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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Purpose, scope and use of the evaluation

The evaluation covers the 2015-2017 period of UNDP’s Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC). The evaluation provides accountability to both internal and external stakeholders related to the planning, implementation and results of the ISNC initiative as well as a learning opportunity for the preparation of a proposal for Phase II.

The evaluation covered all six countries and involved relevant UNDP Headquarter and Country Office staff, implementing partners including central and local governments and Civil Society Organisations, and KOICA, the donor.

The primary objectives of the evaluation were to:

• Assess the performance and results achieved or expected results by 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC);

• Assess the use of the Strategic Framework as a tool for guiding UNDP work and delivering on its mandate;

• Assess the learning from the ISNC experience during the implementation period;

• Specifically, around planning and implementation processes;

• Provide actionable recommendations in regard to the overall UNDP strategy and strategic planning process.

The audience is all actors in the ISNC project together with other stakeholders regionally and globally that have interest in working with the SMU principles for achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods

The choice of methodology takes into account the remote approach to the data collection. The methodology comprised the following methods:

* Desk review producing preliminary findings and evaluation plan;
* Skype conversations with HQ, former staff and all COs before and during the data collection;
* Semi-structured templates for data entry.

The evaluation was two-pronged assessing respectively: The project implementation process and achievements/results with the view to assess which processes were more effective and/or efficient than others in achieving results.

Quality assurance

The data validation had some limitations, since all was received via email. There was thus no opportunity to verify the data and the real data source, neither the validity of the data. Therefore, the data from global and national annual reports were organised in results frameworks the content of which was compared with respectively CO and stakeholder scorings for validation. This enable a comparison of earlier validated data with new data. Since the three types of data had high level of consistency and coherence the validity of the evaluation data is regarded as high.

In short, the evaluation abides by OECD criteria and UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluations.

Key findings, conclusions, and recommendations

Each analytical step will be presented individually, as some conclusions and recommendations cover several findings.

Findings:

* The project aimed at “demonstrating how various development cooperation modalities, Official Development Assistance (ODA), domestic resource mobilization, South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC and TrC) could complement effectively within one development initiative and support the implementation of the 2030 development agenda”. The was demonstrated in terms of varied and extensive achievements covering all levels and types of stakeholders in all countries. The combining of respectively donor, government and private resource allocation – the latter mainly from beneficiaries and contributed in kind, proved feasible and is viewed as being the main course for the rapid and substantial achievement at output level.
* The project design did not have a component directly targeting the research/pilot aspect of the project in terms of analysis of applicability of various principles and approaches in the different contexts. Being a pilot/test/research project (see project aim above), the very research component needs to have a corner of the logframe and funds allocation to be able to collect the data proving the hypothesis (the objective here) right (or wrong). The achievements alone cannot prove the feasibility of the SMU principles as other factors can have caused/added to the results. Specific pilot data relating achievements to fund, timing, approach, target group etc. were required to have delivered the intended “demonstration of SMU applicability.
* The implementation timeframe was too short to conclude on the suitability and sustainability of the achievements inclusive of the systems and structures, which were established to support the key principles of Saemaul Undong approach: Self-reliance, cooperation and can-do spirit.

Conclusions:

* The project fulfilled its objectives of cooperation and can-do spirit at outcome level, while self-reliance is undocumented and unlikely in the short project time.
* The reported output achievements justify a full testing of the SMU principles to allow for possible achievements at impact level thus also proving the likely sustainability.
* Some learning may have been lost because of the lack of regular analysis of the SMU principle applicability and reporting and knowledge sharing of the same. Achievements cannot stand alone as evidence of SMU principle relevance, as the achievements can have been influenced by other factors.

Recommendations:

* In recognition of the substantial, and possibly mind-changing, but frail results achieved in the first phase it is strongly recommended to have a phase II. A possible next phase should be launched soon as systems and structures established during phase I are more likely to be in place or easily revivable.
* Design of a next phase should have a component specifically analysing the applicability of each principle, but also of the synergy effect of combining various actors (tri-partite partnerships e.g. key ministry, local governments and research, or key ministry, market facilitators and farmer groups) and methods (i.e. involvement in all stages of project design and implementation; use of or support to relevant, existing policies, plans and programmes; knowledge sharing at national, regional and global level) as emphasised and detailed under “Findings”. Design of a project extension or of other research/pilot project should take all factors into account (timeframe, size of funding, seasonal etc.) with the aim to have (i) comparable data and (ii) realistic stakeholder expectations.
1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

During the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) the proportion of people living in extreme poverty has been halved at the global level, over two billion people have gained access to improved sources of drinking water, and a low debt burden and an improved climate for trade are levelling the playing field for developing countries. At the same time, data indicates persisting disparities and rising inequality in the midst of emerging development challenges related to the impact of climate change, rapid urbanization, energy needs, the recurrence of financial crises, and food and nutrition security. Rural-urban gaps, in particular, are apparent in access to reproductive health services, clean drinking water and education[[1]](#footnote-1).

The increasing recognition of widening disparities and inequalities calls for renewed efforts to implement interventions that are proven to address development challenges at the local level and that are cost-effective, scalable and sustainable. In this context, the remarkable economic growth of the Republic of Korea (ROK) in the 1970s has been a topic of interest by academia and development practitioners for many years. Research indicates that absolute rural poverty in ROK declined from 27.9 percent in 1970 to 10.8 percent in 1978. Many have at least in part attributed this transformation of rural ROK to the launching and implementation of the *Saemaul Undong* (SMU) an integrated local development programme that evolved mainly as farm-based initiative between 1971 and 1979, while taking an urban/rural and more autonomous shape from 1980-1998[[2]](#footnote-2).

The development of the SMU can be condensed as illustrated in the table below. The two mid-columns show respectively the ISNC implementation of SMU and the original ROK implementation of SMU[[3]](#footnote-3):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase of SMU** | **ISNC SMU features** | **Features ROK SMU** | **Increase of GNP per capita (in US$)** |
| Foundation and groundwork (1970 –1973) | * Improving living environments: Expanding roads inside villages, constructing common laundry facilities, improving roofs, kitchens and fences.
* Increasing income: Expanding agricultural roads, improving farmland and seeds, division of labour.
* Attitude reform: Fostering diligence and frugality, and a cooperative atmosphere.
 | * During this phase the campaign was introduced and implemented.
* The government-initiated activities, with a top priority in improving living conditions and roads and villages were expanded
 | * 257 in 1970
* 375 in 1973
 |
| Proliferation (1974 – 1976) | * Increasing income: straightening rice field ridges, consolidating creeks, encouraging combined farming, operating common working places, identifying non-agricultural income sources.
* Attitude reform: Attitude changes through Saemaul education and public relations activities.
* Improving living conditions: Improving housing and water supply systems, operating village centres.
 | * Expanding programme

scope and functions to include non-agriculturalincome sources* Increasing income and

changing attitudes.* Earning national understanding and consensus.
 | * 402 in 1974
* 765 in 1976
 |
| Energetic Implementation (1977 – 79) | * Rural areas: construction of more modern housing, encouraging growth of special-purpose plants, running industrial facilities to com- bine agriculture and manufacturing.
* Urban areas: Paving alleys, cleaning,

 establishing order.* Corporations and factories: Enhancing productivity, conserving materials, promoting sound labour-management relations.
 | * Rural areas saw the construction of modern houses, which encouraged growth, especially of industrial facilities, agriculture and manufacturing.
* In urban areas, alleys were paved, and order was improved and reinforced.
* This progression allowed for linkages between villages, economies of scale, and an emergence of district unit characteristics
 | * 966 in 1977
* 1,394 in 1979
 |
| Overhaul (1980 – 1989) | * Social atmosphere: Kindness, order,

 selflessness, cooperation.* Economic development

Combined farming, distribution improvement, credit union activities.* Environmental activities:

Cleanliness, developingparks throughout thecountry, building betteraccess roads | * Throughout the country the social atmosphere improved, and cooperation were reinforced.
* Economic development soared, especially with farming.
* Resources were better allocated, and credit unions proliferated.
* The environment was taken into consideration:
* Cleanliness, developing
* parks throughout the
* country, building better
* access roads
 | * 1,507 in 1980
* 4,934 in 1989
 |
| Autonomous Growth (1990 – 1998) | * Sound atmosphere: Developing traditional culture, emphasizing hard work and sound lifestyles.
* Economic stability: Economic recovery, urban-rural direct trade and linkages.
* Living environment: Cultivating better community environments, emphasizing autonomous living
 | * ROK improved traditional culture with an emphasis on hard work and stable lifestyles.
* The people experienced economic recovery then economic stability, particularly with the help of urban-rural direct trade.

 * Autonomous lifestyles became more popular and possible.
* Self-reliance was established, allowing the growth of liberalization and localization.
 | * 5,503 in 1990
* 10,548 in 1996
 |

 Table 1 – Saemaul Undong stages

The New Village Movement’s successes can be most clearly seen as a “learning cycle of stimulus, reflection, resolution and practice”**.** The government used incentive systems that they knew would be successful, playing off of the competitive nature of the Korean people. Farmers were seen as the centre of the movement, promoting the spirit of the *Saemaul* Movement. Eventually, the program was implemented both in rural and urban areas and at all different levels of society: village, town, county, and provincial. The input practices and deriving outcomes came to form the SMU virtuous cycle:



 Fig. 1 – SMU process

In the first periods of evolution the communities received further governmental incentives when responding well to the initiative. That could be illustrated by and arrow between the sixth and first box in the above figure hence forming the SMU cycle.

In a study: “The Saemaul Undong Movement in the Republic of Korea” the Asian Development Bank (ADB) found that:

“the SU movement demonstrated that the best results occur when the government helps those communities that help themselves,” and also actively sought to scale up and expand the number of self-reliant villages through a number of approaches (e.g. following the designation of the SU as a top government priority, the *Saemaul* Central Promotional Council as well as sub-councils for each level of local government administration were established, effectively creating an SU movement inter-ministerial policy coordination system at the national level).”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The ADB report therefore concluded that this reliance on diligence, self-help and cooperation helped to prevent dependence on aid or government resources. Over time, SU projects became increasingly funded from community resources and financing instead of from the government budget.

1. **PROJECT FOCUS AND PLANS[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**2.1 Systems and structures**

Building on *Saemaul* application experiences together with other complementary development solutions, UNDP intended to develop an integrated local development approach – inclusive and sustainable new communities – to apply to a selected number of countries. The final design and selection of countries took shape after a one-year feasibility phase.

In 2014, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea (ROK) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) launched a global initiative called “Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC)”. The initiative focused on scaling up local development solutions for sustainable livelihoods, drawing on the experiences of ROK’s SMU – New Village Movement – which significantly reduced rural poverty by increasing household incomes, improving basic infrastructure and services, revitalizing local communities and empowering women. The key principles of Saemaul Undong (SMU) approach are: self-reliance, cooperation and can-do spirit.

In addition, at the global and regional levels, the experiences of the SMU also provided valuable lessons to inform pertinent global and regional debates including the post-2015 development agenda and implementation mechanisms for rural development and sustainability. UNDP therefore partnered with ROK in ensuring achieving impact at regional and global level through supporting centres of excellences for South-South and Triangular knowledge exchanges and cooperation as well as global advocacy of the Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNCs). It aimed at utilizing its global networks and positioning to ensure that the updated and adapted approach of the SMU makes a significant, evidence-based contribution to regional and global development discourses on sustainable development.

In March 2015, six countries were selected to roll-out the Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC) based on field visits and research findings conducted by UNDP[[6]](#footnote-6). Bolivia, Lao PDR and Uganda were selected as Type Acountries and Myanmar, Rwanda and Viet Nam were selected as Type Bcountries focusing on different ways of adapting and upscaling the model**.**

**Type A** focused on local level implementation while setting up linkages with national policies and programmes. Such implementation of ISNC was expected to produce impact at the local level and in creating national-local linkages that would have the potential in impacting polices at the national level based on the country’s policy environment. Converging entry points should not only help in selecting critical sites, but also in creating policy impact and ownership at the national level that will be sustainable it the long-run. Furthermore, this type of implementation should contribute to the improvement of relevant national policies, considering the lessons learnt from ISNC implementation.

**Type B** implementation focused on policy advices and contributed knowledge to the centres of excellence. These were countries where numerous local development programmes had been conducted or were being planned. Given the small-scale investment from the ISNC programme, targeted village level implementation was not likely to add critical value to the country. Instead, building on existing programmes to develop policy advices, contributing knowledge to the model through centres of excellence, and promoting South-South cooperation (SSC), could be a comparative advantage of these countries. Additionally, UNDP, together with ROK and in collaboration with other development partners, would support to identification of the scalable elements and solutions of previous and current applications of Saemaul Undong projects in the countries, as well as learning from the different local development projects by UNDP and partners, and package them for application, scaling up, and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned regionally and globally.

**2.2 Planned outcomes**

The objective of the ISNC project was to:

Update, integrate and scale up elements of the Saemaul Undong (SMU) and its application into an exemplary systematic approach and effective platform for development cooperation and to create a critical mass of support to localizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Three outcomes should deliver to this objective:

1. Identify proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of SMU and other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South;
2. Achieve impact of the integrated local development approaches known as Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities at both the local and national policy levels through its application to an initial set of countries; and
3. Facilitate South-South and Triangular cooperation and knowledge exchange through support to centres of excellence to disseminate evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving impact at the regional and global levels.

At overall level the project should deliver to UNDP 2014-2017 Strategic Plan outcomes:

Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create livelihoods for the poor and excluded.

Outcome 7: Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles.

Gender and environmental concerns and mainstreaming were cross-cutting issues meant to be incorporated in all activities and achievements.

**2.3 Project Strategy**

With reference to the above content UNDP, together with ROK and in collaboration with other development partners, identified the scalable elements and solutions of the SMU and formulated them into an updated, integrated local development model known as the ISNCs approach for application and scaling up to current country contexts. In so doing, the project also facilitated South-South and triangular knowledge exchange and cooperation on proven solutions for local development by drawing on the experiences of ROK and country-level implementation of the approach and ensure that the lessons learned of the SU and the updated approach influences global and regional development discourses.

This project aimed at demonstrating how various development cooperation modalities, Official Development Assistance (ODA), domestic resource mobilization, South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC and TrC) could complement effectively within one development initiative and support the implementation of the 2030 development agenda. To secure these achievements the project applied a three-phase approach:

* 1. Identification of proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of SU and other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South;
	2. Achievement of policy impact at both local and national levels through applying the systematic approach of ISNCs to three countries[[7]](#footnote-7) where earlier application of SU experiences has achieved initial results;
	3. South-South and Triangular knowledge exchange and cooperation as well as global advocacy through support to already existing centres of excellence that share evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving impact at the regional and global levels.

Advantages of this implementation set-up were expected to be as follows:

* ISNC methodology and toolkit would be enriched with practical experiences from more countries and contexts;
* Knowledge products and policy recommendations produced by the Centres of Excellence should feed and reinforce the ongoing implementation of SMU in Type A countries by UNDP- ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) project, as well as in all countries where KOICA SMU projects are being implemented;
* South-South exchanges on SMU-inspired approach should start from the outset of the Project, rather than at its final stage;
* ISNC Project should have more visibility and impact regionally and globally.
	1. **Knowledge Management and Global Advocacy**

The centres of excellence were meant to accumulate substantive evidence from the developing countries and provide a platform for the countries to collectively advocate at regional and global levels to advance the implementation of the post-2015 agenda. Such a platform aimed at providing examples of innovative local development interventions that proved successful and could be emulated for scaling up.

This knowledge sharing, and global advocacy was overall packed as South-South Cooperation (SSC) and Triangular Cooperation (TrC).

The SSC is a broad framework of collaboration among countries of the South in the political, economic, social, cultural, environmental and technical domains. Involving two or more developing countries, it can take place on a bilateral, regional, intraregional or interregional basis. Developing countries share knowledge, skills, expertise and resources to meet their development goals through concerted efforts. Recent developments in South-South cooperation have taken the form of increased volume of South-South trade, South-South flows of foreign direct investment, movements towards regional integration, technology transfers, sharing of solutions and experts, and other forms of exchanges.

Triangular cooperation is a collaboration in which traditional donor countries and multilateral organisations facilitate South-South initiatives through the provision of funding, training, management and technological systems as well as other forms of support[[8]](#footnote-8).

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The ISNC project had two phases: Phase I, 2014-2015, was a scoping mission determining the design and focus of phase II, the very project implementation from 2015-2017. Phase II of the project was operationalized through a series of targeted interventions with the support of UNDP global programme aligned with the priority areas. The evaluation of the Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC) analysed the role of these strategies and programmes as an implementation mechanism for the ISNC.

The evaluation covered all six countries and involved relevant UNDP Country Office (CO) staff, implementing partners including central and local governments and CSOs, and KOICA, the donor.

The primary objectives of the evaluation were to:

* Assess the performance and results achieved or expected results by 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC);
* Assess the use of the Strategic Framework as a tool for guiding UNDP work and delivering on its mandate;
* Assess the learning from the ISNC experience during the implementation period;
* Specifically, around planning and implementation processes;
* Provide actionable recommendations in regard to the overall UNDP strategy and strategic planning process.

The above was broken down into detailed questions/issues, each of which was assessed as described in section 4. Only few changes were made to the questions raised in TOR[[9]](#footnote-9).

To cover the evaluation objectives the evaluation was two-pronged and addressed the results achieved and the entire process from planning to implementation and exit. The evaluation abides by the OECD criteria and UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluations.

To provide the most benefit to the organization and partners, the evaluation attempts to understand what worked and what did not work regarding planning, implementation and processes related to the ISNC and regarding the type of implemented activities.

The TOR suggest key questions, which structured the section 6[[10]](#footnote-10). They were found to overall cover the purpose and scope of this evaluation for which reason they were kept. The findings would prove if all questions were still relevant or whether there would be need for extra questions/aspects to cover all findings adequately. A few sub-questions were added to cover all aspects appearing in the stakeholder data.

In Section 6, the findings and specific conclusions relate to the questions listed in TOR, which are grouped against the OECD criteria[[11]](#footnote-11) for evaluations, application of which ensures a full analysis from the planning stage to post-project situation. Each criterion is treated separately adding analysis of the specific ISNC project focus areas. The analysis of each criteria concludes in a criteria specific summing-up, while overall and cross-cutting conclusions are presented in Section 7.

1. **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS**

The choice of methodology takes into account the remote approach to the data collection. The methodology comprised the following methods:

* Desk review producing preliminary findings and evaluation plan
* Skype talks with HQ, former HQ staff and COs
* Semi-structured templates

The evaluation was two-pronged assessing respectively: The project implementation process and achievements/results with the view to assess which processes were more effective and/or efficient than others in achieving the planned results.

