

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducted this Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in Iraq in 2013. The ADR aims to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP contributions to development results in Iraq and to determine how effective UNDP strategies were in facilitating and leveraging national efforts to achieve development results.

ADRs are independent, country-level evaluations carried out in accordance with the UNDP Evaluation Policy. The Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP Director reports to the UNDP Executive Board through the UNDP Administrator. The responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP include providing the Executive Board with valid and credible information for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; enhancing the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function; and furthering evaluation coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations (UN) reform and national ownership. Based on the principle of national ownership, the Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP conducts ADRs in collaboration with national governments. The purposes of an ADR are to: provide substantive support to the UNDP Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board; support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country; serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level; and contribute to learning at the corporate, regional and country levels.

This is the first ADR for Iraq, conducted towards the end of the current 2011–2014 UNDP

programme cycle. The ADR will contribute to the preparation of the new UNDP country programme as well as the forthcoming United National Development Assistance Framework.

The objectives of the ADR in Iraq are to:

- Assess UNDP's contributions to development results in Iraq since 2008, focusing on programme activities' relevance, effectiveness and efficiency in achieving intended programme outcomes and the potential sustainability of results;
- Analyse UNDP's strategic positioning in Iraq, focusing on synergies with national development strategies and priorities and alignment with the values espoused by the United Nations; and
- Draw general conclusions and make recommendations to improve the programme's future strategy and approaches.

The evaluation covered the period when the UN in general, and UNDP in particular, had access to vast reconstruction and development funds—the implementation of the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund. The ADR includes activities conducted under the ongoing 2011–2014 country programme and those undertaken between 2008 and 2010, when UNDP had not yet developed its own country programme and instead had lead responsibility in the integrated UN assistance framework (the United Nations Iraq Assistance Strategy programme).

The UNDP programmes provided support during multiple phases of the post-conflict period, operating in the context of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq (UNAMI). The evaluation's scope therefore includes the interface of the UNDP programme with UNAMI, which has

a Security Council mandateⁱ to advise, support and assist the people and the Government of Iraq.

CONSULTATION PROCESS

In normal practice, the programme country government reviews all Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) carried out by the Independent Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) prior to publication. This review is followed by a wider discussion of the report with stakeholders and development actors at an in-country workshop. However, because of political and security developments that have taken place in the country since June 2014, the Iraq ADR did not complete this otherwise mandatory process.

Carried out in the last quarter of 2013, the ADR took into consideration the developments in the country through to April 2014 when the draft report was completed (following review by UNDP Iraq and the Regional Bureau for Arab States). The sudden changes in the country's political and security context significantly altered the environment of UNDP programmes and critically affected the programmes that were ongoing when the evaluation was carried out. Therefore, some (though not all) of the recommendations may not be fully applicable to the current programming context in Iraq.

A report that takes into account the changed country context and its implications for UNDP programmes requires a separate assessment; the present security context does not allow for this exercise.

KEY FINDINGS

STRENGTHENED PARTICIPATORY MECHANISMS

The UNDP flagship programme, Support to Elections, has achieved considerable results. In

contrast, performance in other programme areas of the outcome has been constrained by a lack of synergy among programmes and the small scale and stand-alone character of programme activities.

Election support is a government priority, as it accords legitimacy to government-run electoral processes. Assistance to the electoral commission has established the Independent High Electoral Commission (IHEC) as a self-sufficient, independently functioning, sustainable and successful participatory mechanism. Iraq is a middle-income country and IHEC has demonstrated that it is capable of running its own elections. While there may be aspects in which IHEC could use technical assistance, it could source such assistance without a full-fledged UNDP project. The relevance of UNDP's technical support has thus diminished. In addition, some of the issues in the functioning of the IHEC are beyond the scope of the support UNDP can provide.

The other programme areas of the outcome—supporting the functioning of the Council of Representatives, supporting CSOs and reconciling ethnic differences—had only modest interest for the government. Peace and reconciliation support involved small pilot projects premised on the expectation that lessons learned from the projects will greatly enhance UNDP and other agencies' capacities to undertake local community dialogue projects in Iraq. The scale and scope of the pilot projects were too small to demonstrate a viable model for replication or pursuing an approach.

