Peru has created institutional structures and started a long-range decentralization of political authority in order to strengthen democratic governance. In the economic sphere, the country has shown one of the greatest growth rates in Latin America, attained a significant reduction in poverty, and now belongs to the category of upper-middle-income countries. Nonetheless, public dissatisfaction with the political parties and public authorities has reached high levels. Social and environmental conflicts have been on the increase.

UNDP programmes covered democratic governance, poverty and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), crisis prevention and recovery, and the environment and energy. The Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP conducted an independent country programme evaluation that covered UNDP work from 2001 to 2009.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

UNDP’s primary focus in Peru has been assisting with democratic governance. It has been an important ally of the State, reflected in the fact that a large share of programme resources derive from government resources.

Programmes tackled various aspects of democratic governance. In the area of human rights, several national initiatives were established and fortified with UNDP support, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the Defensoría del Pueblo (Ombudsman) and the Special Congressional Disability Commission. Through the reform of the judicial system, improvements have been remarkable, but overall reform was not achieved, hindered by structural inertia and resistance. Support to the Congress brought about some infrastructural improvements, but had little effect on the performance of parliamentary functions.

As an interim measure, UNDP was a valuable ally in assisting with the administration of public resources, guaranteeing transparency, although sometimes with a limited substantive contribution. This role began to diminish with a push for the State to assume management responsibilities, such as through new legislation for public employment and the creation of an authority responsible for civil service careers over the longer term.

In supporting decentralization, UNDP made a pertinent change in its initial support strategy by establishing offices in several regions to directly support respective governments. Decentralization is still at an early stage, however, and requires the long-term creation of skills. At the regional and municipal levels, large unfulfilled needs persist in public administration.

UNDP support to poverty reduction and the MDGs assisted the formulation of social policies and helped focus resources through use of the Human Development Index. The strategic alliance with the Round Table (Mesa de Concertación) to combat poverty, involving hundreds of groups throughout the country, increased awareness and established cooperation mechanisms. The publication of MDG reports helped guide public policies and budgetary allocations. UNDP’s promotion of access to microcredit, especially for women, had a limited effect, however, in contrast to the ample and already well-established microcredit industry in the country.

Crisis prevention and recovery programmes covered natural disaster prevention, emergency aid and support to mechanisms to cope with social conflicts. UNDP made major contributions to analysing risk and continuously supported the National Civil Defence Institute. As the national response to the 2007 earthquake showed, implementation of preventive measures and the capac-
ity to respond to emergencies were still at an early stage. The same applied to social conflict management. Despite support for the National Agreement between the main political parties and civil forces, the Agreement is not a budgetary unit, which limited its influence.

The environment and energy portfolio was small in scope. Support for the establishment of the new Ministry of the Environment was much appreciated, although it took the form of one-off interventions, and the Ministry still needs investment in its capabilities. Small environmental conservation projects helped develop river-basin management models and sustainable, community-based, natural-resource management approaches.

By reducing the size of its programme portfolio, UNDP made progress in lowering the risk of dispersion of the programme, although it still has to formulate specific guidelines for each thematic area. Across-the-board activities and themes not necessarily in the form of projects—such as advocacy, interaction with partners, generation and dissemination of important analysis and consultation for the MDGs, and inter-agency cooperation—have enhanced the organization’s image and prestige. These activities stand to gain in importance in an emergent country such as Peru, where national capacities are increasing and the relative importance of external project support is declining.

UNDP has provided important support to the Peruvian Agency for International Cooperation, from its inception in 2002. An active role in promoting South-South cooperation draws resources offered by the Perez Guerrero Fiduciary Fund, created by the United Nations for this objective.

The UNDP Peru programme is currently in transition from the days when it primarily supported the administration of public resources. While not having abundant resources to contribute, UNDP can still add value to the human development of the country. Programming elements that best respond to present and future challenges include the reformulated strategy to support decentralization, with a presence in the regions, and the ability to generate knowledge and standards for human development by applying the Human Development Index. Also important will be UNDP’s ability to mobilize its regional and global cooperation network, advocate for critical concerns such as climate change and the settlement of social conflicts, and further strengthen national coordination of international cooperation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- UNDP should elaborate specific strategic guidelines in each thematic area in the next Country Programme Document. This will help better define the contents of and weight between programmatic areas, as well as links with non-project activities, and enhance selectivity to further focus on the excluded population. Clearer guidelines for strengthening the focus on gender equity are also to be provided across the thematic areas.
- In the area of democratic governance, the ‘seed project’ model has been useful to start up new State institutions or parliamentary commissions. UNDP should nonetheless privilege involvement in substantive formulation and ensure that there is clear institutional anchoring, and an explicit plan to transfer knowledge and experience.
- The rationalization of the legal system within and between the three levels of public administration should be supported to improve its capacity to respond to human development challenges and achievement of the MDGs.
- In crisis prevention and recovery, a more systemic approach should be adopted and greater continuity in the learning process encouraged so that knowledge can be accumulated and systematized.
- In the area of social conflict management, the base of support and intervention should be broadened and more clearly linked with initiatives on the environment and poverty.
- UNDP should identify with better precision the levels, fields and specific MDGs it should promote concretely.
- UNDP should further reduce its involvement in administrative support to central State entities, giving more attention to strengthening the capacities of regional and municipal governments.
- UNDP should systematize lessons learned and disseminate them among its partners.
- Further diversification of partnerships is recommended, not only territorially (more activities out of the capital), but also with respect to sectors (civil society, private sector, academia, etc.) and global partners.
- In order to gain a broader and more accurate recognition of its commitment to human development, the overall communication strategy should be fine-tuned.

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.
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