**4.1 Desk review**

Review of key documents, both national and global, provided an overview over activities, systems and structures. The desk review included analysis of the project document, global and county annual reports, work plans and other relevant documents[[12]](#footnote-12).

The findings of the desk review in combination with the TOR conditions determined the content and design of the data collection tools. The draft Inception Report received comments from UNDP HQ and from UNDP CO staff resulting in some amendments of the template content.

**4.2 Evaluation coverage**

The evaluation involved the UNDP Head Quarter (HQ), UNDP Country Office staff in all six countries and their key partners. More specifically the evaluation involved all or some key stakeholders in all the six countries e.g. relevant central and local government ministries and institutions, CSOs, other types of organisations (e.g. saving bodies), institutions (e.g. research) and KOICA. The three type A countries mainly involved key stakeholders at devolved level, while the three type B projects mainly involved stakeholders at central/upstream level.

**4.3 Introduction of the tools**

With the view to have as comprehensive, relevant and correct data as possible, the consultant had a skype talk with the focal person in UNDP’s COs about the filling of the templates[[13]](#footnote-13) and the understanding of each item.

This was complemented by with a written guidance to each of the templates. A specifically comprehensive written explanation was prepared for the partner template.

When working directly with the partners there was direct email communication with these explaining the items/thematic areas guiding the evaluation and how to work across the template considering positive and negative experiences with the project processes, while also giving their view on changes which could be considered if replicating or extending the project.

**4.4 Semi-structured templates**

The semi-structured questions/items were presented in a template introducing the questions in writing. Some more detailed templates were meant for the CO, while a specific and less comprehensive template with some same questions were used for the partners.

Since the evaluation took place eight months after project expiry, a number of earlier involved UN staff, partner staff and governmental officers had left or had become involved in new projects.

At CO level the template was filled by relevant staff, which meant that those who had been involved in given activities during the project implementation (administration, gender etc.) or had a memory of project practices filled the relevant part of the template. Hence each CO office returned one set of templates although involving a number of staff – and sometimes former staff.

The partner level included KOICA, central and local government and implementing partners in terms of CSOs, institutions etc. In some cases, each category of partner filled one template the same way the COs did, while in other countries individual staff filled the templates.

Each respondent answered the items/questions they felt directly or indirectly familiar with, for which reason some items/questions were not answered, while unanticipated data were also provided. It was, however, intentional to present all questions to all involved parties, as it is not possible to foresee who will know what since stakeholders, who were not directly involved in a given part of the planning and implementation, may have experienced indirect benefits or challenges of interventions in other lines of thematic or administrative operations. All scorings are anonymous. Achievement scorings were summarised for each category of respondents allowing for quantification of qualitative data, while also providing a one-glance view of the overall findings, while process scorings were consolidated across type of stakeholders.

Each template was in most cases filled by several respondents from the same partners whether government, CSOs or others. One template has up to 10 respondents. Each of the offices mentioned in the list of participating offices (annex 3) received one template through email. This was shared with other colleagues as needs arose. Thus, the exact number of data contributors is not known. It was viewed to be of greater importance to get the widest possible range of details acknowledging they it was a desk evaluation.

**4.4.1 Follow-up contacts**

When receiving the filled templates some countries or partners were contacted through email to add some points or to explain why they had some omissions. This was only relevant in a few cases, as the answers were overall well understood when analysed in their individual contexts

**4.5 Results frameworks**

The desk work showed that the project and national log frames had few targets, and where there were targets, there was no systematic reporting against the targets. It proved that the national final reports had some quantitative details in the narrative, which were extracted and placed in country results framework. The amended template was sent to the CO for further amendments and/or approval. These data were consolidated into type A and B results frameworks.

**4.6 Constraints and limitations**

Being a global home-based evaluation, some risks and constraints were foreseen. They were generally overcome as indicated below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CONTRAINTS | MITIGATION |
| 1. Difference in time zones which could delay response from both sides
 | Consultant work hours spread over more hours to accommodate different office hours and COs were flexible |
| 1. Partners with no or limited proficiency in English resulting in a need for translation of template and response
 | Bolivia and Viet Nam COs translated when necessary |
| 1. Project closed end 2017 for which reason most HQ staff has left and CO staff may be busy with other projects
 | Most were tracked, and communication established either on skype and/or using the CO template. The total response was regarded as satisfactory. |
| 1. Different number and categories of respondents in the different countries was expected. Some countries could have chosen to involve many, as they know that will get a generally low response, while others involve only those they know will respond. The country approach and experiences varied without jeopardising the data relevance and quality, as the number and category of respondents provided a picture of the project outreach and stakeholder commitment in each country adding to the scope of data
 | The respondents were grouped as type A and B respondent with regard to achievements (annex), while all scorings were consolidated for the process scorings (annex 6).Level of response per office was over 100%, as some offices, e.g partner or local government offices involved a number of colleagues in providing their experiences/perceptions.This approach developed on participant request.Types and level of achievements varied. |
| 1. Developing a common understanding, footstep and commitment at a distance could require extra efforts
 | All COs were given a thorough introduction to the approach on skype allowing for questions and familiarization with each other facilitating later communication in case of uncertainties.The time allocated for data consolidation, analysis and reporting was expanded |

Table 2: Evaluation implementation mitigation measures

Especially point a, b and c were expected to delay the completion, which proved to be correct.

1. **DATA ANALYSIS AND PRODUCTS**

The data analysis consisted of three phases:

* Data cleaning
* Overall analysis and consolidation
* Data comparison (worked as data validation, too)
	1. **Data analysis**
		1. **Data cleaning**

The distance evaluation resulted in a slight deviance in entry of data into the provided templates. Further, some data did not belong where they were entered or were not clear in the given formulation. Hence most templates had some changes to have some comparability and to facilitate consolidation of data into one template.

* + 1. **Overall analysis and consolidation**

When having data cleared it was possible to make a more overall, preliminary data analysis of where there were repetitions, maybe formulated slightly differently, where there were single entries apparently of some significance etc. The data with some connotation were consolidated.

**5.1.3 Quality assurance**

The data validation had some limitations, since all was received via email. There was thus no opportunity to verify the data source and validity of the data. Therefore, the data from global and national annual reports were organised in results frameworks the content of which was compared with respectively CO and stakeholder scorings for validation. This enable a comparison of earlier validated data with new data. Since the three types of data had high level of consistency and coherence the validity of the evaluation data is regarded as high.

* + 1. **Data products**

The stakeholder scorings were consolidated into respectively total process scorings for respectively type A and B countries, and total achievements/results for respectively type A and B countries. They are found in annex 3 and 4. They scorings are systematically analysed in this report and held against respectively objectives, process scorings held against achievements and positive and negative scorings held against each other.

1. **FINDINGS**

Since each country had very different focus and approach it was not possible to consolidate scorings showing: How many countries achieved in a given project deliverable since types of deliverables were not consistent. Instead examples of achievements are given under each subject, while details for each country are found in the annexes.

To understand the focus of this evaluation this chapter starts with an introduction of the characteristics of the ISNC, more specifically the design and expected deliverables of respectively type A and B projects, which will put a perspective on the applied process and the achievements.

**6.1. Background**

**6.1.1 Type A countries**

UNDP is the acknowledged multilateral system entry point for innovative territorial partnerships, including decentralized cooperation and local level South-South and triangular cooperation modalities. Therefore, the ISNC project utilized UNDP’s ‘Strategy to Support Localization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),’which aims to improve the quality of life for local residents and building resilient state-society relationships at the local level. An important element of the project methodology is to help all local actors discover the benefits and modalities of effective and continuing co-operation, linking communities with other public and private actors in the local and subnational arena[[14]](#footnote-14).

In brief the key components were as follows:

* Community participation and ownership with emphasis on social inclusion of women, youth and disadvantaged groups (such as persons with disabilities;
* Co-financing principle for community projects: 20 percent of ISNC contribution would be matched with 30 percent government cost-sharing and 50 percent in-kind contributions of labour and services mobilized by the communities;
* Performance-based incentives may be introduced to stimulate the drive and agency of the pilot communities for demonstration effect.

**6.1.2 Type B countries**

The implementation focused on policy advices and contributed knowledge to the centres of excellence. UNDP tapped into national existing funds allocated for projects to create and redistribute productive resources to benefit micro and small enterprises to ensure the sustainability of the ISNC implementation along with existing enabling national polices. Additionally, UNDP utilized the ART Initiative (Articulation of Territorial Networks for Sustainable Human Development), stimulating dialogue between territories to face the global development challenges[[15]](#footnote-15).

It was acknowledged that the small-scale investment from the ISNC programme was not likely to add noticeably to the country. Hence it was viewed as a comparative advantage to build on existing programmes to develop policy advices, contribute knowledge to the model through centres of excellence, and promote South-South cooperation (SSC).

It was important to find policy entry points to inform change at the national level. This involved defining national policy priorities which were included in the agreements between UN and the given country. Tentatively, finding converging entry points would not only help in selecting critical sites, but could also create policy impact and ownership at the national level increasing the likelihood of sustainability in the long run.

**6.1.3 Characteristics of the process scorings of the two types of countries**

The figure below illustrates the scorings of respectively type A and B country experiences with the ISNC planning and implementation process[[16]](#footnote-16)

The blue colour shows the number of positive experiences with a given project implementation process, the orange shows the number of negative experiences while the grey indicates the number of proposed changes to the same process area. The latter indicates the satisfaction with applied processes.

Figure 2 – Consolidated process scorings

Firstly, type B countries gave far more scorings across all aspects of implementation than type A countries. It is also remarkable that type A countries have items with no negative scorings at all acknowledging that no project implementation is flawless. When scoring positively only, there were also fewer scorings on changes.

Secondly, capacity development, which is a precondition for sustainable establishment of SMU principles, score high in type B countries as they had both positive and negative scorings and suggestions for changes, while type A countries had fewer scorings.

Thirdly, cross-cutting issues score low and only positively in type A countries, while having a higher number of scorings in type B countries. Environment scores low in both types of countries.

Fourthly, and maybe most importantly, sustainability has fewer and overall positive scorings in type A countries, while the intervention has one of the numerically highest, but less positive scorings, in type B countries. Type B countries also have the majority of negative and change scorings. Since all details are given in the annex, there is opportunity for learning partly from the data analysis, but also directly from the annexed scorings[[17]](#footnote-17), which provide a wide range of details.

**6.1.4 National level framework**

In countries with decentralized systems of governance and advanced local development policies and institutions (e.g. Uganda and Rwanda), ISNC supported strengthening of existing institutions, mechanisms and practices so as to reinforce their linkage with the local level and enable them to provide better services to communities and respond to their development needs.

Local governments at lower levels are often weak at functional level and little engaged in local development process. Hence the bottom-up planning process aimed at reinforcing the district government commitment by building governmental capacity to mainstream local plans and connect them to resources. Additionally, capacities of local governments below district level were enforced in planning, financing, implementation and monitoring of inclusive and sustainable local development. Hence, in East Africa, this approach aimed at responding to the implementation of African Charter on the Values and Principles of Decentralisation, Local Governance and Local Development.

Additionally, finding a high-level political champion for the ISNC model can be critical for changing attitude of government agencies and communities and making development projects sustainable. Fostering an effective and committed high-level political champion may determine the long-term sustainability and national government ownership[[18]](#footnote-18).

**6.2 Relevance**

The questions from TOR form the headlines of each sub-section with a few amendments reflecting the findings.

**6.2.1 How relevant are the Saemaul Undong articulated theories of change to the expected outcomes and mandate of UNDP within the context of the ISNC?**

There was no declared Theory of Change for the ISNC project since the project aimed at testing the actual applicability of SMU principles rather than aiming at pre-defined changes. This chapter will therefore only asses the relevance of the expected outcomes and mandate of UNDP within the context of ISNC.

The objective was to:

Update, integrate and scale up elements of the Saemaul Undong (SMU) and its application into an exemplary systematic approach and effective platform for development cooperation and to create a critical mass of support to localizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

This should be achieved through three project outcomes:

1. Identify proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of SMU and other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South;
2. Achieve impact of the integrated local development approaches known as Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities at both the local and national policy levels through its application to an initial set of countries; and
3. Facilitate South-South and Triangular cooperation and knowledge exchange through support to centres of excellence to disseminate evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving impact at the regional and global levels.

Out of these outcomes the first related to the inception phase, 2014-2015, which is not part of this evaluation. Hence there remain two project outcomes of relevance for this evaluation

The Implementation Guidance, though, mentions the project intentions as:

Building on SMU application experiences along with other complementary development solutions, UNDP will help develop an integrated local development approach – inclusive and sustainable new communities – to apply to a select number of countries.

An ADB analysis excellently defines the SMU theory of change and the resulting achievements concluding that:

……this reliance on diligence, self-help and cooperation helped to prevent dependence on aid or government resources. Over time, SU projects became increasingly funded from community resources and financing instead of from the government budget[[19]](#footnote-19).

Comparing the aims and objectives of UNDP with the articulated SMU theory of change and achievements of the SMU movement the congruence with regard to focus and aim is obvious. However, fifty years ago the people who designed and implemented Saemaul Undong did not have a Theory of Change or a conceptual use of the vocabularies that are broadly used in development today. Although different interpretations existed regarding how to define the objectives of Saemaul Undong, most agreed that the aim was to generate economic, social and attitudinal improvements. The most broadly accepted objectives were (a) income generation, (b) living environment and basic rural infrastructure improvement, and (c) capacity-building and attitudinal change.

As villagers gained more confidence in their ability and the basic infrastructure necessary to improve agricultural productivity, Saemaul Undong shifted its focus, and income-generation projects were gradually initiated while the scope and size of each living condition improvement project increased. In the last phase, the focus was shifted towards capacity-building and attitudinal changes, while the scope of the projects became broader. Activities in urban areas, factories and corporations became more common, which changed Saemaul Undong into a national campaign[[20]](#footnote-20).

Since the timeframe in the ISNC project was significantly different from that used for the introduction of the SMU principles, partly due to resource allocation and partly due to the nature of the project, not all of the above-mentioned SMU stages were tested and localised.

Firstly, the timeframe of the ROK (Republic of Korea) implementation of SMU had no limit. The full development of the concept took 18 years, while the ISNC project tried to introduce and learn from the SMU rural initiative in a two-year project. A few ISNC countries score that the timeframe was “reasonable”, while other score it as “not ideal”. The latter better reflect the level of achievements with regard to regard to replication of all or some SMU principles in other projects, other countries or regions. The mentioned potential replications may be in Ecuador.

Secondly, ROK’s first step was to support community initiatives aiming at better living conditions, without a lot of predetermined systems and structures, as the intention was to establish good examples from learning and replication. The ISNC project, however, strongly introduced SMU-based systems and structures, built knowledge and capacity at all stakeholder levels and then asked for the communities to develop community project proposals. The initial SU intention of letting people experience how (supported) community initiatives can bring about better living conditions and then, subsequently, let them find out which systems and structures worked well, and which did not, all facilitated the community learning, conclusion and adoption of best approaches. This tactic had an implied learning based on repeated community reflection, analysis and conclusion. Hence the ROK communities made informed decisions– a precondition for sustainability. The timeframe for the ISNC did not allow for this lengthier process for community decisions on relevant community projects.

UNDP’s core mandate is:

To support developing countries in designing and implementing national policies for sustainable human development with a focus on poverty reduction and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Since the ISNC intention was to test SMU principles with the view to assess their relevance for localising the implementation of SDGs, the mandate of UNDP is thus very relevant within the context of the ISNC project.

**Conclusions:**

* There is clear link between the design/planning and the level of sustainability, e.g.:
* The initial SMU principles built on community learning from experience enabling an internalisation of changes, while the ISNC taught stakeholders SU principles and set application of these as a requirement for support thus skipping the internalisation. This may play a key role for sustainability, since what is not fully understood and owned by all levels of stakeholders may fall apart when the project is not there to remind the communities about why and how to apply SU principles.
* The project period was far too short for systemic changes, which need a horizon of 10-15 years to be fully absorbed by and/or integrated into existing national systems and thus effective and efficient. It is therefore not possible to conclude on how much time is required for full development, maturity and internalisation of the SMU principles.
* The project achieved impressive results at all levels in Myanmar, Viet Nam, Uganda and Bolivia, and good results in the remaining two countries, Lao and Rwanda. This indicates a high level of project relevance with regard to applied project processes and the general stakeholder attitude towards SMU principles.
* UNDP offered approaches (SCC, TcR, ART etc.) which tallied well with the SMU principles and processes.

**6.2.2 How relevant were the implementation mechanisms and processes for achieving the ISNC outcomes and institutional effectiveness results in each of the six countries?**

**How effective have the implementation mechanisms and corporate strategies been in supporting achievement of the ISNC outcomes and results?**

Since the two questions overlap, the analysis of both is merged in the following.

The implementation and mechanisms and processes can be divided into:

* Planning and design approach
* Implementation approach and processes
* Monitoring and reporting design and processes

This section provides country *examples* of experiences with the project planning and implementation and no full accounting of the experiences of each country, since experiences are multiple and often diverse. Hence the full account is found in templates in the annexes. The report writing was based on prior data analysis, which determined the focus and structure of the report enabling use of highlights of the relevance and effectiveness of project implementation processes.

**6.2.2.1 Planning and design[[21]](#footnote-21)**

Before the project period (2015-2017) UNDP Headquarter (HQ) had a one-year inception phase to have a robust background for selecting applicable SMU principles and to define criteria for selection of countries. Thus, the design was well considered.

Being a pilot project rather focusing of the relevance of principles than focusing on a specific end-result, the design and plans varied from those of development projects. However, it is only possible to test whether certain principles work, if also measuring results/desired changes for each of the principles. With a timeframe of two years the project could not be expected to have significant and widespread achievements at outcome and impact level. Without a clear line from principle, to approaches applied for each principle and clear definition of level and type of achievements, it is not possible to conclude, which of the principles would be replicable in given contexts.

The effectiveness of the intention to apply localised approaches for the SMU principles cannot be established, since there was no monitoring of which changes arose from each of the localised approaches.

With due respect for the importance of developing localised approaches, which presupposes country-level freedom to design own activities, the provision of full design freedom at national level resulted in loss of the opportunity to compare effectiveness of given principles and approaches in different cultural, development and political contexts, which is the overriding aspect of a testing of principles. There should have been a certain same framework for all countries with room for localisation.

As a consequence of the above, all reporting was very diverse and, because of the short timeframe, overall reporting on activities and to some extend on outputs. As mentioned, this limits the learning about effectiveness of the principles.