ENHANCED RULE OF LAW

The sustainability of the rule of law programme in the federal system has been questionable. In Kurdistan, where the government welcomed the modernization of its judiciary and has embraced the programme, sustainability is more promising. The Rule of Law programme opened the doors for future reform, but concrete achievements were modest. The number of judges and the number of

i The original mandate of UNAMI is in S/RES/1483 (2003), which was most recently renewed in S/RES/2110 (2013).

cases in criminal courts have increased. However, there is little evidence of increased court efficiency, reduced case backlog or increased public confidence in the justice system.

The situation is somewhat different in the Access to Justice and Human Rights programme. Here, the Ministry of Interior has strongly supported the Family Protection Units that provide police and legal assistance to women, children and families to respond to domestic disputes. There is also strong support in the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG); there is full collaboration in supporting judicial training, in providing legal aid, in setting up a Board of Human Rights, in supporting the Directorate for Eliminating Violence against Women and in supporting women's shelters.

Instead of responding to declining resources by consolidating the programme to increase synergies and effectiveness, UNDP has accepted contributions for project financing with little regard to whether the project added to the outcome's internal consistency. There are indications this may be changing—the Country Office is developing a strategy to enhance programme coherence and ensure greater coordination in implementation. National ownership of the support extended by UNDP has been fraught with limitations. Ownership was demonstrated in few areas.

ACCOUNTABLE AND TRANSPARENT GOVERNANCE

Under a challenging political environment, UNDP aimed to support the government in addressing complex issues. However, UNDP's programme approach was either too elaborate or too theoretical to yield tangible results. UNDP programme efforts are modest first steps in achieving outcome objectives. The programme strategies UNDP followed, however, did not fully meet the practical realities of Iraq. UNDP failed to gain critical national support for the programme to remain relevant. While the programmes in this area are in accord with the government's development plan, their relevance also depends on whether its

concept and design could realistically gain political support. UNDP found it challenging to obtain high-level government support for many of its initiatives in this area.

The Public Sector Modernization programme has been driven by an ambitious, whole-of-government approach that is more conceptually satisfying in design than pragmatic. The Office of Inspectors General constitutes a key element in the design of the Accountability, Transparency and Anti-corruption Programme. Adopted from a United States model, it gives little consideration to the Iraqi institutions that have functioned for decades—even under adverse conditions in previous regimes. While the approach is conceptually sound, in practice it is not in accord with the circumstances within which it is meant to function. Similarly, the donor coordination design was a model intervention that was undertaken globally and brought into Iraq with little modification.

Containing tuberculosis has been a priority health sector objective of the government and the international community. Therefore, the UNDP-Global Fund programmes were relevant to this national challenge. However, the UNDP-Global Fund programme does not have a strong substantive linkage to the focus of this programme outcome (and no programmatic linkages with other component programmes in this portfolio).

SUPPORT TO PRO-POOR STRATEGIES

UNDP programmes, while relevant, were focused on localized recovery activities and were not consistent with the country programme's policy- and institution-building orientation. Conflict Prevention and Recovery projects made tangible contributions to the recovery of public services and infrastructure, with some limited support to institutional capacity. The combined target population for the three projects was approximately four million persons living in the immediate urban area and surrounding communities.

Most projects were delivered during a transitional period, as Iraq emerged from the violence

of 2005 to 2007 and before conditions began to deteriorate again with the 2011 breakdown of the Erbil Agreement government. UNDP responded to the basic infrastructure needs of the post-2007 crisis. In most cases there was tangible evidence that the projects met their objectives (implementation delays notwithstanding). The various projects had the possibility of helping consolidate positive trends as conditions improved, including expanding the delivery of basic public goods and services, improving the lives of beneficiaries through their access to services, legitimizing the Iraqi State as the provider of these services and opening a compact between state and society.

Prior to 2008, all projects were affected by extreme security conditions that produced security-related restrictions (which are still in effect). Performance variables included poor quality of design, weak management oversight and implementation capacity, underestimation of risk and lack of mitigation. External factors also played an important role, such as beginning with uneven national ownership, limited capacities of national counterparts and the politicization within some ministry counterparts.

ENABLING POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Managing changes in the Iraqi context was an important programme challenge for UNDP. Difficulties left UNDP unable to sustain its engagements in key programme areas, including private-sector reform. Contributing factors included weaknesses in UNDP's transition strategy, absence of coherent demand from government, lack of government funding and the sharp reduction of international funding as donors scaled back their operations.

