item	1	3956	3956	3.956
3.5 Other (please specify)					
<b>Subtotal Equipment and supplies</b>				<b>3.956</b>	<b>3.956</b>
<b>4. Local office</b>					
4.1 Vehicle costs	Per month				
4.2 Office rent	Per month				
4.3 Consumables - office supplies	Per month				
<b>Subtotal Local office</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>5. Other costs, services</b>					
5.1 Publications	Lump sum		10000	10000	5.816
5.2 Studies, research	Lump sum				
5.3 Expenditure verification/Audit					
5.4 Evaluation costs	Lump sum		13000	13000	13.000
5.5 Translation, including equipment	Per day	10	700	7000	5.834,89
5.6 Financial services (bank guarantee costs etc.)					0,00
5.7 Costs of conferences/seminars					0,00
5.7.1 Training for NPG	Per person/day	360	15	5400	5.535,00
5.7.2 Training for Regional Ombudsman Offices	Per person/day	210	15	3150	3.990,00
5.7.3 Training for NGOs	Per person/day	480	15	7200	7.581,00
5.7.4 Training for professionals/authorities	Per person/day	310	5	1550	6.099,00
5.7.5 Training on Communication/Behavior Change	Per person/day	240	15	3600	3.360,00
5.7.6 Advocacy seminars/workshops	Per event	6	800	4800	4.596,00
5.8. Visibility actions	Lump sum		2200	2200	1.922,00
<b>Subtotal Other costs, services</b>				<b>57900</b>	<b>57.733,89</b>
<b>6. Other</b>					
6.1 Small grants for legal aid services	Per grant	5	20000	100000	100.000
6.2 Small grants for communication/social change activities	Per grant	5	5000	25000	25.051
<b>Subtotal Other</b>				<b>125.000</b>	<b>125.051</b>
<b>7. Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action (1-6)</b>				<b>376.626</b>	<b>376.501,71</b>
8. Indirect costs (maximum 7% of 9, total direct eligible costs of the Action)				<b>26364,00</b>	22.863,84
<b>9. Total eligible costs of the Action (7+ 8)</b>				<b>402.990</b>	<b>399.365,55</b>
10. Provision for contingency reserve (maximum 5% of 7, subtotal of direct eligible costs of the Action)				0	0
<b>11. Total eligible costs (9+10)</b>				<b>402.990</b>	<b>399.365,55</b>
12. - Taxes - Contributions in kind				0	0
<b>13. Total accepted costs of the action (11+12)</b>				<b>402.990</b>	<b>399.365,55</b>

Source: Final Financial Report