The intentions were, as well, to share this new knowledge about the SMU applicability partly through Centres of Excellence, partly regionally and globally through SSC and TrC.

The inception period provided details suggesting a linking of the project to national policies and strategies and to other relevant project/programme activities in the respective countries. This resulted in involvement of all or some key stakeholders in all the six countries e.g. relevant central and local government ministries and institutions, CSOs, other types of organisations and KOICA. The three type A countries mainly involved key stakeholders at devolved level, while the three type B projects mainly involved stakeholders at central level. In the five countries the selection of communities was guided by key stakeholders, while Uganda CO seems to have played a central role with regard to community selection.

The project focused on establishment of systems and structures connecting community initiatives with Local Government (LG) procedures and change of mind-set to be a contributor rather than beneficiary. The other focus on improved living conditions through upgrading of livelihood support facilities such as roads, market centres, health clinics etc. was well received at planning stage and hence incorporated into national plans, in some cases given national budget. Viet Nam established a block grant support, which was institutionalised into national poverty reduction policies and strategies.

Uganda noticed that the composition of national, district and sub-country implementation team was well thought, as it ensured involvement of all power centres facilitating transmission of the model to several sectors.

Myanmar chose to work with a conflict sensitive intervention mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development projects for active dissemination and discussion among national stakeholders. A quite different, but interesting use of the SMU principles, which yielded positive experiences and results, for example the first inter-ministerial meeting on conflict sensitive community development and livelihoods programming.

Some countries experienced that the budget was insufficient for the planned activities. The minimal need for funding went beyond the available amount, as the project also experienced (i) late reception of funds, (ii) project launching after budget planning in the respective countries delaying national contribution and (iii) unseasonal support of inputs such a seeds and fertilizer.

With regard to *logistics* the country experiences were many and diverse as the examples below show[[22]](#footnote-22):

On a positive note the scorings were:

* Bolivia noted that delegation of execution of funds, project design and procurement authority from UNDP HQ to the CO helped in moving the work and resources faster. Other countries noted positive experiences fully in line with this.
* Across the countries the strong involvement and use of local/national systems and structures (policies, programmes, strategies, and capacities) was highly appreciated and found effective.

On a negative note the experiences were the following:

* Project duration was noted as being (very) short in all countries either by COs or by partners. For some the haste with which the project was implemented was also caused by late start of the implementation due to late funding. Only one CO notes that time was adequate, but that the period was very busy. Despite this, all find that achievements were good not least taking conditions into account.
* UN procedures perceived as lengthy by all countries whether COs, partners or KOICA. Specifically, the procurement procedures were mentioned as they delayed the progress. It was suggested that UNDP HQ transfer a lump sum to the COs, e.g. quarterly, to have match project pace and mode of operations. In some recipient countries government procedures at all levels were lengthy, too, which added to the challenge faced by the short project duration.
* Frequent change of personnel across all stakeholders (COs and partners) necessitated repetition of i.e. training and information, which disrupted and implicitly delayed the work

**6.2.2.2 Implementation approach and processes[[23]](#footnote-23)**

With regard to *administrative processes* the scoring of Viet Nam covers the views of all countries by stating that: “Timelines, procedures and funds/budget versus project activities strictly followed the Harmonized Program and Project Management Guidelines (HPPMG), which was approved by the UN Resident Coordinator and the Government of Viet Nam and applied for all UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF projects in Viet Nam. UNDP HQ support and coordination of information exchange and learning among 6 countries play an important role in defining project interventions/ activities”. All countries had positive scores on administrative procedures.

Negative scores include: The discrepancy between UN requirements for stakeholder specificity against Bolivia specifications; misalliance between funds/budget versus planned and expected activities; the linkage to existing programmes made the ISNC be invisible or mistaken, as people took it for being one of the already implemented projects/programmes.

Myanmar indicates that there was need for more support from HQ.

The type of activity which most consistently frames the *implementation* *activities* seems to be “capacity building”[[24]](#footnote-24) which tallies with the project intention to generate and share knowledge. The capacity building was mainly implemented as knowledge building in terms of training and workshops, while OECD regards development of policies as capacity building, too. The capacity building methods were diverse and targeted a wide range of stakeholders. Examples below illustrate the diversity[[25]](#footnote-25):

Type A countries:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF CAPACITY BUILDING INITIATIVES** |
| Bolivia | * Conducted training of municipality officials in public management and knowledge management;
* Leadership School for women and youth in Sacaba municipality;
* Video showcasing SSC mechanisms and lessons learnt
 |
| Uganda | * Development of five policy briefs;
* Published a story book on ISNC experiences and Best Practices;
* Developed training curriculum and training materials on Community Savings and Credit
 |
| Lao | * Workshop on inclusive development, youth engagement, gender equality and women’s empowerment;
* Gender information rooms equipped with books and materials available to the public;
* Study tours with good knowledge application;
* Establishment of two Livelihood Support Centres which provides vocational training in weaving, dress-making, organic farming, cooking and food processing
* Establishment of two Livelihood Support Centres which provides vocational training in weaving, dress-making, organic farming, cooking and food processing.
 |

Table 3 – Examples of capacity building, type A countries

Type B countries:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF CAPACITY BUILDING INITIATIVES** |
| Myanmar | * Launch of report of Myanmar’s good practice and learning from mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development;
* Establishment of inter-ministerial study group on conflict sensitivity and the first indicator framework on conflict sensitivity in Myanmar. It served as a mechanism for information sharing and dialogue
 |
| Rwanda | * Comparative analysis report on Saemaul projects vis-a-vis Rwanda home-grown solutions highlighting the nine best practices.
* Online portal was developed, and stakeholders were trained on the use of online centre of excellence for knowledge sharing
 |
| Viet Nam | * Development of handbook on community leadership and facilitation skills got community leaders, village heads, farmer group leaders, civil social organizations/associations, etc.
* ISNC Festival piloted the first time at national level;
* Passing on one resolution and four Decisions in the Assembly;
* For the first-time gender mainstreaming became a cross-cutting issue in all national poverty reduction interventions
 |

Table 4 - Examples of capacity building, type B countries

The two types of capacity building clearly deliver to their respective target groups with type A countries building capacity of centres of powers to have ready linkages for involvement of and partial hand-over of powers to the communities, while type B countries extract knowledge from communities for central level use, whether resolutions, inclusion of gender in all national poverty reduction initiatives or comparative analysis illustrating best practices for national and international sharing.

The arrangement of the training faced some challenges. Some countries note[[26]](#footnote-26) that the literacy rate at community level was overall low making the use of handbooks be limited; trainers have no proper facilities, in which to train and others are not skilled trainers – all of which limits the effect of the massive training.

**Conclusions on plan and design:**

* The SMU principles proved to be relevant showing in the change of mind-set across all levels of stakeholders, while it may not have taken sufficient root to be sustainable[[27]](#footnote-27).
* The testing of SMU principles, which involve data collection on methodologies and approaches used for given activities never formed part of the log frames. The testing part seems to have disappeared amidst the many activities that were launched to test the actual relevance and applicability of the SMU principles. There is thus no substantial recording and reporting on the testing part of the project, which was otherwise the overall intention/objective of the project.
* The implementation mechanisms and processes were overall very relevant and appreciated in all countries. Only Myanmar did not feel fully comfortable about the execution of the processes and mechanisms, mainly with regard to planning and to HQ support.
* The focus on capacity building across all levels of stakeholders worked well noticing that it was knowledge that was provided and not skills, which may negatively affect the sustainability[[28]](#footnote-28). Transforming knowledge into skills/action is often the most difficult part in development across the globe.
* Capacity is not built in a workshop, which can only provide knowledge. Capacity includes provision of skills to implement the learning, which seems to have had less emphasis.
* The lengthy UNDP HQ procedures (e.g. for procurement) in combination with slow partner procedures did not tally well with the expected rapid implementation making the actual implementation period be even shorter. This was not taken sufficiently into account during the planning.
* The missed timing of project launching and subsequent untimely delivery of inputs (e.g. seeds) made the project lose a whole season and thus valuable implementation time and outcome level opportunities in terms of farmer income.

It should be noted that the design and implementation approach and processes determine efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The above will not be repeated in the sections analysing efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. But the above should be regarded as determining factors in tandem with those mentioned directly in the respective sections.

* + 1. **To what extent does the ISNC position UNDP respond to the 2030 Agenda and the new development landscape – especially within the context of localizing the Sustainable Development Goals?**

Apart from feeding into national policies, strategies and plans, the project was to operate the frame of the 2030 agenda and thus deliver to specific Sustainable Development Goals.

Only Viet Nam (CO) and Uganda (Local Government) account for which SDGs the project delivered to, while Lao accounts for the national policies to which the project delivered. Since all projects were designed to deliver to national policies, strategies and programmes they will implicitly have delivered to the SDGs as policies and intervention in all donor supported countries are to some extent aligned to the 2030 agenda.

All countries refer to which areas they wanted to focus on, e.g. hunger, but without mentioning which SDGs such focus will deliver to.

**Conclusions:**

* Narratives in global and national progress reports show that all countries deliver to one or more of the SDGs without accounting for which and how.
* Hence there were no recorded efforts of how each country localised the principles for SDG related achievements.

**6.2.4 To what extent and how were stakeholders involved at design level?**

A range of stakeholders from central to local government, trade associations, CSOs, community level leadership arrangements, research institutions, KOICA and others were involved from planning to implementation and monitoring. The respective partners participated in the levels of planning and implementation that were relevant for the role they played. This saw central government, CSO head offices, KOICA and research institutions participate at the more overall level of planning involving alignment with national policies and strategies and establishment of criteria for the implementation, while local governments, partner CSOs and communities participated in the detailed design of the implementation of the community prioritised activities.

The COs selected communities in collaboration with key ministries and partners. The main ownership in all countries was placed with a relevant central ministry while some local governmental structures had co-ownership at devolved levels.

COs facilitated the national planning involving central level partners, while the communities selected by the central partners were capacity build to plan and largely implement activities at community level.

**Conclusions:**

* All stakeholders were involved in project planning and design for their respective levels of implementation.
* As the extensive and varied capacity building activities show[[29]](#footnote-29) the project aimed at also building partner capacity with the view to prepare partners for a nationally relevant design of project approach and activities. The result of this shows in the diversity of project activities across all levels of stakeholders and across the six project countries.
* The noticeable immediate results achieved in the relatively short project period bear witness of the effectiveness of the trilateral (UNDP, Government and partner(s)) approach and the early partner involvement.
	1. **Effectiveness**

Establishment of effectiveness presupposes regular, results-based monitoring with recording of results at output, outcome and impact level. Effectiveness can only be assessed if having full record of global achievements in this case and also knowing the level of achievement.

Moreover, being a testing of the applicability of SMUs principles with regard to SDG relevant achievements, such reporting should have been an integral part of all global reporting. Since these reports were more narrative than results-based and had no account of the experienced applicability of the applied principles, the analysis of the effectiveness will rather assess the reported development achievements at national level and less the effectiveness of the learning.

Since the monitoring plays a role for the full evaluation of the ISNC project it was viewed as relevant to have a small assessment of the limitation of the monitoring, maybe mainly the reporting, which was used. It should be noted that there has been no opportunity to assess the monitoring tools and practices at national level for which reason the analysis mainly concerns design and reporting.

**6.3.1 Monitoring and reporting**

**6.3.1.1 Monitoring design**

Most monitoring designing begins with development of results or logical framework organising the logic of all monitoring including formulation of indicators, source of data and in which period given data can/shall be collected. Not all activities may run throughout a project period.

The logical framework shall as a minimum have a logical arrangement of activities, SMART[[30]](#footnote-30) indicators, suggestion of how/where to get the required data, information etc.

The ISNC global framework did not have such details. It is acknowledged that such detailed framework could not be developed until the countries had decided which SMU principles they wanted to apply for which SDG activities in conjunction with decisions on which approaches and activities that would be used for each of the chosen principles. There is no structured framework for this which may also be the reason why there is no uniform, national reporting feeding into an analytical global report focusing on the learning aspects. The project objective intentions were to:

…… update, integrate and scale up elements of the Saemaul Undong (SMU) and its application into an *exemplary systematic approach*…..

To be exemplary there need to be conclusions drawn on the contextual applicability. The global reports were the media for this.

**6.3.1.2 Organisation of the monitoring**

The monitoring was well organised and appreciated by all countries. There were clear lines for data handling, compilation and analysis – the latter at country board level. A couple of countries notice some challenges at field level where partners may have insufficient experience with handling, analysing and using the data.

At the HQ level, the SSC team in BPPS undertook all upstream monitoring and evaluation measures, which were in accordance with UNDP policies and procedures, to ensure the proper implementation of the ISNC global project. The team conducted the following:

* + - Annual Community of Practice (COP)/Workshop Meeting
		- Quarterly teleconferences
		- Annual Progress Reports
		- Annual Project Board Review
		- Project board meetings
		- Atlas financial reporting

The above was concluded in anAnnual Review Report prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Board and the Outcome Board. As minimum requirement, the Annual Review Report consisted of the Atlas standard format for the QPR covering the whole year with updated information for each above element of the QPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level.

The reporting was done against the annual work plan and marked with green, yellow and red depending on the level of achievement/delivery. Thereby the AWPs took over the role of the log frame, and the HQ and COs lost overview over total project achievements.

Based on the above reporting the COs conducted an Annual Project Review during the fourth quarter of the year or soon after, to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year. The review was driven by the Project Board and could involve other stakeholders as required. It focused on the extent to which progress was made towards outputs, and that these remained aligned to appropriate outcomes.

The monitoring was conducted by partners while data handling was done by CO and KOICA.

The consolidated data formed basis for the annual report and all was shared with the HQ.

**Conclusions:**

* The lack of results-based monitoring and reporting against objective resulted in lack of relevant information about the degree, type and level of learning and about the actual relevance of SMU principles for SDG achievements. If analysed well the many achievements could have provided evidence of the likely applicability of various principles and the approaches applied under each principle.
* The organisation and implementation of the monitoring was well structured. The lack of opportunity to report on outcome and impact may have resulted in loss of records of possible achievements at these levels.

**6.3.2 How effective[[31]](#footnote-31) has UNDP been in achieving the expected results of the ISNC?**

As indicated above most achievements were at output level while the project intended to achieve results at impact level despite having only two years of implementation as highlighted in the following:

1. Identify proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of SMU and other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South
2. Achievement of **policy impact** at both local and national levels through applying the systematic approach of ISNCs to three countries where earlier application of SU experiences has achieved initial results;
3. South-South and Triangular **knowledge exchange and cooperation** as well as global advocacy through support to already existing centres of excellence that share evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving **impact** at the regional and global levels.

The availed data did not deliver evidence of outcome and impact, but narratives of activities and outputs[[32]](#footnote-32).

There are achievements for all three results although result 1 mainly related to the inception period, 2014-2015. For all results the reporting is narrative and output related, while the COs and partners provided outcome data for this evaluation although without categorising the level of achievements. Examples of outcome achievements include: Establishment of saving schemes as a result of increased income, functionality of various types of production groups etc.

Deliverable to result 1 was mainly relevant for type A countries. Rwanda and Viet Nam did not report on achievements relating to Result 1.

*Examples* of achievement under **Result 1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS** |
| Bolivia | * Establishment of leadership school for youth and women
 |
| Uganda | * Use of Parish Development Committees (PDCs) as Planning Structures at the grassroots
* Affirmative Action on ensuring representation of Women, Youth, Elderly and PWDs at relevant decision-making platforms in the community
* Community Champions became the drivers of the desired change
* Increased volunteerism amongst the communities to participate in communal activities
* Formed Cooperatives of Farmers in Maize, Banana, Rice
 |
| Lao | * Establishment of two Livelihood Support Centres
* Involvement of communities in road maintenance
* Establishment of Gender Information Rooms
 |
| Myanmar | * Experience with mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development
 |

Table 5 – Examples of achievements, Result 1

*Examples* of achievement under **Result 2:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS** |
| Rwanda | * A national forum on ISNC was established for policy dialogue
 |
| Viet Nam | * ISNC spirits and approach have been institutionalized into official program document of NTP-SPR (2016-2020) and poverty reduction related policies
* Passing of 1 Resolution and 4 Decisions
* For the first time 3-5-year budget for poverty reduction
* For the first-time gender became cross-cutting issue in all poverty reduction
* ISNC institutionalised in the National Targeted Programs resulting in budget and a range of changes in government approach
 |

Table 6 - Examples of achievements, Result 2

Inputs to this result should mainly be expected from type B countries. Myanmar did not report on any achievements under this result.

*Examples* of achievement under **Result 3:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF ACHIEVEMENTS** |
| Bolivia | * Produced video showcasing SU/ISNC and SSC. The Government of Ecuador shows interest in rolling out the SU/ISNC model
 |
| Uganda | * Partnership with Uganda National SMU Centre and National Farmers Leadership Center (NFLC).

Because of limited planning for dissemination of knowledge, best practices and experiences of the ISNC and because some of the key project interventions were commenced in the final quartile of the project lifetime the knowledge sharing was incomplete. Further, not all the stakeholders had access to the Best Practices and Experiences of the ISNC |
| Myanmar | * Because of the research and training, DRD proposed the World Bank to provide conflict sensitivity training to their staff of National Community Driven Development project (NCDD). International Alert is now providing conflict sensitive facilitation training to CDD staff of DRD with the financial support of the World Bank since May 2018 until now.
* The Netherland embassy and many INGOs invited Alert to share our research findings especially at their organization strategic planning workshop and partners meetings.
* Alert also conduct conflict sensitivity workshop with local partners of the Netherland embassy and provide technical support to integrate conflict sensitivity in the strategy of Netherland embassy
 |
| Rwanda | * The communication about the Centre of Excellence did not have the biggest outreach during the project.
* Organization of regional conference on Lessons Learned sharing best practices on rural and community development in Africa
 |
| Viet Nam | * ISNC has been institutionalized in the two **National Targeted Programmes on Sustainable Poverty Reduction (NTP-SPR) and New Rural Development (NTP-NRD)** for the period 2016-2020 (particularly on production support and capacity building), **circulars, the M&E framework and handbooks** for NRP-SPR implementation
 |

Table 7 – Examples of achievements, Result 3

The achievements listed above illustrates very well how each of the involved countries selected own areas of interventions and implementation/testing, localising and sharing information about SMU principles

**Conclusion:**

* The substantial achievements in all countries for at least two of the result areas is remarkable not least when working with the relatively short time frame. Even more so taking into account the attitude changes and commitment that was a precondition for achievements across all levels of stakeholders.
* The acceptance of the SMU principles, of national engagement and linkage with national policies and strategies shows in the diversity in types of activities across all levels of implementation.
	+ 1. **To what extent can UNDP be expected to contribute to development impacts at the country level through the achievement of the ISNC outcomes?**

Chapter 6.3.2 provides good evidence that UNDP stands a very good chance of moving the level of achievements from output to outcome and impact level in all of the six involved countries should the project have a phase II.