This programme area generally showed good output-level effectiveness. However, outputs were not always well used. Project design flaws and inefficiencies within the government were both contributing factors. Regardless, the portfolio contributed to only a limited number of outcomes, in large part resulting from the deteriorating

situation in Iraq after 2011. The ongoing country programme was prepared during a period of transition and optimism (2008–2010), with conditions deteriorating as soon as the plan became effective in 2011. UNDP was confronted with a series of parallel transitions in its programme and funding environment. These produced deteriorating security conditions and sharp reductions in resources and activities just as UNDP was attempting to shift into a development-oriented programme. At the same time, significant institutional effort by UNDP was used to bring the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund to an orderly closure. Importantly, the Government of Iraq has not emerged as a funder of UNDP activities (with the exception of some support from the Kurdistan Regional Government). UNDP had difficulty managing this combination of factors.

Sustainability was best when the government had strong ownership, projects were embedded into national strategies and institutions or when UNDP was able to sustain its engagement over an extended period of time. The PSDP-I, LADP, Private Sector Development and the Partnership Services for Fiduciary Monitoring Agent plans projects continue operations and show good possibility for output-level sustainability. These projects are integrated into government priorities and systems and have effective governance arrangements. Given that most of these projects were of good quality, sustainability will depend on the government's use of the outputs. Mine Action, however, shows poor possibility for sustainability, given government inefficiencies.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1: UNDP delivered a number of tangible benefits to the country through individual component programmes. These benefits are evident in strengthened policies, legislation and institutional capacity in priority areas for the government. UNDP's contributions were important in restoring public services and infrastructure as Iraq emerged from the 2005–2007 crisis. UNDP sustained its support

despite the challenges posed by the security situation in central and south Iraq.

UNDP programmes addressed issues that were relevant to the challenges faced by the country. UNDP aimed to address complex issues such as inefficient delivery of basic services, abuse of the public trust by civil servants and the need to ensure that capital investment expenditures addressed real needs. UNDP approached such complex issues with grand designs, some of which were too theoretical to yield tangible results.

The relevance or strategic value of UNDP programme areas notwithstanding, the challenge is to design a strategy that considers the evolving country context. There may be little UNDP can do to support reforms in a country where conflict is ongoing and where government cooperation is so difficult to secure.

Programme design, however, could be more sensitive to the difficult delivery environment by taking practical constraints into consideration. In areas such as Rule of Law programming in south and central Iraq, considerable presence, tact and strategic responsiveness are required. In some instances, UNDP programming may not have approached these sensitive matters with the required finesse. Security constraints and the limitations of remote delivery hindered UNDP's efforts to deliver these programmes efficiently and effectively in south and central Iraq. These factors also made UNDP's Iraq operations highly costly; the extent to which such costs were justified was unclear.

An important consequence of operating under security restrictions is that programme implementation focuses on support primarily to the central government and almost not at all to the governorate or other subnational entities. Several programme areas would have benefited by broadening their focus to the provincial and district levels. Local initiatives do figure under economic reform and diversification efforts, but not under efforts to strengthen governorate-level development planning institutions and systems or efforts

to integrate these into a unified approach to decentralization within Iraq's federal structure.

Trends in Iraq constrained UNDP contributions to development results. After a period of optimism and improvement (2008–2010), conditions in Iraq have again declined and it has become difficult to address core governance issues. In addition, economic trends have been towards further concentration of economic activity in the state, driven by a rapid increase in the oil sector. In this context, there was limited progress towards the government's priorities of economic diversification and private-sector development, which were key elements of successive national development plans.

Conclusion 2: Since 2008, UNDP has aimed to shift its programme focus from reconstruction and recovery to development, and, accordingly, from a project-based approach to a more coherent and strategic programming approach. However, UNDP has yet to achieve a coherent programmatic approach to address critical development challenges in Iraq.

The legacy of UNDP operations under the Iraq Trust Fund was its project-oriented approach with attention to delivery rather than long-term development results. UNDP has begun to steer itself towards a coherent and strategic programme approach, first with its Interim Country Strategy 2008–2010 and then with its first post-2003 country programme for 2011–2014. Despite this intent, UNDP's country programme is a composite of self-standing projects that lack significant synergies or coherence. The failure to transform the country programme into a coherent and strategic approach has been due to senior Country Office management's lack of strategic leadership during the crucial period of programme transition.

