**UNDP IN BOTSWANA**

Botswana is well known for having one of the world’s highest economic growth rates, but still needs to translate huge wealth from diamond resources into a sustainable level of poverty reduction. Significant challenges have come from HIV/AIDS, although the country made good progress on the Millennium Development Goals. It is widely considered to be one of the leading countries in Africa with regard to good governance, a reflection of its generally high quality of institutions, independent legal system and relatively low level of corruption.

UNDP has provided support in the areas of poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS, governance, and energy and the environment. The Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP conducted an independent country programme evaluation that covered UNDP work from 2003 to 2008.

**TOTAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES, 2004-2008: $76.9 MILLION**

**FUNDING SOURCES, 2004-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Botswana</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMME BUDGETED FUNDS BY THEMATIC AREA, 2004-2008 ($ MILLIONS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Amount ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS and gender</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

UNDP-supported interventions in Botswana have generally been effective and responded well to national development needs, although impacts have often been limited to target groups with a fairly small number of people. The importance of UNDP support is highlighted by the fact that the organization is the only active development partner in most of its programme areas.

The most notable achievements on HIV/AIDS took place in strengthening institutional capacity. Key contributions included helping to establish umbrella HIV/AIDS organizations, strengthening the Ministry of Education’s response to the epidemic and supporting subnational structures.

Governance programme achievements were promising but not entirely fulfilled. In poverty reduction and economic diversification, activities were pertinent and well-conceived, but limited in impact due to government capacity constraints and policy factors. The Multi-sectoral Committee on Poverty Reduction was felt to be taking the correct approach, for instance, but was highly dependent on a short-term international policy adviser and other external inputs.

UNDP support was instrumental and decisive in work on energy and the environment, assisting, for example, in the adoption of the Community-based Natural Resources Management Policy. But the high number of interventions brought challenges in terms of workload and maintaining the focus of the programme.

Gender equality and mainstreaming have featured across interventions, and backed an increase in women’s political participation and steps to respond to gender-based violence, among other achievements. There was a tendency for patchwork treatment of gender, however; an explicit strategy and specific human resources were needed.

Sustainability was a cross-cutting programmatic concern, but did not always lead to genuine national ownership. In community interventions, the need to respond to beneficiaries’ immediate needs and priorities was a continuous challenge. In institutional projects, adequate capacity-strengthening activities, such as training events, took place, but not always within the framework of a comprehensive strategy. While some projects had a sustainability strategy, others did not.

UNDP had a prominent position in supporting key civil society organizations, yet some stakeholders felt that they should have greater and more meaningful involvement in the country programme.

Aid coordination was also an area in which the organization could have made a bigger contribution; there were signs that the Resident Coordinator was beginning to assume this role. Stronger focus on the principles of the Paris Declaration and aid effectiveness could enhance UNDP’s delivery of development support.
Responsiveness to government needs stemmed from
the fact that a large amount of programme funding came
from the Government, although its share in the environ-
ment was smaller than in other practice areas, due to the
high volume of Global Environment Facility funds. As
a rule, all projects had a steering committee to include
stakeholders in the decision-making process.

Despite an adequate match between national policies
and country programme objectives, interventions did not
always fully support the achievement of these objectives.
The identification of core problems for projects and the
definition of subsequent project purposes were not always
clear. Institutional frameworks were not always success-
fully selected, which may explain the lack of buy-in by
national counterparts in some projects.

Technical assistance absorbed a sizeable share of
funding. It was generally appreciated for its good quality
and relevant contributions, although some stakeholders
commented that it was insufficient, a notion that may be
based on a misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities.

Overall, its effect on strengthening national capacities
and sustainability was questioned.

Competent and experienced human resources are a
key asset of the country office, but UNDP’s bureaucracy
and procedural delays were criticized. Projects in all pro-
gramme areas were reasonably efficient, when measured
with disbursement rates, implementation of activities
and production of outputs. Capacity constraints in the
country office caused administrative delays, but most
stakeholders did not consider these serious. To enhance
efficiency, financial monitoring and reporting should
be strengthened.

As a key development partner in Botswana, UNDP
was visible and respected, in part due to the organiza-
tion’s participatory approach and strong relationship with
the Government. Looking forward, there are several
areas for intensifying UNDP support, such as capacity
building and aid effectiveness. These need to be analysed
in a holistic manner and a corporate strategy formulated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• The UNDP country programme should include a more realistic and adequate formulation of intended outcomes
  and respective indicators, and should be operationalized through annual action plans and accompanying
  budgets. Key programmes should sharpen their focus.
• A strategic review and possible revision of internal systems could cover areas such as the distribution of
  human resources among units, and the possibilities of stronger alignment of procedures with those of the
  Government. The policy for cost recovery should be revised so that it enables sustainable provision of services.
• UNDP should explore the possibilities of working more closely with civil society, including to play a watchdog
  role for service delivery.
• Financial monitoring and reporting should be strengthened. A specific monitoring and evaluation unit could be
  created, including to enhance alignment with government monitoring structures and mechanisms.
• All interventions supported by UNDP should be based on project documents that fulfil universally applied
  criteria of project cycle management. There should be an explicit strategy for sustainability in every project.
• All projects need to have clearly defined roles, responsibilities and decision-making structures, and these must
  be effectively communicated to all pertinent stakeholders.
• Future programme design should limit the number of cross-cutting issues to one or two, and have a clear
  strategy for ensuring that these are adequately addressed.
• UNDP should further strengthen gender equality and mainstreaming through assigning specific human
  resources. A clear strategy should be in place to ensure adequate attention to youth issues.
• Towards improved efficiency of the governance programme, UNDP could establish a senior-level management
  team that regularly reviews progress on implementation.
• The governance programme could benefit from regular reviews and documentation of good practices.
• Strengthening the linkages between National AIDS Coordinating Agency and subnational coordination
  structures is a potential area for UNDP work, drawing on experiences in other countries.

ABOUT THE ICPEs

Independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs) are the backbone of the work of the Independent Evaluation Office. They capture evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results and the effectiveness of strategies supporting national development. They enable continued improvement in UNDP programmes, contribute to strengthened national ownership and evaluation capacity, and underpin accountability to national stakeholders and UNDP’s Executive Board. To date, over 100 ICPEs have been conducted worldwide.

See the full reports at the Evaluation Resource Centre, erc.undp.org