The involved governments have all engaged in different ways both at central and local level and have accepted changes in hitherto procedures and practices. Hence there is a foundation for continued introduction of SMU principles at national level. It should be noted that the life quality aspect, which is the aim of the SMU principles, is not achieved, which could make devolved level participants be hesitant and activities at this level fall apart. There is urgent need to demonstrate the value of the principles. The involved governments may need technical and financial support for some years to generate stable systems that can ensure the desired sustainability.

Design of a possible new phase need to focus on how to take the countries from output to outcome and impact level of achievements and how to make these achievements be sustainable. The design also has to take the negative CO and partner experiences into account. These include[[33]](#footnote-33), but are not limited to:

* Challenges were either not adequately defined or not taking into account in design of the project, which negatively affected effectiveness and efficiency[[34]](#footnote-34). This concerned e.g. low literacy and language skills in Lao;
* Inadequate teaching conditions for leader trainers in Bolivia;
* In Myanmar the HQ feasibility mission was undertaken without adequate consultation with the CO. In addition, KOICA was involved, but still with the view to have the SU principles applied as they were earlier applied;
* Too short timeframe and inadequate funding in Rwanda. The implementation arrangement of the project was not well set as seeking approval for some activity in both UNDP and FONERWA caused impeding delays in implementation;
* Limited planning for dissemination of knowledge, best practices and experiences of the ISNC and lack of exit strategy was among the negative issues noted in Uganda;
* Several countries noted the necessity of best timing of project launching as a factor of importance to avoid that agro-based activities are scheduled for the period of dry spell, or launching at peak time of General elections etc.

Viet Nam did not record any negative experiences.

**Conclusions:**

* The relevance and effectiveness of use of localised SMU principles are illustrated in the previous section. The limited timeframe made it impossible to take the achievements to the more sustainable levels.
* The evaluated project design was based more on performance in terms of establishing and testing SMU systems and structures and less on focusing on the effect of the established systems, for example how these improved life qualities in the respective groups of beneficiaries. However, there is obviously a robust foundation for relatively swift achievement at outcome and impact level if extending the project making the next design focus of learning about SMU applicability. This would be of global relevance.

**6.4 Efficiency**

Efficiency in the DAC development context should be understood as “Value for money” – or did the project achieve the planned results within the provided resources. In this SMU piloting and testing context the principles were tested, but not concluded on and made exemplary. As concluded earlier the project delivered impressively to result 1 and 2, while achievements for result 3 were predominantly at activity level. Since result 3 concerns sharing of knowledge at national, regional and global level, there need to be something tangible to share. Since most achievements were at activity and output level there was little tangible to share in terms of proven effective approaches generating sustainably improved life quality. Hence the project did not deliver the expected value.

The efficiency analysis on expenditures against budget and national outputs/achievements against financial input was not possible. The efficiency analysis below is therefore solely based on availed documentation.

* + 1. **To what extent did the linkage with existing national policies, plans and programmes contribute towards efficiency in delivery?**

All countries report on linkage with national policies, plan and programmes. This had very positive consequences:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF LINKAGES AND EFFECT**  |
| Bolivia | The linkage to the national Development Plan of Bolivia facilitated the execution of the project in terms of budget increase of 50% for municipality goals |
| Uganda | The project was linked to Uganda’s Decentralisation policy resulting in local authorities were in charge of and overseeing the implementation. This resulted in capable ownership |
| Lao | Project linked to: 7th National Socio-Economic Development Plan, the National Nutrition Policy (2008) and the National Nutrition Strategy and Plan of Action (2010-2015). In particular, the Multi-sectoral (Convergence) Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) Action Plan. This raised awareness resulting in policy planning including Sam Sang, the NSEDP both 7th and 8th, Food and Nutrition Security Convergence Action, and the new SU implementation by KOICA |
| Myanmar | Linked to Ministry of Border Affairs with the aim to develop an Action Plan |
| Rwanda | Has no reporting on the linkage |
| Viet Nam | The project contributed to: **One Plan 2012-2016:***Focus Area 1:* Inclusive, Equitable and Sustainable Growth. *Outcome 1.1:* By 2016, key national institutions formulate and monitor people-centered, green and evidence-based socio-economic development policies to ensure quality of growth as a Middle-Income Country*Output 1.1.3:* Multi-dimensional approaches and human development are applied in poverty reduction components of SEDPs at central and local levels in order to effectively address chronic poverty and emerging forms of povertyWith high relevance to the **country’s need and 2030 Agenda**, this project was well received by all stakeholders at all level and could mobilize resources from different relevant government programs/projects. |

Table 8 – Examples of effect of linkages with national policies

All countries apart from Rwanda report on linkages and how these had a positive effect on the project efficiency as the project was generally implemented with few national delays and some governments allocated funds for the project or support activities and/or incorporated ISNC/SMU principles into existing policies and programmes.

**Conclusions:**

* In terms of value-for-money the project managed to deliver substantially at output level to result 1 and 2 in all countries. Full delivery to result 3 was challenged by the timeframe.
* The project strategy to build on national policies, strategies and programmes in combination with a trilateral approach made it possible to see a high level of very diverse achievements as illustrated in chapter 6.3.2[[35]](#footnote-35) proved to be beneficiary for the project efficiency.

**6.4.2 To what extent have UNDP and KOICA resources been used efficiently in contributing to the outcomes and results outlined in the ISNC project document?**

At the time of planning the direct funding in US Dollars was as indicated below. The two major donors were:

The Republic of Korea with USD $5,066,361.00

UNDP with USD $63,577.00

All countries spent all of their resources. Uganda and Rwanda requested non-cost extensions in 2018 in order to deliver on several activities. This was communicated to the donor and approved, and funds were spent during the first quarter in 2018. Additionally, some resources were put aside for 2018 at HQ to conduct the evaluation and the hiring of consultant to ensure the final execution of some activities of the project as both staff members managing the project at HQ have left to other jobs.

When looking at the efficiency of the approach, Uganda concludes that “the model is a low-cost model using an approach expecting the communities to contribute 50%. Some countries were surprised to see that this was possible, maybe because considerable efforts were made explaining this approach to the communities at the very start”. Uganda experienced that farmers in some communities surpassed the 50% contribution and some were ready for full own funding at project expiry.

Bolivia and Uganda note untimely roll-out of the project as neither national budgeting period, nor agricultural production seasons were adhered to. In Bolivia seeds were therefore delivered out of season. In Uganda the roll-out came during an election campaign. Obviously, such incongruity in timing of activities could have had cost efficiency implications the size of which cannot be established. In the evaluation scorings Bolivia and Rwanda notes that the funds were insufficient to support the activities proposed by communities and associations[[36]](#footnote-36).

With regard to achievements among type A countries[[37]](#footnote-37), the three across the entire spectre of activities from planning, to introduction, implementation and establishment if systems and structures supporting the SMU principles and further to knowledge products in terms of e.g. published story book about best ISNC practices, video on the same case studies on gender mainstreaming. Systems and structures supporting sustainability include e.g. saving and credit associations (Uganda), establishment of milling facilities and similar (Uganda), Livelihood support centres and Gender Information Rooms (Lao) and Leadership School for women and Youth in Bolivia. The intention was to use The SSMart for the SDGs through SSC. The SSMart had a window dedicated to community led development efforts, which was supported by the project as a way to facilitate market creation through SSC. A wider market access or development was not reported on.

Type B countries[[38]](#footnote-38) recorded very different types and levels of achievements, which reflect the different readiness and focus of the three countries. The difference shows in Myanmar’s decision to develop a conflict sensitive community development model using SU principles, Rwanda with lesser performance maybe due to change of project manager, and Viet Nam which has delivered outstandingly to a wide range and number of project elements with focus on policy advice and contribution of knowledge. Further, Viet Nam and Lao has listed the MDGs/SDGs to which the project delivered.

For replication purposes it may be worthwhile conducting an in-depth analysis of the relation between scale of input and scale of achievements while defining the operational context of each of the six countries. There seems to be an opportunity for valuable learning, which can increase efficiency in future SU-based projects.

**Conclusions:**

* The project fully utilised the funding.
* The project delivered remarkably well to result 1 and 2 taking the experimental approach and the timeframe into account.
* Based on project expenditure information available[[39]](#footnote-39) all indications are that funds were expended on activities relevant to the project.

**6.4.3 How efficient was the coordination and collaboration, specifically management arrangements at the global, regional and country levels, in supporting the implementation and results achievements of the ISNC?**

The coordination was three-pronged including UNDP HQ to CO coordination, regional/SSC coordination and national coordination linking producers with the policy level. Concerning *coordination of project implementation* from UNDP HQ to COs there is little reporting. A few examples of CO experiences with HQ coordination is given in chapter 6.2.2. All countries had positive scores on the management procedures between national and UNDP HQ level finding the systems and structures straight forward and easy to use.

The project was managed by the Development Impact Group in the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS) under the SSC team. Under the leadership of Director of the

An organogram illustrates the mode of UNDP project organisation and implicitly coordination:

**TEAM C (Output 3)**

SSC team in collaboration with global policy centres incl. Seoul Policy Centre and partner institutions

**TEAM B (Output 2)**

UNDP Inter-bureau task force with Relevant COs, RBx and RSCs

**TEAM A (Output 1)**

UNDP expert Panel including representatives from BDP, RBX and Seoul Policy Centre

**Project Support**

UNDP expert panel

**Project Manager**

BDP Poverty Practice Manager and SSC Lead Advisor

**Project Assurance**

Programme Support Unit

**Senior Supplier**

Representatives of relevant Development Solutions Team, South- South Cooperation Team, global policy centres and RSCs, and ROK MOFA

**Executive**

Director of Bureau for Development Policy

**Senior Beneficiary**

RC/RRs of participating COs; representatives of partner countries and relevant RBx

**ISNC Board**

**(Country 3) Project Team**

CO Project team in collaboration with ROK and regional partners

**(Country 2) Project Team**

CO Project team in collaboration with ROK and regional partners

**(Country 1) Project Team**

CO Project team in collaboration with ROK and regional partners

Figure 3 – Organisation and coordination of the work

*At the global level* the project was managed by the Development Impact Group in the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS) under the SSC team. Under the leadership of Director of the Development Impact Group, the project was managed by the South-South Cooperation Lead Advisor and the South-South Cooperation Policy Analyst. The project implementation at the Global level was guided by an inter-bureau task force composed of experts and managers from the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, relevant UNDP bureaus (Regional Bureau for Asia-Pacific, Regional Bureau for Africa and Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean) and the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre.

The overall role of the HQ was to have a coordinating and overseeing function.

The *regional coordination* involved knowledge facilitation support. The whole scope of advisory services and main workshops provided within the project, particularly related to knowledge management and advisory services on local development, were provided with the technical support of the Regional Service Center advisors. Despite this the regional offices are quite invisible in the reporting. A range of SCC and TrC activities was launched such as the SSMart, which was launched by UNDP’s Associate Administrator in November 2016 during the Global South-South Development Expo in Dubai, the centre of excellence and its features was formally presented through the World Forum of Local Economic Development (17th – 20th October 2017), development of knowledge products etc.[[40]](#footnote-40) Irrespective of these multiple and diverse activities there was no consolidated overview over (i) which SSC and triangular activities took place, (ii) where and with which purpose/content they took place, and further (iii) with which achievements. This could have guided the global reporting on achievements and implicitly this evaluation. The regional UNDP office for Asia and the Pacific supported Myanmar on implementation issues, while there is no direct reporting of coordination of ISNC Asia activities.

*Nationally the coordination* was three-pronged consisting of (i) coordination of project functions, (ii) linking national-local efforts and (iii) coordination of the sharing of knowledge sharing.

The project coordination was spearheaded by ISNC project boards headed by UNDP CO. The board comprised key partners inclusive of KOICA.

Coordination at national level scores thinly[[41]](#footnote-41). The efficient coordination is mainly seen in the scale of achievements which, in all countries, required substantial coordination. Examples of direct coordination are few, while the establishment of systems and structures linked to the intended national-local linkage for type A project (understood as utilising existing policies and strategies to have better livelihoods at community level), and the local-national linkage for type B projects (understood as learning from best practices to enhance national policies and strategies) are plenty.

Type A countries positive scores include:

**Bolivia:**

* Collaboration between productive associations and municipal technicians to join hands and brains without overlaps and gaps;
* Expertise of a range of partners[[42]](#footnote-42) within agriculture, livestock, forestry, youth and local governments was provided to the communities as a complementary package of support; and
* Joint field visits between UNDP and municipalities facilitating coordination, monitoring and timely corrective actions.

Uganda and Lao did not report on coordination, but the earlier mentioned Ugandan achievements with regard to level farmer self-reliance indicates that the coordination was efficient.

Type B countries:

None of the type B countries mentioned coordination efforts or provided examples of achievements presupposing efficient coordination.

**Conclusion:**

* The coordination at HQ level was well received, while the coordination at regional level is little documented. The documentation is also weak at national level where achievements implicitly verifies that coordination existed. The efficiency therefore can only be stablished by the virtue of the many output level achievements which require effective and efficient coordination to be rolled out and manged within the budget.

**6.5 Cross-cutting issues**

All projects had gender and environmental components, which is a precondition for funding. There was, however, no reporting availed describing how gender and environment was mainstreamed, which focus areas were chosen and why, while evaluation data[[43]](#footnote-43) .

**6.5.1 Gender Mainstreaming**

On gender mainstreaming UNDP’s Implementation Guidance explains the necessity of gender mainstreaming interventions as follows:

No new global agenda can be achieved if it is not adopted at all levels of society. One of the key lessons we learned from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) is the importance of national and local actions for high-level impacts. By localizing the SDGs, we aim to reach women and youth as well as the poorest and most marginalized people. These groups often face additional burdens of discrimination – based on age, gender, ethnicity, indigenous status, disability, place of residence, HIV status or other factors. They typically have the least resources and remain the farthest behind. If development is not carried out locally, it will never benefit everyone.

Therefore, a local approach in pursuit of the proposed SDGs, involving communities in the transformation they want while empowering them to become transformative will universalize the development agenda as it localizes its implementation[[44]](#footnote-44).

A review of country documents and evaluation scorings show that there was no systematic gender mainstreaming as defined by UNDP, but rather measures to have equality. Here, as in many other projects/programmes, gender seems to be understood as the equal right of both male and females to participate in same initiatives. However, gender mainstreaming is wider and is defined as follows:

“The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels**. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension** of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetrated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.”

Gender equality refers to the **equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities** of women and men and girls and boys[[45]](#footnote-45).

The parts in bold are essential as they acknowledge the differences in male/female concerns, needs and capacities. Much project design assumes that male and female interests are the same and should be equally shared, while the intention is to systematically create relevant opportunities for both.

The analysis of project content shows the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **EXAMPLES OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING MEASURES** |
| Bolivia | * Bolivian state gender policies taken into account in project design.
* The contracts of all associations required incorporation of and reporting on gender measures
* 40% of participants were women.

This resulted in association statutes and regulations were redrafted and that many associations had women leadership |
| Uganda | * All decision-making bodies at parish level should have representation of vulnerable people.
* Reporting formats had gender disaggregated data
 |
| Lao | * Women in Development (WID) and Gender and Development (GAD) approach were used throughout the project timeline.
* Capacity building of local gender sensitive planning
 |
| Myanmar | * Gender interface conflict included in training and research

This resulted in awareness about gender conflict interface among participating government institutions |
| Rwanda | * Gender was mainstreamed into design, monitoring and reporting (no details)
 |
| Viet Nam | * Ensuring gender representation in design, implementation, management and monitoring of poverty reduction projects.
* Mainstreaming of gender into policies, programmes projects

This resulted in design of monitoring to capture gender specific interests and achievements and equal accessibility for women to services |

Table 9 – Examples of gender mainstreaming measures

All countries applied gender measures, mainly focusing on gender equality in all activities and reporting with disaggregated data. As mentioned above, this does not suffice, but is a very good start of having future systematised gender considerations and recording incorporated from project on-set.

**Conclusion:**

* The ISNC applied a gender equality approach apparently without applying a gender mainstreaming approach in the planning, which would have meant that there would also have been reflection over male needs and interests during the planning – not least for male youth. Hence the project lost an opportunity to design and test localised gender mainstreamed activities and learn from this for SSC and global sharing. Gender equality achievements are many, while activities focusing on sex-based needs were not reported.

**6.5.2 Environmental measures**

The environmental sustainability had two dimensions addressing respectively productive and residential areas. UNDP’s intentions were:

…to also reflect the integration of the three pillars of sustainable development – economic growth, social development and environmental sustainability. The ISNC model aims to promote sustainable productions that involve the community in economic activities that are environmental friendly and deliver social benefits[[46]](#footnote-46).

Examples of how to practice the intentions are few in the Implementation Guidance and do rather refer to principles than to applicable practices. Looking at the text the environmental sustainability must relate to environmentally friendly agricultural production methods and establishment of healthy residential environments with water and sanitation, solid waste management etc.

At national levels the countries achieved the following:

**Bolivia:**

* The two selected communities both had mitigation and management plan for solid and liquid waste management implemented in accordance with State laws.

**Viet Nam:**

* A risk log identified at the project formulation stage was reviewed and updated quarterly to minimize, mitigate and manage potential risks.
* Extensive dialogues across ministries.
* Evidence-based review and monitoring of new modalities.

**Lao:**

* Risks were mitigated by promoting sustainable productions and economic activities that are environmentally friendly and deliver social benefits.
* The project promoted renewable energy sources, the usage of environmentally friendly technologies, and interventions that are environmentally friendly, based on effective and prudent management of local natural resources that aim to contribute to the improvement of the local environment.
* The project also organized an organic farming course.

The three other countries did not report on environmental measures. For the two countries addressing environmental issues the environmental impact (positive and negative) of the changed and/or improved agricultural productions and of waste management is not documented.

**Conclusion:**

* It was confirmed by UNDP HQ that all countries included environmental mitigation in the project design. It is interesting that mitigation measures were then not rigorously reported on in annual reports. Some useful learning may have been lost.
	1. **Sustainability**

The likely sustainability depends entirely on the quality and applicability of achievements. This was analysed in earlier sections.