Under the current country programme, though individual component programmes and projects achieved results, the programmes were operating relatively independently and synergies among them were not pursued. There was no strategy

to use the combined forces of these component programmes to increase their effectiveness and efficiency in achieving their outcomes. A clear example is that the missed synergies among the Public Sector Modernization programme, the Anti-corruption programme and the Local Area Development programme have yet to be realized.

The present preoccupation with fund-raising led to some isolated projects that, while good in their intentions and hence marketable, were too small and *ad hoc* to create much discernible impact. Further, UNDP pursued programmes even when the political support critical to the particular approach was lacking (e.g. the Anti-corruption and Rule of Law programmes), when there were political and reputational risks (e.g. the Election Support programme), or when the lack of delivery resulted in a loss of credibility (e.g. the Parliament Support programme).

Conclusion 3: UNDP lacked strategic leadership at critical points in programme support in Iraq, undermining the potential of UNDP contributions. UNDP has addressed this issue recently with the change in leadership to provide a more strategic vision to UNDP support in Iraq.

The mid-level programme managers, each in charge of a component programme, are generally competent, having led their programmes to some successes. They were left to identify funding opportunities and pursue their programme objectives and project delivery. While senior management fully supported their individual efforts, little guidance was given to integrate these component programmes into a strategic approach aimed at achieving country programme outcomes. Under such circumstances, the support provided to individual programme managers by senior management unintentionally led to a country programme that was neither cohesive, strategic nor prioritized and where programme managers competed rather than collaborated.

The phasing out of the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund in 2009

and 2010 made UNDP increasingly dependent on bilateral donor contributions at a time when bilateral donors were withdrawing from Iraq. Donor development plans often play a significant role in shaping UNDP's engagement. A related issue is that in many areas of the programme, UNDP did not adequately plan for reductions in donor resources. Instead of reducing and sharpening the scope of its interventions, UNDP has diversified and fragmented its interventions.

It is essential to find ways of diminishing the inefficiencies caused by security restrictions, to do more to facilitate contact with national partners and to make sure that expert staff with Arabic language skills are readily available. In many programme areas, opportunities were missed and important expectations went unmet, which often diminished UNDP's credibility.

Conclusion 4: UNDP implemented programme models and approaches without sufficiently customizing them to the local context and culture. This contributed to poor national ownership and undermined the effectiveness and sustainability of UNDP support.

UNDP applied programme models that it used in other countries without first adapting them to the Iraqi context and culture. For example, the Peace and Reconciliation projects applied a western reconciliation method that would not work in the Iraqi cultural context and was rejected by local stakeholders. The Accountability, Transparency and Anti-corruption Programme used a United States model in developing the Office of the Inspectors General, and most national stakeholders were pessimistic about its sustainability. Poor design among some UNDP Iraq Trust Fund-funded projects resulted in outputs being delivered but never used, or to late delivery that undermined results.

UNDP showed improvement over time in developing and adapting programme models to respond to the Iraqi context, as seen, for example, in the evolution of the LADP programme model over its three iterations. Though this indicated

that UNDP was making sustained efforts, the lack of initial adaptation had significant impacts on the programme's contributions to development results.

Conclusion 5: UNDP's programmatic collaboration with UNAMI was weak and not beneficial for enhancing UNDP contributions.

Synergies between UNDP and UNAMI were less than positive, which undermined UNDP programmes' contributions in some areas. Potential areas of collaboration were not adequately utilized. This was despite the fact that UNDP's Resident Representative had been serving as the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General for development and humanitarian affairs (which directly supports the head of UNAMI). The comparative strengths that UNDP usually exercises in the United Nations country team was overshadowed in Iraq, sometimes with justification and sometimes without. In critical matters, particularly those in which the common interests of development partners was at stake (e.g. on security constraints), UNDP was not sufficiently proactive in ensuring that its interests (or the interests of other important development partners) were adequately represented.

The lack of clear roles in areas where both UNDP and UNAMI had a mandate was a factor in UNDP's poor contributions to development. UNDP unsuccessfully established an identity that was distinct from either UNAMI or the United Nations country team. Establishing a clear distinctness from the Security Council-mandated activities of UNAMI will be essential for UNDP to convey its own positioning in key areas.

Conclusion 6: UNDP has not always succeeded in gaining the government's full confidence as a trusted, long-term development partner that strategically provides support through well-integrated programmes or that delivers what it has committed.