**6.6.1 Are the results of the ISNC programme in the individual countries likely to be sustained?**

With the earlier described range of achievements, national anchoring and stakeholder commitments it would be easy to conclude that the project would be nationally sustainable. It should be noted, though, that the achievements are hardly internalised due to the often-late roll-out and short time of implementation. The stakeholders in all countries gave their judgement on the likely sustainability. It shows below[[47]](#footnote-47):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY** | **LIKELY SUSTAINABILITY** | **CHALLENGES** |
| Bolivia | * The national exit strategy aimed at creating market opportunities for sustainable continuation
* Public entities and CSO were involved all of who have the knowledge and financial capacity to complement the ISNC work
 | * Heavy staff rotation among implementers
* Low adaptation of SU/ART methodology by municipal technicians and production associates
 |
| Uganda | * Working through the Lower Local Governments, Parish Development Committees (PDCs), and Community Groups, which creates ownership of projects at Lower Local Government level and community level
 | * Without an exit strategy some interventions were started in the last quarter of project period leaving tiny chance of sustainability
* Not all the stakeholders have access to the Best Practices and Experiences of the ISNC
* Stop of funding without measures enabling a take-over of communities and governments made the likely sustainability be fragile
 |
| Lao | * Project created local development machinery, for example, Community Livestock Bank, which is growing its financial capital for livestock activities.
* Created village saving groups which will be a long run financial sources and improve the saving attitude of the villagers.
* Developed the network and linkage with GIZ vocational training program.
 | - |
| Myanmar | * The creation of an inter-ministerial study group on conflict sensitivity could sustain the initiative
 | * As always, it is difficult to sustain interest, and events in Rakhine occupied the attention of several ‘mulipliers’ that had been engaged.
 |
| Rwanda | * Available repository of best practices, toolkits, and lesson learned from projects implemented by NGOs, Government Institutions and Private sector
 | * Overall project time was spent for activity planning and consultation. More time should have been allocated to the implementation and strengthening the system and network established by the project.
* Exit strategy was not well strategically planned in terms of resources required to support the online center of excellence
* Support to operationalize the online center of excellence did not go well. The online center of excellence was launched during the end of the project, which created a gap.
* Few stakeholders continued to upload knowledge products in online center of excellence
* Lack of dedicated staff to support operationalization of the online center of excellence.
* More time should have been allocated to the implementation and strengthening the system and network established by the project
 |
| Viet Nam | * ISNC spirits and approach have been institutionalized into official program document of NTP-SPR (2016-2020) and poverty reduction related policies
* Establishment of an M&E framework for progress report and evaluation of ISNC's achievementsThis is developed on integration with the M&E framework of PRPP Project
* A network linking poor people with local associations, scientists, market experts

This network works effectively, helps establish new production groups for poor people, promote start-ups and business development | * In some localities, this network is not strong enough, partly due to inadequate support of local authorities
 |

Table 10 – Examples of likely sustainability

The trilateral and early involvement approach had the potential to generate a high level of sustainability, if the new capacity and subsequent attitude change had had the necessary time to take full shape and root.

The envisaged changes at national level were immense at output but were to a large extent not achieved at outcome and impact level. As mentioned by Rwanda most time was spent on implementation (input/output) and less on establishing systems and structures supporting a continuation. Left as they are most activities seem not to be sustainable with only Viet Nam having institutionalised the approach into various policies and programmes. The likelihood of sustainability in Viet Nam is significantly higher than in the other countries.

The environmental implications of the new productions are not known. Neither is the potential benefits from environmentally sound practices and localisation of the same.

**Conclusions:**

* When analysing the scale of sustainability of achievements, the project efficiency is substantially less than when measuring efficiency as (output level) achievements against budget. This tallies well with stakeholder observations that time was too short and that the full focus on implementation/achievements may not be ideal.
* Analysis of the sustainability of the use of SMU principles was not monitored and reported on. The many achievements indicate that, if given the required time, the use of localised SMU principles would facilitate a sustainable move towards the SDGs.
* The gender and environmental sustainability was not recorded wherefore valuable learning about and sharing of best practices may have been lost.
1. **Overall conclusions and lessons learned**

This section extracts lessons learned from all observations and conclusions made in section 6. This section makes more overall conclusions partly on the processes and partly conclusions on the project achievements. All lessons learned are related to specific observations and conclusions.

**7.1 Cross-cutting conclusion and lessons learned**

This conclusions cuts across all other conclusions made and consider the multiple and varied achievements found in annex 7.

**Conclusion:**

* The project aimed at “demonstrating how various development cooperation modalities, Official Development Assistance (ODA), domestic resource mobilization, South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC and TrC) could complement effectively within one development initiative and support the implementation of the 2030 development agenda”. The applicability of the approach was demonstrated, while the ability to generate outcome and impact was no substantiated.
* That the timeframe did not allow for many outcome level achievements and none at impact level, which will negatively affect sustainability.

**Lessons learned:**

* That despite a narrow timeframe and experimental approach, it is possible to have substantial achievements at output level across all levels of stakeholders as a first step towards achievements within the SDGs.

**7.2 Process analysis**

The process analysis will concern highlights from the following processes:

* Planning
* Design
* Implementation
* Monitoring

Below conclusions and derivative lessons learned for each of the process stages.

**7.2.1 Conclusions on the planning process**

For the setting of the national framework the COs worked quite similarly in all six countries involving relevant government levels and ministries, other partners (research institutions, CSOs, and others) and KOICA. They selected the participating communities. All countries worked with improved living conditions (infrastructure, services) and improved agro-based income generating activities. The detailed planning at community level was carried out by local level partners: Devolved level ministries, local authorities, partners at local level or local level partners and community structures.

They developed the details of infrastructure and livelihood projects applying SMU principles.

The planning was not timed with the national planning making some countries lose up to a year before some governments could prove their commitment and contribute financially to the planned activities. Further, provision of farm in-puts was not seasonal, which made farmer lose a season of production and income.

**Conclusion:**

* The two-stage planning was very relevant and effective despite being highly participatory. The full involvement resulted in unusually high level of engagement from central governments and other involved institutions.

Such early and full involvement forms a robust base for sustainability.

* The initial planning was evidence-based building on data from an inception year. The continuation of this is not clear in the annual planning as it is not possible to follow the level of achievements per activity from input to output, outcome and impact.

**Lessons learned:**

* The full involvement and systematic approach to the planning following ISNC version of SMU principles created a common footstep and a spirit of achievement.
* Planning without visible systematism made it difficult to follow the stage of achievements of each intervention. If not before then at the time of evaluation.
* Good ideas may be challenged when the planning focuses mainly on activities and deliverables and less on timing of activities, definition of level of achievements etc.

**7.2.2 Conclusions on the design**

As mentioned earlier[[48]](#footnote-48) the design had some very innovative and effective approaches which, jointly with the vast composition of activities and involvement a wide and diverse range of actors and immense efforts in capacity building, made this project reach far given the short project period. Since the entire content built on SMU principles, it is relevant to assess to what extent and how these were used.

In brief ROK made use of five SMU stages of development spreading over a period of 28 years to achieve results building on adequate and localised systems and structures.

The ISNC project condensed all elements of the two first SMU stages, which lasted six years during the ROK introduction, into a two-year project period, while also adding elements from later SMU stages to the project such as poverty eradication, credit facilities etc. It is acknowledged that the participating countries had some SMU experiences in advance and/or were otherwise ready for this very different approach, which may be the background for accepting a speedy process.

**Conclusions:**

* The use of SMU principles for development seems to work even within the short timeframe.
* The involvement of cross-cutting issues worked quite well with regard to gender equality, and introduction of environmental measures. None of cross-cutting issues were rigorously reported on.
* The gap between the ROK and UNDP approach was considerable been with regard to approach, order of activities and timeframe making sustainability be frail.
* The current negative stakeholder reaction (disappointment, loss of hope, loss of engagement etc.) arises from their intensive engagement followed by a disruption of activities rather than a phasing out although the time for expiry was known. The project expiry came exactly when things started taking shape and the relevance and applicability of the SMU principles could have been concluded on.

**Lessons learned:**

* The headline for this could be “Less is more”. This should be understood as: Rather aim at sustainability of fewer interventions than planning – and making people hope for or believe in - comprehensive changes within the given timeframe.

The ROK approach confirms that fewer, but sustainable, changes were what generated the building blocks for gradual and sustainable development over time.

* All countries mention lack of exit strategy, which is a required component in all project designs. The consequences of not having one was recorded by some countries at the time of the evaluation as countries experienced that the established services were stalling, knowledge sharing ceasing to work and popular engagements getting lost.

**7.2.3 Conclusion on the Implementation**

The implementation set-up was generally highly appreciated by all countries and all parties. All found them clear and simple to work with. The only repeated negative experience was the delays in execution of some of the procedures and/or design of the same.

The order and choice of SU activities varied from that of ROK, who focused on a wide range of village development for an entry. Village developments are likely to have influenced the popular attitude. When the village development had picked ROK supported agro-based activities and in phase 2 also non agro-based activities. ISNC did it all within the two-year timeframe.

**Conclusion:**

* The efforts invested in building the administrative capacity of partners proved beneficiary in terms of both timeliness and correctness in administration and implementation.
* The recorded low sustainability in type B countries may relate to the compactness of downstream activities, the hasty introduction of a range of activities while simultaneously intending to extract learning from activities, which had not yet generated documentable results.

**Lessons learned:**

* The above-mentioned spirit from the planning stage in combination with clear administrative procedures enabled the high implementation performance.
* That beneficiaries can end up being frustrated when seeing opportunities slip their hands.

**7.2.4 Conclusions on monitoring and reporting**

Monitoring design was guided from the CO and either designed by the CO or the implementing partner. The partners and/or CO staff conducted the monitoring, while no community level bodies were involved in the monitoring. The reporting was done by the CO and report content approved by the Board. UNDP HQ had a coordinating and overseeing role being responsible for delivery as stated in country work plans and for monitoring expenditures. Monitoring and reporting was overall input-output based.

**Conclusion:**

* The monitoring systems and practices were effective, but not efficient since the SWP do not bear witness of systematic use of monitoring data.
* The exclusion of key stakeholders and performers from monitoring has at least two consequences:
* Context related information explaining quantitative data is lost;
* The devolved level learning opportunity is also lost.

The above loss of learning seems to have negatively affected effectiveness, efficiency and ownership/sustainability.

**Lessons learned:**

* Monitoring should not be an activity among other activities but be an efficient management tool which is useful for partners at all levels.
* Those being directly involved in the implementation at various levels are those knowing valuable details of the implementation with regard to progress and adequacy of approach, current target group, timing etc. Such details were critical for learning from the application of the SMU principles, but were never recorded.
1. **Recommendations**

The recommendations below draw upon the conclusions made in chapter 7 including some detailed conclusions made during the analysis of findings. Recommendations are made for each key stage of the project cycle and are based on findings, conclusions and lessons learned.

It is overall strongly recommended that the project should be immediately extended incorporating observations and lessons learned from the evaluation.

The recommendations target specific categories of conclusions and findings for research/test projects:

It is recommended that the HQ/RO/CO roles are clear with no gaps or overlaps:

* HQ should be the office overseeing and coordinating at global level without direct implementation engagement and little participation in project activities, apart from global activities;
* HQ should be the entity conducting the research part of such test/pilot project documenting and sharing the learning of the research/test/piloting part of the project;
* RO should be the office coordinating regional activities and supervising on day-today issues being familiar with the cultural and political context;
* RO should be the convener of/or support regional meetings and participate in these;
* CO should be the overseeing and coordinating office at national level supervising partners with regard to collaboration requirements and procedures and supporting the process as necessary.
* Sufficient funds and time be allocated for on-site review and evaluation of a possibly second phase.

For planning and design, it is recommended that:

* Projects aiming at changing government and local systems and structures and in addition changing the attitude of a population should plan for a 10 (-13) year project. The full period could be broken down into 3-year phases with clear defined types and level of achievements for each phase as they are designed.
* Timing of the launch of activities should reflect seasonal activities in government and among stakeholders.
* Stakeholders suggest:
* Government institution to lead the implementation of all activities and disburse the project cost to Government or partner organization
* Reinforced use of knowledge into the planning
* Capacity building is a key activity when introducing SMU principles.

The DAC definition of capacity building is far wider than just knowledge.

There is need for application of a holistic approach encompassing development/

adjustment of:

* Systems
* Structures
* Knowledge
* Skills
* Adequate number and type of staff
* Equipment/facilities
* Psychologically conducive work environment.

A range of methods support such changes:

* Training/knowledge
* Hands-on experience/skills
* Peer Learning
* Mentoring
* Twinning
* Provision of technical staff and secondments – also at devolved and community level.
* There is strong need for ONE overall log frame when involving several countries, not least when testing principles, as there is need for documenting applicability of each principle and the context in which they are applicable. Systematic reporting on achievements for outputs, outcome and impact for each principle would generate learning making replication be easy.

For implementation the following is recommended:

* The evaluation scorings showed a significant need for detailed communication strategy

The strategy should define:

* Who should know what – and the purpose
* Media for sharing (TV, radio, conferences, reports, well-designed printed briefs, short breakfast meetings etc.)
* Frequency of sharing with each type of stakeholders

Recommendations for project exit include:

* The negative effect of lack of a project exit strategy was the concern of several stakeholders. Irrespective of the timeframe there is need for an exit strategy preparing the mind-set of all stakeholders that this is the time for a take-over.

Documents, whether policies, instructions or others cannot replace a planned exit, which is more practical than intellectual.
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Terms of Reference

**AMENDED TOR**

|  |
| --- |
| **Consultant - Evaluation of Project Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New****Communities (ISNC) covering period 2015-2017** |
| **Location:** | Home-based |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Contract |
| **Post Level:** | International Consultant |
| **Languages Required:** | English |
| **Starting Date:**(date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | 1 August 2018 |
| **Duration of Initial Contract:** | 1 August – 3 October 2018 (43 working days) |
| **Expected Duration of Assignment:** | 1 August – 3 October 2018 (43 working days) |

**Background Overview**

UNDP is conducting an evaluation of the 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC). The evaluation will provide accountability to both internal and external stakeholders related to the planning, implementation and results of the ISNC initiative as well as a learning opportunity for the preparation of a proposal for Phase II.

UNDP is seeking the services of a consultant to undertake the evaluation of its project: Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC) covering the period of 2015-2017.

**Project Background**

In 2014, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea (ROK) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) launched a global initiative called “Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC)”. The initiative focused on scaling up local development solutions for sustainable livelihoods, drawing on the experiences of ROK’s SMU – New Village Movement – which was a rural development programme implemented in the early 1970s that significantly reduced rural poverty by increasing household incomes, improving basic infrastructure and services, revitalizing local communities and empowering women. The key principles of Saemaul Undong approach are: self- reliance, cooperation and can-do spirit.

The ISNC programme aimed to update, integrate and scale up elements of the Saemaul Undong (SMU) and its application into an exemplary systematic approach and effective platform for development cooperation and to create a critical mass of support to localizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It was intended to:

* identify proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of SMU and other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South;
* achieve impact of the integrated local development approaches known as Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities at both the local and national policy levels through its application to an initial set of countries; and
* facilitate South-South and Triangular cooperation and knowledge exchange through support to centres of excellence to disseminate evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving impact at the regional and global levels.

Overall, this programme aimed at demonstrating how various development cooperation modalities, Official Development Assistance (ODA), domestic resource mobilization, South-South and Triangular cooperation (SSC and TrC) can complement effectively within one development initiative and support the implementation of the 2030 development agenda.

In March 2015, ROK selected six countries to roll-out the ISNC based on field visits and research findings conducted by UNDP. Bolivia, Lao PDR and Uganda were selected as **Type A** countries and Myanmar, Rwanda and Viet Nam were selected as **Type B** countries focusing on different ways of adapting and scaling up the model**.**

**Type A** focuses on local level implementation while setting up linkages with national policies and programmes. Such implementation of ISNC is expected to produce impact at the local level and in creating national-local linkages that will have the potential in impacting polices at the national level based on the country’s policy environment. Converging entry points will not only help in selecting critical sites, but also in creating policy impact and ownership at the national level that will be sustainable it the long-run. Furthermore, this type of implementation may contribute to the improvement of relevant national policies, taking into account the lessons learnt from ISNC implementation.

**Type B** implementation focuses on policy advices and contribute knowledge to the centres of excellence. These are countries where numerous local development programmes have been conducted or being planned for already. Given the small-scale investment from the ISNC programme, targeted village level implementation will not likely add critical value to the country. Instead, building on existing programmes to develop policy advices, contributing knowledge to the model through centres of excellence, and promoting South-South Cooperation (SSC), will be comparative advantages of these countries. Additionally, UNDP, together with ROK and in collaboration with other development partners, will support to identify the scalable elements and solutions of previous and current applications of SMU projects in the countries, as well as to learn from the different local development projects by UNDP and partners, and package them for application, scaling up, and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned regionally and globally.

**Project Description**

UNDP is conducting an evaluation of the 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC). The evaluation will provide accountability to both internal and external

stakeholders related to the planning, implementation and results of the ISNC initiative as well as a learning opportunity for the preparation of a proposal for a Phase II.

**Duties and Responsibilities**

**A brief summary of the project: Project Title**

Evaluation of the Implementation of the 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC)

**Project Objectives**

The primary objectives of the evaluation are to:

* Assess the performance and results achieved or expected results by 2015-2017 Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC);
* Assess the use of the Strategic Framework as a tool for guiding UNDP work and delivering on its mandate;
* Assess the learning from the ISNC experience during the implementation period;
* Specifically, around planning and implementation processes;
* Provide actionable recommendations in regard to the overall UNDP strategy and strategic planning process.

**Expected Project Output/Outcome**

The expected outcomes are clearly identified findings, lessons learned and actionable recommendations related to the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the ISNC Framework and Implementation mechanisms. This should occur through the following deliverables:

* Inception Report
* Data Collection and Analysis including field visits
* Debriefing of initial findings, conclusions and recommendations
* Draft Report
* Final Report

See Deliverables section for further details

**Scope of Services, Expected Outputs and Target Completion**

The evaluation will focus on the ISNC initiative and the associated implementation mechanisms. The evaluation will cover both programmatic outcomes as well as the institutional effectiveness results with the intent to validate the identified theories of change in the targeted communities: i.e. self-reliance, cooperation and can-do spirit.

**Quality Standards and Assurance**

The evaluation must adhere to, reflect and assess UNDP quality standards for programming as follows:

**Strategic:**

Programming priorities and results are consistent with the UNDP Strategic Plan and aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). Programmes and projects are based on clear analysis backed by evidence and theories of change, justifying why the defined approach is most appropriate and will most likely achieve, or contribute to, the desired development results along with partner contributions. The role of UNDP vis-à-vis partners has been deliberately considered. New opportunities and changes in the development context are regularly re-assessed with any relevant adjustments made and actions taken, as appropriate.

**Relevant**:

Programming objectives and results are consistent with national needs and priorities, as well as with feedback obtained through the engagement of targeted excluded and/or marginalized groups as relevant. Programming strategies consider interconnections between development challenges and results. A gender analysis is integrated to fully consider the different needs, roles, and access to/control over resources of women and men and appropriate measures taken to address these when relevant.

Programmes and projects regularly capture and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

**Social and environmental standards:**

Social and environmental sustainability are systematically addressed throughout UNDP’s programming in an integrated way. All programming applies the core principles of human rights, gender equality, and environmental sustainability. Potential harm to people and the environment is avoided wherever possible and otherwise minimized, mitigated and managed. The complete Social and Environmental Standards can be found [here.](https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPSubject.aspx?SBJID=136&amp;Menu=BusinessUnit)

**Management and monitoring:**

Outcomes and outputs are defined at an appropriate level, are consistent with the theory of change, and have SMART, results-oriented indicators with specified baselines and targets and identified data sources. Gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators are used when appropriate. Relevant indicators from the Strategic Plan’s Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) have been adopted into

the programme or project’s results framework. Comprehensive, costed monitoring and evaluation plans

are in place and implemented to support evidence-based management, monitoring, and evaluation. Risks and opportunities are identified, with appropriate plans and actions taken to mitigate and manage risks. Governance of programmes and projects are defined with clear roles and responsibilities and function as intended to provide active and regular oversight to inform decision-making.

**Efficient:**

Programming budgets are justifiable and valid, and programming design and implementation includes measures to ensure efficient use of resources. The size and scope of programmes and projects are consistent with resources available and planned to be mobilized. Plans include consideration of scaling up and links with other relevant initiatives to achieve greater impact, and procurement planning is done early and is regularly reviewed. Monitoring and management include analysis of and actions to improve efficiency in delivering desired outputs with the required quality and timeliness, such as CO support to National Implementation (NIM). Costs are fully recovered (see Cost Recovery Policy.)

**Effective:**

Programming design and implementation is informed by relevant knowledge, evaluation and lessons learned to develop strategy and inform course corrections. Targeted groups are systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded. Results consistently respond to gender analysis and is accurately rated by the gender marker. Managers use data from monitoring in decision making to maximize achievement of desired results. South-South and Triangular Cooperation is used to achieve results, when relevant, and these aspects of results delivery are captured in the results framework. The required implementing partner assessments have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessment.

**Sustainability and national ownership:**

Programming is accomplished in consultation with relevant stakeholders and national partners, who are engaged throughout the programming cycle in decision-making, implementation, and monitoring.

Programming includes assessing and strengthening the capacity and sustainability of national institutions. A strategy for use of national systems is defined and implemented, if relevant, and monitoring includes use of relevant national data sources, where possible. Sustainability of results is accomplished through tracking of capacity indicators and implementation of transition and scale up plans.

**Evaluation Period Scope:**

To address both the accountability and learning needs related to the strategic framework the scope of the evaluation will cover the full period of the programme, 2015 to 2017.

The ISNC was operationalized through a series of targeted interventions with the support of UNDP global programmes aligned with the priority areas. The evaluation of the ISNC will address the role of these strategies and programmes as an implementation mechanism for the ISNC.

With the exception of Uganda, no mid-term review of the ISNC was undertaken but each of the six individual initiatives reported annually on progress. The findings from these periodic reviews should also be assessed and included in the evaluation. The final scope of the evaluation including the specific components and corporate implementation strategies will be determined through a consultative process between identified stakeholders and the consultant. A final detailed scope will be included in the final inception report.

**Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The specific scope and evaluation questions will be determined following consultations with management. In general, the evaluation will address the results achieved or expected to be achieved by the strategic framework. To provide the most benefit to the organization, the evaluation will also attempt to understand what worked and what didn’t work regarding planning, implementation and processes related to the ISNC. The final evaluation questions will be determined as part of a consultation process during the development of the inception report. Below are draft questions based on the current scope and purpose of the evaluation. As draft questions, it is expected that they will change/be refined during the consultation process for the inception report.

**Some examples are proposed below**: Relevance:

* + How relevant are the Saemaul Undong articulated theories of change to the expected outcomes and mandate of UNDP within the context of the ISNC?
	+ How relevant are the implementation mechanisms and processes for achieving the ISNC outcomes and institutional effectiveness results in each of the six countries?
	+ To what extent does the ISNC position UNDP to respond to the 2030 Agenda and the new development landscape – especially within the context of localizing the Sustainable Development Goals?

Efficiency:

* + To what extent have UNDP and KOICA resources been used efficiently in contributing to the outcomes and results outlined in the ISNC project document?
	+ How efficient is the coordination and collaboration, specifically management arrangements at the global, regional and country levels, in supporting the implementation and results achievements of the ISNC?

Effectiveness:

* + How effective has UNDP been in achieving the expected results of the ISNC?
	+ How effective have the implementation mechanisms and corporate strategies been in supporting achievement of the ISNC outcomes and results?
	+ To what extent can UNDP be expected to contribute to development impacts at the country level through the achievement of the ISNC outcomes?

Sustainability:

* + Are the results of the ISNC programme in the individual countries likely to be sustained?
	+ Has a clear exit strategy been formulated?

**Evaluation Approach**

The evaluation with take a utilization focused approach and therefore be consultative and participatory in nature. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNDP Evaluation Policy[[1]](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=79005&amp;_ftn1) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System[[2],](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=79005&amp;_ftn2) as they apply to UNDP.

The evaluation should be independent, transparent, inclusive, participatory and utilization focused. The evaluation will seek broad engagement from relevant stakeholders during all stages. This will allow for the full range of information and experience to be captured and will also help to ensure the relevance and utilization of evaluation findings and recommendations. To support a participatory approach, the evaluation will include, as part of the inception phase, a thorough stakeholder analysis as well as a plan to involve relevant stakeholders in the evaluation.

The specific methodology will be determined by the consultant with full consultation of relevant stakeholders during the inception phase. However, given the complexity of the evaluation, the methodology will need to consider a variety of types of evaluation and complementary methodologies including elements of organizational, process and programmatic evaluations.

**Core Stakeholders**

The evaluation will include activities to identify and ensure relevant internal and external stakeholders are consulted. In order to identify and ensure all relevant and appropriate stakeholders are included, the consultant will carry out a thorough stakeholder analysis to be included in the inception report. For the purposes of this evaluation, stakeholders are defined as those individuals, groups, or entities which are directly involved in carrying out the work of the ISNC and/or support UNDP to carry out this work. In addition, relevant stakeholders also include those individuals, groups or entities which benefit from the work of UNDP and the ISNC and would therefore have a stake in the success of UNDP in carrying out and achieving the results outline in the ISNC. Currently identified core stakeholders of the evaluation include, but are not limited to:

* + Member States, including host country, programme countries and donor countries
	+ UNDP staff and management, including those at HQ, Regional Offices and Field Units (mission and non-mission)
	+ Local Authorities
	+ UNDP
	+ Partner organizations of the UN system (i.e. UNCDF)
	+ Civil Society Organizations
	+ Media

**Consultation Process**

A stakeholder mechanism for participation will be developed to ensure appropriate consultation throughout the evaluation and at appropriate process points. The evaluation will commence with a thorough consultation process during the inception period. In addition, UNDP, in collaboration with stakeholders, will gather the relevant reference documents for the evaluation. *Based on inputs received during the consultation meeting and a preliminary review of the reference documents, evaluation ToR and Inception Report may be further revised.*

Debriefings of the draft report, and other processes as necessary, will be provided to larger stakeholder groups including staff and management at HQ, ROs and FUs to the extent possible. Debriefings with external stakeholders, including UNDP partners may also occur, dependent on the time and resource availability.

To the extent possible and appropriate, the evaluation will leverage existing opportunities for consultations with both external and internal stakeholders. The consultations with the identified stakeholders will contribute significantly to the evaluation. These consultations will assist the consultant in answering the identified evaluation questions and providing relevant and useful recommendations.

**Methodology and Data Sources**

The consultant will conduct the evaluation using various data collection methods including a desk review, group interviews/focus groups, individual interviews and case studies. The methods used will ensure an unbiased and objective approach and will validate collected data. The consultant will ensure that all data is valid, through the use of triangulation of both source and method. The evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach, inclusive of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data collection methods will use both primary and secondary data to the extent available and will be implemented through the following processes:

**Desk review: Relevant reference documents and project information will be compiled, summarized and analysed. The review will include, but not be limited to the following:**

* + Guidance documents and agreements relevant to the planning and implementation of the ISNC.

i.e. Project Documents, MOUs and agreements with UNDP COs;

* + Annual ISNC progress reviews and the minutes from annual board meetings at global level.
	+ Corporate strategies supporting the implementation of the ISNC;
	+ Programme and project planning, design, monitoring and reporting information and documents, including Global Programme documents, Annual project progress reports (APPRs) and output documents;
	+ General background information related to UNDP, the previous strategic planning processes and current strategies;
	+ Quarterly progress reviews and the minutes from the annual board meetings at country office level;
	+ Any other relevant documents.

**Stakeholder consultations and interviews:** Based on the results of the stakeholder analysis, the consultant will conduct consultation meetings and carry out extensive interviews with relevant stakeholders (in person and/or by phone). Interview questionnaires will be prepared based on the evaluation questions and on the design matrix and will be included in the inception report.

**Case studies**: Case studies will be developed and presented in the evaluation as appropriate. The case studies will be based on specific themes, innovative practices and/or country programmes and/or projects selected from UNDP activities. The goal will be twofold; to show clear good practices which could be replicated and to provide concrete, practical examples of implementation and progress of the ISNC. The final case studies will be identified in the inception report.

**Field Visits**: The evaluation consultant will work with UNDP staff and management to identify specific project sites in the six programme countries to visit. To the extent possible, the evaluation consultant will leverage these opportunities to meet directly with national project stakeholders, including partners and beneficiaries. These field visits should represent the variety of work and activities related to each country intervention for both Type A (Bolivia, Lao PDR and Uganda) and Type B countries (Myanmar, Rwanda and Viet Nam). Final field visit locations will be determined during the inception phase.

A draft evaluation design matrix has been developed to link the evaluation’s questions to indicators/measures and data sources (see draft version in Annex 1 to this Terms of Reference). These questions and the matrix will further evolve during the evaluation process.

The fulfilment of the purpose of the evaluation and the successful implementation of the evaluation work plan will depend on several factors, including the timely availability and accuracy of data on activities, performance and results and most importantly participation by stakeholders in the evaluation process. Any limitations encountered will be discussed in the final report.

**Evaluation Consultant**

The evaluation consultant (ET) will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation, including conducting consultations with relevant stakeholders, data collection, including field visits, and debriefing meetings.

Members of the ET should have no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the ISNC. To the extent possible, the ET should collectively possess expertise in the following areas:

* + Evaluation management and methodology;
	+ Local, community-led development with multi-stakeholder engagement.

The ET will be responsible for conducting the evaluation in accordance with UNDP/Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and UNEG standards as they apply to UNDP, and for the preparation of the inception report, evaluation report and other identified deliverables. See Annex 2 for additional details and qualifications related to the evaluation consultant.

**Evaluation Report**

The major deliverable of the evaluation is the evaluation report. It will be drafted according to the UNDP evaluation report template. It will meet all of the criteria within the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports[[3].](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=79005&amp;_ftn3) In particular, the report will illustrate the main findings based on analysis and triangulation of data and on the evidence found with regard to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in this ToR. It will also contain conclusions and recommendations addressed to a hypothetical Phase II of the ISNC (if the ET recommends a Phase II). Supporting material (e.g. project data, survey results) will be annexed to the report or provided in an additional information document.

**Tentative Schedule of Activities - Activity / Timeframe/deadline:**

* Consultant recruited **- Start Date 1 August 2018**
* Evaluation design and inception report finalized
* Consultations with stakeholders, Data collection including field visits Analysis and Synthesis
* Draft Report circulated internally for feedback
* UNDP Feedback to consultant **26 September 2018**
* Final report submitted to UNDP management **27 September 2018 – 3 October 2018**
* Contract end-date 3 October 2018
1. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>
2. <http://uneval.org/document/foundation-documents>
3. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607>
4. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>

**Specific deliverables include the following**: **Description / Estimated working days and travel / Tentative Due date**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timeframe/Deadline** |
| **1.** | **Submit final draft Inception Report** | Inception report, including stakeholder analysis, plan for stakeholder consultation and draft data collection tools delivered. See additional description in ToR | **14 August - DRAFT 17 August - Final** |
| **2.** | **Conduct Data Collection and Analysis** | Data collection and initial analysis undertaken including both qualitative and quantitative methods. | **22-31 August** |
| **3.** | **Data Quality Assurance** | Skype or email follow-up on responses which (i) have interesting observations; (ii) are unclear, or (iii) are insufficiently filled. | **3-7 September** |
| **4.** | **Data Synthesis and Analysis** | Analysis and Synthesis and Debriefing with UNDP HQ and identified stakeholders (via Skype). | **5-12 September****(Overlap with the above)** |
| **5.** | **Draft Evaluation Report** | The draft evaluation report should be structured and presented using the UNDP evaluation report template and UNEG quality checklist;Should include recommendations for a Phase II of the ISNC, circulated for stakeholder comments and feedback. | **13- 19 September** |
| **6.** | **UNDP to provide comments** |  | **20-26 September** |
| **7.** | **Final Evaluation Report and knowledge products (presentations)** | The final evaluation report should include an issue log identifying how stakeholder feedback was addressed;All recommendations included in the final evaluation should be actionable and relevant to the work of UNDP and specifically to the extent possible future strategic planning efforts of UNDP | **27 September - 3 October** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Institutional Arrangement*** The evaluation will be managed by the Development Impact Group;
* The UNDP South-South Cooperation Advisor will be responsible for coordinating the evaluation in accordance with agreed timelines and ensuring the quality of the various deliverables. The UNDP South-South Cooperation Advisor will also ensure alignment of all evaluation processes and deliverables with UNDP/IEO and UNEG standards as they apply to UNDP. The UNDP South- South Cooperation Advisor will also act as liaison between the ET and UNDP.

**Duration of the Work**The evaluation will be undertaken within 43 working days over the period **(1 August 2018 – 3 October 2018)**. Major deliverables, specifically the inception report and draft evaluation report will provide a minimum of two weeks review period for identified stakeholders to include at least the Evaluation Specialist and IEPT.**Location of Work**See Deliverables table above for expected travel and home-based work.**Evaluation experience of the consultant**The consultant should have extensive evaluation experience, specifically within the international context and ideally with the United Nations. Knowledge and experience in strategic planning and organizational management are imperative and understanding of the role of volunteerism is also required.**Impartiality**The consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of the UNDP Saemaul Initiative towards Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities (ISNC) or its implementing processes, including the Global Programmes. |

 **ANNEX 2**

List of Supporting Documents

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PUBLISHER** | **TITLE** | **YEAR** |
| UNDP HQ | Global Project Document | 2014 |
|  | Implementation Guidance | 2015 |
|  | Global Annual Progress Reports for the project period 2016-2017 | 2017 |
|  | Global Annual Work Plans for the period | 2015-2017 |
|  | 2015 Global Board meeting minutes | 2015 |
|  | Minutes of the 2015 Annual Consultations between the Republic of Korea and UNDP  | 2015 |
|  | Session 9 – Global Project Board Meeting minutes – ISNC annual progress 2016-2017 | 2017 |
| UNDP | South-South Global Thinkers |  |
| UNDP | Handbook on Planning, Monitoring And Evaluating for Development Results | 2009 |
| Asian Development Bank | The Saemaul Undong Movement in the Republic of Korea | 2012 |
| Asia-Pacific Development Journal | Analysis of Sarmaul Undong: A Korean Rural Development Programme in 1970s, volume 16, No. 2 | 2009 |
| UNDP CO Bolivia | Annual Progress Reports for the project period | 2015-2017 |
|  | 2017 Annual Work Plan I and II | 2016 |
|  | Workplan Bolivia Centre of Excellence 2017 | 2016 |
| UNDP CO Lao | 2015 ROK-UNDP Annual Progress Report | 2015 |
|  | Lao Progress Report – December 2016 | 2016 |
|  | Lao PDR Annual Progress Report (2016-2017) | 2017 |
|  | Lao PDR ISNC Final Report(2015-2017)\_2 | 2017 |
|  | Lao 2017 ISNC AWP | 2016 |
| UNDP CO Myanmar | Myanmar ISNC work plan 2015 | 2014P1 05 -  |
|  | P1-05 2016 work plan signed October 2016 | 2016 |
|  | Myanmar 2017 work plan | 2017 |
|  | AWP as of Dec 2017 (signed) | 2017 |
|  | ISNC – Myanmar Final report (2015-2017) | 2018 |
| UNDP CO Rwanda | 2015 ROK-UNDP Annual Progress Report | 2016 |
|  | Rwanda Annual Progress Report 2016-2017 | 2018 |
|  | Rwanda ISNC AWP 2017 | 2017 |
|  | Rwanda Progress Report Aug 2017\_v2 | 2018 |
|  | Final draft Saemaul workshop report\_2017 for circulation | 2017 |
|  | Rwanda – ISNC Final Report (2015-2018) | 2018 |
|  | Rwanda – ISNC Final Report (2015-2018) \_v2 | 2018 |
|  | Rwanda – ISNC Final Report (2015-2018) \_v2 cleaned | 2018 |
| UNDP CO Uganda | ISNC project document Uganda | 2015 |
|  | ROK-UNDP Annual Progress Report 2015 | 2016 |
|  | Progress Report Dec 2016 ISNC Uganda | 2016 |
|  | Uganda Annual Progress Report 2016-2017 | 2018 |
|  | Uganda QI 2017 Progress Report | 2017 |
| Viet Nam | Annex 1 – PRPP AWP 2015 | 2015 |
|  | Annex 1 – PRPP AWP 2016 | 2016 |
|  | Viet Nam 2017 work plan | 2017 |
|  | Viet Nam 2017 work plan II | 2017 |
|  | Viet Nam Annual Progress Report 2016-2017 | 2018 |
|  | Viet Nam ISNC Final Report (2015-2017) | 2018 |
| UNDP | South-South Global Thinkers |  |
| UNDP | Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results | 2009 |
| Asian Development Bank | The Saemaul Undong Movement in the Republic of Korea | 2012 |
| Asia-Pacific Development Journal | Analysis of Saemaul Undong: A Korean Rural Development Programme in 1970s, volume 16, No. 2 | 2009 |