National partner ownership of programmes is critical to sustaining programme achievements

and to informing national planning and policies. There are important examples of UNDP programmes that were embedded in government priorities and systems with robust national ownership. Notwithstanding such examples, it was challenging for UNDP to secure national ownership for its programmes.

With exceptions, the government did not consider UNDP to be a key development partner in providing strategic policy and programme support. UNDP's lack of clear programme focus was one factor, as the agency had some difficulty defining its possible roles to the government. The security situation in the country did not allow UNDP to have sufficient interactions with national partners, which led to another major factor—insufficient communications and interactions with the national counterparts, exacerbated by the remote programme management from Amman. Further, the complex political situation was not conducive for UNDP to engage with government partners and gain their ownership over programmes. While avoiding exposure of its staff to security risks is justifiable, UNDP was neither proactive nor innovative in addressing this challenge, unlike some other UN agencies. Although UNDP made the policy decision to move its Country Office back to Baghdad, the decision to do so was slow in coming.

UNDP's programme positioning was undermined by many government officials' and donors' perception of UNDP as a mere implementer of donor projects rather than as a driver of development that works closely with national counterparts. UNDP has not successfully conveyed the value addition of its programmes to national stakeholders.

UNDP's ability to provide strategic support to Iraq's development depends on well-integrated programmes and careful planning to ensure that commitments are met. This was compromised by UNDP's increasing need to raise funds, resulting in a focus on resources rather than programme coherence. Though UNDP has increasingly been counting on sharing the cost of programming with the government, it seems that government

officials are not fully convinced of the value of UNDP support such that they would share expenses. For its part, the government has often not clearly articulated the contributions it wants from UNDP.

Conclusion 7: While there is a rationale to provide more central-level support, opportunities were not adequately taken to strengthen sub-national capacities (particularly in central and south Iraq).

UNDP did not effectively balance its programme support between the federal and governorate levels. Service delivery at the governorate level has been a priority area for Iraq. While some projects focused on governorate-level service delivery, UNDP did not adequately consolidate its strategy to respond to governorate-level needs and priorities. More recently, UNDP has been considering opening up field offices to support UN programmes. This is a much-needed step in preparing for a more substantive role in supporting development in Iraq.

Conclusion 8: UNDP did not give gender equality adequate priority in programme implementation, and was not persistent in its efforts to integrate gender in its programme support.

Despite achievements in a few projects, UNDP's programme response generally neglected gender. Where gender was addressed, the Iraq context presented significant challenges, particularly when it came to politically sensitive national policies. UNDP lacked a strategy to systematically approach gender issues in its programme areas or to collaborate with other agencies on this issue.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: UNDP Iraq should consolidate its programme support, ensuring that it has adequate scope and depth to address the key development challenges confronting Iraq. UNDP should move away from funding-driven, low-impact activities.

In order to strengthen its credibility, UNDP Iraq should develop programmes that build on its comparative strengths in areas such as governance. UNDP should avoid regrouping existing projects into new overarching programmes, particularly where projects are not aligned to intended outcomes. It should establish a strategy for each programme area and then appropriately develop activities that will substantively address Iraq's development challenges. The strategy should be realistic and flexible in adapting itself to changing political and security situations.

As donor funding for its programmes declines, UNDP needs to be specifically conscious of using limited resources for more sustained support in a few areas. The programme is presently constructed around broad reform areas, the scope of which is too large to impose any constructive limitations on what UNDP does. The result is that programme areas comprised dispersed and eclectic projects, without a judicious approach to reform initiatives.

UNDP should not proceed without a clearly structured and focused programme. A first step is to narrow the reform areas, replacing the broad mandates with specific problem-solving initiatives in which UNDP has substantial expertise and where it has government support.

Recommendation 2: UNDP's future relevance will depend on establishing strong development partnerships with the Government and people of Iraq. UNDP Iraq should make it a priority to develop and sustain partnerships with national counterparts.

A key challenge for UNDP is to restore close relationships with national partners in the government and civil society. Other UN agencies have tried various methods to overcome this challenge with varying degree of success. UNDP should learn from such experiences and strengthen its relations with the government.

Following through on recent management decisions (e.g. moving programme management from

Amman back to Baghdad and recruiting more programme managers who are Arabic speakers) will be critical for increasing the level of interaction between programme management and national partners. UNDP should also actively pursue a strategy to increase the number of national staff on the programme team.