 **ANNEX 3**

List of participating offices

Apart from KOICA most participating offices had 3-10 staff entering details for

areas with which they had experience

|  |
| --- |
| **BOLIVIA** |
| Municipal Autonomous Government of Sacaba |
| Municipal Autonomous Government of Tiquipaya |
| Departmental Autonomous Government of Cochabamba |
| UNDP CO |

|  |
| --- |
| **VIET NAM** |
| National Coordination Office for Poverty Reduction (PRCO), Ministry of Labor, War Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA) |
| Department of Social Assistance (DSA), MOLISA |
| Social Work Division, DSA, MOLISA |
| DSA, MOLISA |
| UNDP Viet Nam |

|  |
| --- |
| **LAO** |
| Lao Women’s Union |
| KOICA in Lao PDR |
| UNDP CO |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **MYANMAR** |
| Relief and Resettlement Department, MSW |
| International Alert |
| UNDP CO |

|  |
| --- |
| **RWANDA** |
| FONERWA  |
| Consultant |
| Victor Technologies |
| UNDP CO |

|  |
| --- |
| **UGANDA** |
| Ministry of Local Government |
| Bunyangabu district officers |
| Maracha district officers |
| Kabarole district officers |
| Luuka district officers |
| Maracha districts officers |
| Biwologoma Cooperative (ISNC Champion) |
| Maracha Youth (ISNC Champion) |
| Urban Authorities Association of Uganda (UAAU) |
| National Centre for Saemaul Undong in Uganda |
| Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development |
| Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development |
| KOICA Uganda |
| UNDP CO |

|  |
| --- |
| **UNDP HQ (Former ISNC staff)** |
| Policy Analyst, BPPS |
| Senior Advisor for CC-TrC, BPPS |
| SCC Unit |
| Director of the Development Impact Group |

 **ANNEX 4**

Evaluation matrix

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **OECD Criteria** |
| **Evaluation item** | **Relevance** | **Effectiveness** | **Efficiency** | **Changes** | **Sustainability** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CROSS-CUTTING OVERALL TEMPLATE, ANNEX 3A AND 3 B** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Policy Environment**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policies, acts, strategies and plans developed | x | x |  |  | x |
| 1. **Design of intervention**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Project relevance for country
 | x |  |  | x | x |
| 1. Project relevance for 2030 goals
 | x |  |  | x | x |
| 1. Timeframe
 | x | x | x |  | x |
| 1. Approach
 | x | x | x |  | x |
| 1. Budget
 | x | x | x |  |  |
| 1. **Involvement of stakeholders**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Organisation
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Partnerships
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Ownership
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Citizen involvement
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. **Administration**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Timeliness
 |  | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Procedures
 |  | x |  | x |  |
| 1. Funds/budget versus activities
 |  | x |  | x |  |
| 1. UNDP HQ Support
 |  | x |  | x |  |
| 1. UNDP HQ coordination
 |  | x |  | x |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **OECD Criteria** |
| **Evaluation item** | **Relevance** | **Effectiveness** | **Efficiency** | **Changes** | **Sustainability** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CROSS-CUTTING OVERALL TEMPLATE, ANNEX 3A AND 3 B** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Organisation of the work**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Systems
 |  | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Structures
 |  | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Staffing
 |  | x | x | x |  |
| 1. Knowledge/skills
 |  | x |  | x |  |
| 1. Infrastructure
 |  | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Coordination
 |  | x | x | x |  |
| 1. **Gender mainstreaming**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Gender in policy and plans
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Gender in project design
 | x | x |  | x | x |
| 1. Gender in monitoring
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Gender in reporting
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. **Environmental measures through:**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Minimizing risks
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Mitigating risks
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Managing risks
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. **Capacity building**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Communication/advocacy
 | x | x | x | x |  |
| 1. Training
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Mentoring
 | x | x | x | x | x |
| 1. **Sustainability**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Systems established
 |  |  |  |  | x |
| 1. Networks established
 |  |  |  |  | x |
| 1. Knowledge and skills
 |  |  |  |  | x |
| 1. Existence of exit strategy
 |  | x | x | x | x |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation item** | **Relevance** | **Effectiveness** | **Efficiency** | **Changes** | **Sustainability** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **THEMATIC ISSUES : MONITORING ANNEX 4.1** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Monitoring systems and structures**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Applicability
 |  | x |  |  |  |
| 1. Data analysis
 |  | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Data use for planning
 |  | x | x | x | x |
| 1. Reporting formats
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. M&E Infrastructure
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. **Monitoring tools**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicators
 |  | x | x |  | x |
| 1. Tools for data collection
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. Tools for data compilation
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. Data analysis
 |  | x | x |  | x |
| 1. **Capacity of monitoring agents**
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Communities
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. CO staff
 |  | x | x |  |  |
| 1. HQ staff
 |  | x | x |  |  |

**ANNEX 5**

Data collection tools

**5A. OVERALL AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES – CO staff**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: CO staff to fill all items if having the necessary experience**

**How: Each item has a number of sub-items. If some activities/aspects are not covered, please fill them as the last point under point 11.**

 **You only fill details you have experience with and leave the rest. Do not try to answer items, with which you have no experience.**

 **Do not make long descriptions of each item/activity. Just mention in bullet points which activities “Worked well” or “Did not work well” and indicate**

 **HOW this affected the results/situation positively or negatively – e.g. what do people do differently after the intervention**

**\* Item 5: Definitions in accordance with OECD/DAC definition of capacity:**

**Systems**: Methods, routines, procedures, legislation

**Structures:** Policy, authority, rights & duties, communication

**Staffing:** Refers both to adequacy of staff number and staff competences

**Knowledge and skills:** Knowledge can be gained from studies and training, while skills can only be acquired through practicing

**Infrastructure:** Equipment, facilities, offices, means of communication, vehicles etc.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEM** | **WHAT WORKED WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **PROPOSED CHANGES** |
| 1 | Policies, acts, strategies and plans developed |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Design of intervention, e.g.:1. Project relevance for country
2. Project relevance for 2030 goals
3. Timeframe
4. Approach
5. Budget
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Involvement of stakeholders:1. Organisation
2. Partnerships
3. Ownership
4. Citizen involvement
5. Type of involvement
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Administration:1. Timeliness
2. Procedures
3. Funds/budget versus activities
4. HQ Support
5. UNDP HQ coordination
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5\* | Organization of the work:1. Systems
2. Structures
3. Staffing
4. Knowledge/skills
5. Infrastructure
6. Coordination
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Gender mainstreaming:1. Gender in sector policy
2. Gender in activity design
3. Gender in monitoring
4. Gender in reporting
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Environmental measures through:1. Minimizing risks
2. Mitigating risks
3. Managing risks
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Capacity Development, e.g.1. Communication/advocacy
2. Training
3. Mentoring
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sustainability of:a) Systems establishedb) Networks establishedc) Knowledge and skillsd) Existence of exit strategy |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Other items |  |  |  |  |  |

**5B. OVERALL AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES – partners**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: CO/ISNC partners**

**How: Each item has a number of sub-items. If some activities/aspects are not covered, please fill them as the last point under point 11.**

 **You only fill details you have experience with and leave the rest. Do NOT try to answer items, with which you have no experience.**

 **Do not make long descriptions of each item/activity. Just mention in bullet points which activities “Worked well” or “Did not work well” and indicate**

 **HOW this affected the results/situation positively or negatively – e.g. what do people do differently after the intervention**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEM** | **WHAT WORKED WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **PROPOSED CHANGES** |
| 1 | Design of intervention, e.g.:1. Project relevance for country
2. Project relevance for 2030 goals
3. Timeframe
4. Approach
5. Budget
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Involvement of stakeholders:1. Organisation
2. Partnership relevance
3. Partner ownership
4. Citizen involvement
5. Type of involvement
6. Relevance of involvement
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Administration:1. Timeliness
2. Procedures
3. System adequacy
4. Funds/budget versus activities
5. HQ Support
 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | Gender mainstreaming:1. Gender in sector policy
2. Gender in activity design
3. Gender in monitoring
4. Gender in reporting
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Capacity Development, e.g.1. Communication
2. Training
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Sustainability of:a) Systems establishedb) Networks establishedc) Knowledge and skillsd) Existence of exit strategy |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Other items |  |  |  |  |  |

**5C MONITORING SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: Staff responsible for monitoring at CO and HQ level**

**How: Each item has a number of sub-items. If some activities/aspects are not covered, please fill them as the last point under point 4.**

 **You only fill details you have experience with and leave the rest. Do NOT try to answer items, with which you have no experience.**

 **Do not make long descriptions of each item/activity. Just mention a given activity in brief and indicate HOW this**

 **activity affected the results/situation positively or negatively = what is positively or negatively different after the intervention.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEMS** | **WHAT WORKED WELL** | **POSITIVE IMPACT** | **WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL** | **NEGATIVE IMPACT** | **SUGGESTED CHANGES** |
|  | Monitoring syst. & structures:1. Applicability
2. Data analysis
3. Data use for planning
4. Validity
5. Reporting formats
6. M&E Infrastructure
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Monitoring tools:1. Indicators
2. Tools for data collection
3. Tools for data compilation
4. Data analysis
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Capacity of monitoring agents:**1. Communities
2. CO staff
3. HQ staff
 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Others** |  |  |  |  |  |

**5D. PARTNER ROLES**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: Staff involved with partner cooperation at CO level**

**How: You only fill in the boxes, where you have direct experience. If you have never worked with e.g. the private sector, you leave these boxes empty. If you have worked with more than two of the same category of partners, e.g. more than two institutions, you just add a line to the template.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER CATEGORY** | **NAME**  | **ROLE** | **PLANNED ACHIEVEMENT** | **ACTUAL ACHIEVEMENT** |
| **Private sector** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **CSO/NGO** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Central government** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Local government** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Institutions** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Centres of excellence** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**5E. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND ADVOCACY**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: Staff involved with/responsible for knowledge management and advocacy at CO level**

**How: You only fill in the boxes, where you have direct experience. If you have never worked with e.g. the private sector, you leave these boxes empty. If you have worked with more than two partners, e.g. more than two institutions, you just add a line to the template.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FOCUS AREA** | **ACTIVITIES** | **CHANGES SEEN** | **CHALLENGES FACED** | **SUGGESTED CHANGES** |
|  | Systematic documentation of lessons learned for comparative analysis |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | South-South and triangular knowledge exchange and cooperation |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Global sharing and advocacy of evidence-based results and expertise at regional and global levels |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Inputs to global and regional discourses on scalable solutions for sustainable rural development for the post-2015 development agenda |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Others |  |  |  |  |

**5F. RISKS**

**GUIDANCE:**

**Who: Staff involved with/responsible for defining risk at the planning level and following risks during the implementation at CO level**

**How: You list the risks that you experienced in the first (left) column. Do ONLY list the most important risks that you faced, NOT the ones listed in the Implementation Guidance unless they are the same. Give them a “category” (column 2) and indicate which effect you feared that this risk could have (column 3). Make a brief description of the counter-measures that you rook (column 4) and finally indicate how this counter-measure helped in mitigating the risk (column 5).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RISK FACED** | **CATEGORY** | **EXPECTED EFFECT** | **COUNTER-MEASURES TAKEN** | **RESULT/EFFECT** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX 6**

Consolidated Process Scorings

**TYPE A COUNTRIES (BOLIVIA, UGANDA, LAO) TOTAL SCORES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEM** | **WHAT WORKED WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **PROPOSED CHANGES** |
| **1** | **SCORINGS** | **3** | **7** | **1** | **1** | **2** |
| 1 | Policies, acts, strategies and plans developed | 1. Local govt involvement
2. The productive development policies of the local govt were promoted
3. The articulation of the proposal with the National Development Plan was a meeting point, which facilitated the execution of the project.
 | * Local leaders empowered themselves
* Show a political will of institutional support for the success of the project.
* Active participation of territorial partners.
* Producers entered into a new way of commercialization in supermarket chains
* The local govt budget to have been raised from 2015 to 2018 by 50%.
* Enhanced the capacity of negotiation of the municipalities in the dialogue spaces
* Shared resources of different public entities to offer better services to productive associations.
 | 1. Changes of authorities
 | * With the new Vice minister and the new strategy of the Office, the participation of the Ministry of Productive Development has been reduced. It has had a participation, but not the expected.
 | * It’s advisable to promote multi-stakeholder and multilevel spaces in order to institutionalize the ART and SU methodologies to be more effective.
* Participation in dialogue spaces of the municipal, departmental and national entities, in order to share public resources (financial, human resources, equipment, …).
 |
| **2** | **SCORINGS** | **29** | **28** | **10** | **8** | **11** |
| 2 | 1. Design of intervention, e.g.:
2. Project relevance for country
3. Project relevance for 2030 goals
4. Timeframe
5. Approach
6. Budget
 | 1. The strengthening of productive capacities to empower the local governments.
2. Promote the mind-change in the productive development sector to articulate the public policies priorities with the producer’s necessities (2)
3. Timeframe sufficient to empower productive associations on all the productive phases (2)
4. The selected associations have implemented coordination and articulation capacities to enhance their joint productivity
5. The budget added value was of the triangle participation
6. The sustainability of the enterprises was strengthened.
7. Vocational training
8. Livelihood Support Training Center
9. Capacity building (stakeholders)

1. Community involvement/capacity building.
2. Partnerships
3. Community Market support
4. SMU work approach and the leveraging of resources relevant for municipal governments
5. Strategic agenda of the Municipal Govts.: Productive Development
6. Municipal Governments involvement
7. The work approach facilitated the empowerment of the producers
8. The inclusion of disadvantaged sectors
9. Production and marketing committees were appointed within producer organizations
10. The budget assigned to each intervention was aimed at conditioning infrastructure, equipment and technical assistance
11. Working with the Communities as the champions of change;
12. Application of the three principles of Self-help, Diligence and Cooperation at community level;
13. Using the ISNC as a platform to address priority SDGs
14. Using Integrated approach as opposed to traditional sectors when addressing community challenges;
15. Value Chain Development
16. Community Champions became the drivers of the desired change
17. Increased volunteerism amongst the communities to participate in communal activities
18. Formed Cooperatives of Farmers in Maize, Banana, Rice.
 | * There are specialized technicians and budgets to implement productive development strategies in the local govt
* Municipal technicians have developed a new view on the articulation priority-based with producers on the implementation of municipal plans.
* The Mayor has seen the importance of promoting this topic and not only health and education as priority poles.
* Shared efforts in the execution of the project is incorporated into local Governments
* Some of the productive associations have shown their change-in-time to other productive associations before the conclusion of the project in South-South and local exchanges.
* Enterprises can operate after withdrawal of funding and cooperation support
* The producers share good practices, seeking to standardize production
* Has been a proper consolidation and appropriation to the commitment of the project.
* The joint associations have reached a point where their articulation has prompted to better results in budget management and to their productive activities.
* Future productive development activities have sustainability and appropriation from the productive associations and local authorities.
* Enhance livelihood skills and knowledge of village targets leading to increase in the household nutrition level and food security.
* Relevant for women and poor households who are the direct beneficiaries.
* Centers established.
* Built and strengthened the capacity of the Government staff and planners on gender issues.
* Training staff engaged in the ISNC project to improve their understanding of small business development and village facilitation
* Villagers have knowledge about their business and have access to markets.
* Improved knowledge of villagers through the implementation of the community campaign on breastfeeding, food security and nutrition in the target villages.
* Project supported infrastructure systems resulting in better access to markets and diversified supply sources
* Projects involved lots of community members
* Support provided to the village productive groups to make local villagers reach economic self-reliance.
* Built working partnerships with line ministries and civil society organization (RRDPA)
* Established many economic groups and promoted community driven working approach which is a basis for future development.
* The project enhanced the fundamental business practice and improved entrepreneurs’ skills and marketing network directly benefiting women, among others.
* Respond to a greater number of needs of municipal governments
* Contributed in the creation of direct and indirect employment within the family units
* Contributing to economic well-being, reducing the conditions of territorial poverty that producers had
* Opened over 200kms of Community Access Roads; Cleaned Community Water Sources; Constructed Kitchens for households headed by vulnerable people – elderly & widows through volunteerism
* Developed the Maize and Banana Value Chain in Luuka & Bunyangabu respectively – provided bulking centers & milling facilities in Luuka
 | 1. The Municipal Governments still do not have permanent platforms (sectoral dialogue spaces) to gather the demands of all productive sectors.
2. The start of the project was not carried out during the operational and budgetary planning period of the Municipal Governments, which generated some delays in the implementation of the activities
3. The change of mentality of the producers was not as accelerated as planned
4. With the methodology of producing leaders teaching, not always worked fine, due to the fact that some of them had not got the ideal teaching conditions.
5. The timeframe of the deliverance of the inputs of the projects, due to the implementation calendar, was not in accordance to the agricultural calendar
6. Low levels of literacy and language barriers could impact the level of engagement and knowledge transfer with the villagers.
7. The budget was not enough to cover a total of approximately 80 registered demands in the municipalities, with all the stakeholders being able to support only 27 productive undertakings
8. Several associations were pending support in technical assistance and equipment
9. Working Directly with Lower Local Governments without direct engagement with the Technical Staff at the District Level
10. Short Project Lifetime to have achieved mindset change
 | * There is no proper record of the set of productive associations in the territory.
* Once the projects were approved, additional actions had to be taken to incorporate them into the municipality's planning and budget.