Recommendation 3: UNDP Iraq should develop adaptive strategies that will continue to contribute to Iraq’s development under different and evolving political and security scenarios, particularly the challenging security context of central and south Iraq.

To meet Iraq’s immediate and long-term development needs, UNDP should adapt its programme strategies and operations to difficult security situations and an evolving institutional context. The volatility of the security situation should be factored into programme planning and design. UNDP should take adequate measures to devise innovative ways of adapting to—and overcoming—security limitations in working in central and southern Iraq. UNDP should also address issues arising out of working from the International Zone that severely restricts interaction with national counterparts. UNDP should place the risk of working with partners before the importance of UNDP’s presence.

One of the problems in developing a four-year country programme in a post-conflict situation is the unrealistic requirement that the programme must have a tight results framework that assumes an orderly development process, one that is not affected by political and security factors. The current country programme, developed during a time of optimism, was unrealistic in terms of its expected achievements. Establishing solid overarching goals for the programmes does not preclude incorporating flexible and adaptive mechanisms and strategies to achieve these goals and, if necessary and justifiable, revisiting the country programme results expectations.

Recommendation 4: UNDP Iraq should ensure the appropriate balance of programme support

between the national and governorate levels and should strengthen the synergies between programmes at the two levels.

The lack of public-sector capacities at the governorate and local government levels is one of the most critical challenges in the country. Although UNDP addresses this issue through the Local Area Development programme, strengthening service delivery will require a more coherent approach to local-level capacity development.

UNDP is exploring the possibility of opening local programme support offices in south and central Iraq outside Baghdad, as well as having UNDP national staff embedded in government ministries and offices. Such measures should be followed through in order to support strengthening governorate capacities and to improve collaboration access with national partners.

Recommendation 5: UNDP programmes need to prioritize promoting gender equality. The lack of a conducive environment cannot justify inadequately pursuing programmes that promote gender equality and women’s empowerment.

UNDP should take specific measures to systematically integrate gender into its programme response and should commit adequate resources to ensure its implementation. Gender analysis should inform programme design and implementation of the forthcoming programme. In order to maximize results in the area, UNDP should strengthen partnerships with UN agencies.

Recommendation 6: UNDP should strengthen its own technical and advisory capacities. UNDP should review programme management and should develop an appropriate strategy to respond effectively to Iraq’s development needs.

UNDP’s role and contribution in Iraq depends on the quality of the advisory, policy and programme support it provides. National counterparts in Iraq expect advisory services from senior-level experts

who bring cutting-edge ideas. UNDP should ensure that the programme and policy support it offers is of high quality and provided by senior experts who are familiar with the national context. UNDP should not use programme models that are ill-suited to the Iraqi context.

UNDP should strengthen its technical advisory capacity at a relatively senior level in key areas of programme support in order to effectively contribute to strengthening Iraq institutions. UNDP staff should have adequate skills to respond to different political and security scenarios in Iraq.

Recommendation 7: Recently, the importance of UNDP’s mandate in integrated peacekeeping missions has been increasingly recognized. UNDP and UNAMI should draw lessons from countries where close coordination between UNDP and the integrated mission has been mutually beneficial and has enhanced their contributions to peacebuilding and development. UNDP and UNAMI should make concerted efforts to solve disagreements regarding their roles in the area of governance.

Greater clarity of programme roles and closer links are needed for an effective partnership between UNDP and UNAMI. This will require

both partners to exhibit administrative flexibility. UNDP should recognize and respect the status that the Security Council has accorded the Mission in Iraq and support it in principle and in practice. UNAMI should recognize UNDP’s expertise and capacity to take the lead on issues where UNAMI believes it has exclusive jurisdiction.

UNDP will have to recognize and respect the status that the Security Council has accorded the Mission in Iraq and support it in principle and in practice. At present, this recognition and respect do not exist. A small working group should be established to represent UNAMI and UNDP, resolve differences and chart new and collaborative directions.

UNDP and UNAMI should jointly address differences in the programme orientation of the peacekeeping and development mandates and how it should manifest in supporting Iraq. UNDP and UNAMI should revisit the Integrated Strategic Vision in order to work out a viable plan of action to strengthen their collaboration in areas where their mandates are complementary. Efforts should be made to build on the synergies of the peacekeeping and development mandates and to promote integrated approaches.