* In women and young people, the changes were significant, however in a significant number of producers the changes of mentality were not the expected.
* It was difficult for them to assimilate some technical issues and replicate them to their colleagues.
* Some of the seed delivery did not match the correct time of the year to produce, so the production was not correct
* Lack of funding investment to operate their businesses.
* Delays in project implementation and reporting particularly procurements and submission of Reports and Accountability of funds
* Some communities lapsed back to the dependency syndrome
 | * Support the Municipal Governments in obtaining productive statistics and coverage of attention to the productive sector where the project intervened.
* The budget assignation should be taking in account the management times of the local governments, to achieve the institutional agreements according to the approval periods of the operational and budgetary planning.
* Prioritize intervention actions in vulnerable groups, with special emphasis on the family and not on people, so that knowledge can be transferred to children.
* Identify and adapt the explanations to the capacities and characteristics of the associate teaching and learning producers
* The agricultural calendar should be taken in the planning stage to accomplish a proper environmental management.
* Need for project continuation, LWU in partnership with UNDP has developed the second phase project document.
* Agricultural calendars should be taken into account in order to hire specialists and carry out workshops while producers are carrying out activities in which technical assistance is needed.
* For the elaboration and design process of projects it's necessary to have a multidisciplinary team of specialists or have the support of other municipal teams so as to develop and optimal project.
* It is necessary to see collaborative actions articulated to other financial entities
* Include activities and budget to be managed at Higher Local Government level
* Provide not less than five years to experience significant mindset change
 |
| **3** | **SCORINGS** | **15** | **13** | **10** | **5** | **6** |
| 3 | Involvement of stakeholders:1. Organisation
2. Partnerships
3. Ownership
4. Citizen involvement
5. Type of involvement
 | 1. UNDP-Municipal governments have been a critical partnership to all the stages of the process
2. Most of the productive associations and municipal technicians worked together with the technical team in the design and implementation of the projects, which meant guaranteeing the success of the interventions
3. Following SU-ART joint methodology, the producers have been the central axis and leading actors in the design and implementation of the project.
4. The involvement with the project has been increased because of the commitment of the productive association members, having to finance a 33% counterpart.
5. Constant feedback, coordination and validation of the processes between technical teams, local technicians and producers increased synergies and joint work contributing to more effective and efficient implementation.
6. Setting up the obligations and responsibilities of the multilevel actors from the beginning
7. Working at an executive and technical approach during the implementation of the project with the municipal governments helped in the fulfillment of the milestones thanks to the arisen of corrective measures taken in consensus.
8. Within the framework of the project, organizations were able to provide complementary support to the productive associations.
9. Before we did not prioritize the productive sector, now that it is demonstrated that it contributes directly to the creation of jobs we are interested and committed
10. The UNDP effectively coordinating participation of various products/producers (2)
11. The UNDP complies with the framework agreements signed to implement projects
12. Involvement with cooperating agents, such as KOICA, was timely to directly support producer associations
13. Partnership with Uganda National SMU Centre and National Farmers Leadership Center (NFLC)
14. Use of Parish Development Committees (PDCs) as Planning Structures at the grassroots
 | * Key partners in building the technical capacity of the local villagers in livestock management, agriculture, and disease management
* The active involvement that was had with the technical personnel of the municipalities helped to share tools which have now been incorporated into the municipal governments’ day-to-day
* The participation of public authorities at the national, regional and local level was opportune to strengthen the territorial dialogue and express the difficulties when implementing productive projects.
* Establishment of counterparts has implemented a constant dialogue between producers that strengthen associations and its active participation in the project.
* Confidence building in validation process between producers and technical team has speed up the implementation processes in regard to associations' counterpart.
* The producers who participated in this experience now have knowledge of the planning and implementation process of feasible projects.
* The primary scenario setting (game rules) extended the project's life.
* Have been essential to facilitate the implementation and project selection to be a transparent process
* Promoting a productive territorial network linked to the communitarian economy
* To obtain intergovernmental cooperation to prioritize support in the Local Governments of Tiquipaya and Sacaba, with the policy of "*Compro Boliviano*" and "*Sello Social*".
* Reliable Facilitators of Communities on the SMU Model, Mindset Change and the three Principles
* Community Ownership of the Priority Interventions in the Community Development Plans
* Easy mobilization of communities and local resources
 | 1. Lack of Communication with Donor
2. Delay of the project implementation due to long approval procedures of work plan both in UNDP and LWU.
3. Delays in material procurement (computers and printing.)
4. Confusing between DIM and NIM project management approach leading to slow decisions making process.
5. There is still a lack of knowledge in some producers, on how functioning and decision-making mechanisms work
6. The municipal governments having the SU-ART methodology discourse, still do not express it in their budgeting to meet the demands of the producers.
7. The project could not intervene in all the desired productive associations.
8. Many expectations were generated by producer associations. They hope that at least in another stage they can be contemplated in their financing
9. Technical Support from relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs)
10. The model was not adopted beyond the Ministry of Local Government
 | * They do not have the confidence to present their demands clearly and consistently before their public authorities in the functioning and decision-making mechanisms.
* There are still several demands from producer organizations that are not being addressed in their real dimension, only the most urgent ones are being answered
* Some productive associations showed their discontent with the election of the interventions.
* There were some claims because they could not meet all the demands identified in the municipalities of Tiquipaya and Sacaba
* A number of the MDAs who were also members of the Project Board were not conversant with what was happening under the project
 | * Regular Consultation with Donor
* Promote focused training in leadership issues and organizational strengthening in productive associations.
* Incorporate a specific section of the general project to influence the planning processes of the Municipal Governments, to deepen the support to the productive sector.
* Deepen the training of producers on the need to have a revolving capital fund to meet the emerging demands of the market
* Support associations that could not be assisted
* Have deliberate actions to popularize the model, and/or project beyond the implementing partner
 |
| **4** | **SCORINGS** | **12** | **15** | **6** | **5** | **3** |
| 4 | Administration:1. Timeliness
2. Procedures
3. Funds/budget versus activities
4. HQ Support
5. UNDP HQ coordination
 | 1. M&E
2. The Country office has achieved the execution of funds in the established time on the annual procurement work plan.

 1. Contracting an external procurement supervisor for the specialized purchases.
2. Contracting an in-field administrative assitant.
3. Using internal UN procedures speeded up the processes.
4. Planning and monitoring of the personnel assigned in the territory.
5. Delegation of procurement authority to the Country Office administrative has been a key-point.
6. Positive feedback on the HQ procedures, who were informed on the progress of the project, and supported the transfer of funds from the main fund provider.
7. The proven experience of UNDP - Bolivia, helped to collect the means of verification with rigor, thanks to the operational and administrative procedures with which this institution operates
8. Resource programming did not have important budgetary adjustments, which showed to a large extent a close relationship between planning and execution.
9. Management of the Project through the Program Support Team (PST) at the Ministry with a designated Program Officer & Finance Assistant
10. Consistent support from the UNDP Country Office
 | * Monthly and quarterly basis monitoring to identify and monitor programmatic and operational progress and challenges.
* Annual Project Board Review:
* Lao Women’s Unions developed the monitoring plan and carried out the field monitoring regularly
* A team from the Central and Provincial LWU visited all three districts.
* Project has several tools developed to monitor the progress of the project activities
* Annual Progress Reports: updates on the implementation along with a work plan for the coming year.
* Avoiding having pending payment requests and falling within the project deadline.
* The external supervisor allowed the administration to formulate coherent and technically focused purchases.
* Facilitate the technical-administrative coordination and mandatory to a good implementation of the Project.
* Having the administrative discharge for purchasing allowed to move resources faster and get to the beneficiaries with the specific projects faster
* Project implementation has been in accordance to the work plan.
* Project start, and conclusion deadlines were guaranteed.
* The fulfillment of the milestones of the project was achieved,
* Timely preparation and submission of Physical and Financial Project Report
* Technical Support during planning, implementation and reporting on the Project Interventions
 | 1. Project activities were delayed in the first year and intensively implemented in the second year within a short time frame
2. Frequent Change of person in charge
3. The administrative procedures are very bureaucratic in the Municipal Governments
4. The duration of the project was not enough, because the administrative and legal processes by the Municipal Governments consumed a lot of work of the staff
5. The fund allocated for projects was low in relation to the needs registered by the associations and the number of associations registered in the project launch
6. Working Directly with the Lower Local Governments without direct engagement of the Higher Local Governments
 | * As a result, we will not be able to measure some achievements immediately at the end of the project timeframe and need to follow up future.
* Irregular Reporting
* Delays in the approval of scheduled expenses
* Several associations were not able to participate in the project, due to the availability of resources in the project
* Delay in project implementation and reporting at Local Government Level
 | * To achieve more significant changes in public policies by municipal governments is considered to have at least a 5-year presence
* Generate agreements for allowed and non-admitted expenditures by strategic partners of the project
* Provide a greater allocation of resources according to the beneficiary population and territorial conditions
 |
| **5** | **SCORINGS** | **3** | **3** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| 5\* | Organization of the work:1. Systems
2. Structures
3. Staffing
4. Knowledge/skills
5. Infrastructure
6. Coordination
 | 1. The conformation a unique equip formed by municipality and UNDP technicians.
2. Official delegation of directive and technical team by the mayor.
3. Joint field visits between municipal and UNDP technicians.
 | * Adaptation to the municipality organization and comprehension of the public structure and functioning.
* Involved them to comply with the Project mandate.
* Facilitated the coordination, design and permanent monitoring and evaluation of the projects, being able to apply corrective actions in correct time and form.
 |  |  |  |
| **6** | **SCORINGS** | **10** | **14** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| 6 | Gender mainstreaming:1. Gender in sector policy
2. Gender in activity design
3. Gender in monitoring
4. Gender in reporting
 | 1. Capacity building of local gender sensitive planning.
2. Vocational training targeting female target groups.
3. Women in Development (WID) and Gender and Development (GAD) approach were used throughout the project timeline.
4. The UNDP and Bolivian State gender policies have been taken in account in the implementation of the Project
5. The project contracted a professional to mainstream and include gender approach in producer organizations.
6. The technical contract for gender mainstreaming in the project accompanied all the associations to reflect the lessons learned in this field and periodically reported them.
7. The municipalities prioritized the inclusion of vulnerable sectors, therefore the invitation to productive areas with participation mainly of women is prioritized
8. The projects that the municipal technicians worked in included awareness activities for the inclusion of women in productive processes
9. Direct financing of Women Led Initiatives
10. Affirmative Action on ensuring representation of Women, Youth, Elderly and PWDs at relevant decision-making platforms in the Community
 | * Knowledge on health care and nutrition of females increased.
* Gender sensitive planning knowledge and skills of district and provincial staff strengthened.
* Female head saving groups established and group management skill enhanced.
* Women have better jobs and good business skills and the products are licensed to become one district one products certified by the state authorities.
* Workshops were held to raise awareness and involve women as a vulnerable sector in Bolivian society.
* The project has had broad gender component, as a result many of the associations have incorporated women leadership
* Managerial and awareness work has been done in gender aspects within all associations to enhance the women and youth participation in the associations.
* There are documents reflecting this component and showing how the implementation of the projects in accordance to the gender approaches.
* Project records indicate that more women than men were supported
* Workshops were held on the roles of men and women when caring the family and the economic contribution
* Established a Vocation School to skill the Youth and Women in Luuka, Bukanga S/C, Biwoologoma Village
* Trained over 60 youths and women in tailoring and hair weaving
* Empowered women to actively participate in decision making processes at community level
* Promoted innovations especially in areas such as making of eco-stoves using local resources
 |  |  |  |
| **7** | **SCORINGS** | **2** | **3** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| 7 | Environmental measures through:1. Minimizing risks
2. Mitigating risks
3. Managing risks
 | 1. The design of the projects was made in accordance to the environmental law, and it was mandatory to accomplish some environmental standards to implement the projects.
2. The auditors of the projects carried out permanent follow-ups to verify compliance with environmental regulations, to avoid observations by the Ministry of Environment of the Bolivian State.
 | * Each project had a mitigation and management plan for the waste generated from the production process of the economic units, both in the municipality of Tiquipaya and Sacaba.
* The projects were implemented in accordance to the state law and standards permanently.
* The Municipal Governments have certificates that endorse the application of mitigation measures in their economic activities.
 |  |  |  |
| **8** | **SCORINGS** | **10** | **11** | **2** | **0** | **2** |
| 8 | Capacity Development, e.g.1. Communication/advocacy
2. Training
3. Mentoring
 | 1. Training and workshop for different target groups with appropriated training methodologies.
2. On the job training or learning by doing for female villagers.
3. The training on gender-sensitive planning
4. Study tours with good knowledge application (2)
5. Creation of female owned productive groups is very powerful capacity building approach.
6. The technical capacities of the Municipal Government officials were strengthened to be in dialogue spaces with the producers.
7. The identification of operative processes accelerates the capacity trainings on new technicians (due to constant personnel rotation).
8. Permanent backups of communicative and capacity inputs between the municipalities-UNDP team.
9. Identifying operative processes to contribute to the efficient implementation.
10. Continuous training of community champions and PDCs at NFLC on SMU and Modern Agricultural Technics
 | * Build the capacity of LWU staff, counterparts, and villagers who are involved in the ISNC Project
* RRDPA delivered (ToT) equipped participants with basic knowledge and skills in small business development.
* LWU Conducted TOT participants learned about the operation and management of the village development fund.
* Two staff from the livelihood support centers attended the IT training course in Vientiane Capital where they learn how to use the modern IT facilities
* After this course, these trainers are planning and conducting additional training courses in their target groups which are multiple effects of a single course.
* The results of this course include increased knowledge on gender-sensitive planning methodology among the provincial leaders.
* Bring new idea and apply community driven projects in the target areas.
* Sharing Lessons by Peer Learning
* There are technical data sheets of good practices carried out in economic units
* Added value on municipalities’ public management and communication management, generating continuity and sustainability on the implementation of the Project.
* The instruments used in the projects are being used by the technicians of the municipalities, because they have been quite practical in their use
* Number of SMU Groups increased by 50%;
* Community champions were able to put the new skills into practices and interest other community members to adopt these practices – for example piggery farming using IMO, Rearing exotic Poultry and cross fertilizing with local breeds
 | 1. Low literacy rate among ethnic women prevented female full participation and difficulty in communication during the training and workshops.
2. Lack of fund for follow up and additional supports
 |  | * Develop local and simple communication tools.
* Develop new projects and activities.
 |
| **9** | **SCORINGS** | **15** | **8** | **2** | **2** | **1** |
|  | Sustainability of:a) Systems establishedb) Networks establishedc) Knowledge and skillsd) Existence of exit strategy | 1. Integration of environmental sustainability productions and economic activities.
2. Organized organic farming course
3. Project created local development infrastructure
4. Created village saving groups which will be a long run financial sources and improve the saving attitude of the villagers.
5. Developed the network and linkage with GIZ vocational training program.
6. Female groups have food cooking skills.
7. The tools for the baseline survey, design / implementation of projects were worked and shared with the municipal governments.
8. Alliance with public entities and producers has been basic to promote in-time sustainability after the implementation of the process.
9. Collection of data and lessons learnt for the whole implementation of the projects
10. During the implementation of the project, it was possible to work with public entities and NGOs that will complement the activities programmed in the projects.
11. The exit strategy was aimed at strengthening marketing activities, which were oriented to the participation of productive fairs, provision of productive inputs and assistance in the implementation of some productive processes.
12. To have a designated technician on lessons learnt and data collection was primordial to validate processes and to have a proper feedback.
13. Thanks to the project, we have seen the need to create a platform for productive associations
14. Working through the Lower Local Governments, Parish Development Committees (PDCs), and Community Groups
15. Documentation of Best Practices and Experiences
 | * Aim to contribute to the improvement of social benefit and the local environment.
* These supports will gain the medium- and long-term environmental benefits of organic agriculture.
* Growing its financial capital for various activities. E.g, Community Livestock Bank,
* Articulation of producers with different funding actors may permit further activities complementing the projects, in terms of good manufacturing practices and food safety.
* Maintain an indirect accompaniment could boost the growth in the production of the enterprises with which the Project worked.
* The presidents of associations of producers have held some meetings to analyze these actions and have in these spaces the participation of public and private entities related to the productive sector
* Ownership of Projects at Lower Local Government level and Community Level.
* Published a story book on ISNC Experiences and Best Practices
 | 1. Exit Strategy – there was no clear exit strategy
2. Limited planning for dissemination of knowledge, best practices and experiences of the ISNC
 | * Some of the key project interventions were commenced in the final quartile of the project lifetime
* Not all the stakeholders had access to the Best Practices and Experiences of the ISNC
 | * Have a clear exit strategy for these projects.
 |
| **10** | **SCORINGS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Other items |  |  |  |  |  |

**TYPE B COUNTRIES (MYANMAR, RWANDA, VIETNAM) TOTAL SCORES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEM** | **WHAT WORKED WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **WHAT DID NOT WORK WELL** | **IMPACT/EFFECT** | **PROPOSED CHANGES** |
| **1** | **SCORINGS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Policies, acts, strategies and plans developed |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** | **SCORINGS** | **7** | **5** | **5** | **4** | **6** |
| 2 | Design of intervention, e.g.:1. Project relevance for country
2. Project relevance for 2030 goals
3. Timeframe
4. Approach
5. Budget
 | 1. Avenues for knowledge sharing (2)
2. Engaging youth in Interventions for sustainable development
3. Frame interventions in line with the global aims.
4. To capture experiences, good practice and lessons from UNDP’s experiences in different country contexts.
5. Conflict Sensitive and Social Cohesion Responsive Local Development
6. The timeframes were reasonable
7. Project relevance for country
 | * Unlimited access to knowledge products including best practices and lessons from the knowledge product.
* Promoting knowledge sharing and learning culture among stakeholders (2)
* Mainstreaming environment and climate changes into youth entrepreneur
* Framed a conflict sensitive intervention which national stakeholders found very valuable, given the development assistance going into primarily conflict-affected areas.
* Comparative analysis between Rwanda’s home-grown solutions and ROK’s Saemaul mode
* CoE was a good approach for Rwanda
 | 1. Inadequate attention to consulting national stakeholders during intervention design.
2. The timeframe not ideal for full operationalization of the COP and the online knowledge sharing platform
3. The relevance to SDGs was not so much assessed
4. Budget
5. The implementation arrangement of the project was not well set. Heavy administration process
 | * CO felt pressured to participate.
* The established community and platform might be no longer functional in near future

-* The budget was not sufficient
* Delays in implementing some projects activities. Few activities were implemented at the end of the project
 | * Continued technical assistance and mainstreaming to ensure ISNC elements are reviewed, assessed and promoted after 2020(2)
* Develop strategic action-plan to integrate and role out ISNC spirits in SEDP (2021-2025)
* ISNC should also be promoted in social assistance programs,
* For further utilization of the set community & platform, another follow- up or support would be required in a longer timeframe (3-4 years.)
* Enough funding to ensure the maintenance of interventions beyond the project period.
* Government institution to lead the implementation of all activities and disburse the project cost to Government or partner organization particularly when that organization has a good record for implementing projects. This increase ownership to implementer and it reduces approval process of project activities.
 |
| **3** | **SCORINGS** | **14** | **20** | **2** | **2** | **4** |
| 3 | Involvement of stakeholders:1. Organisation
2. Partnerships
3. Ownership
4. Citizen involvement
5. Type of involvement
 | 1. Participation of stakeholders in design of interventions (2)
2. Stakeholders collected and shared knowledge products. (2)
3. Stakeholders participate in interviewing process for the study report
4. Stakeholders participated in trainings and workshops (2)
5. Partnership worked well, close collaboration with regular follow-up from both ends.
6. Participation of high policy making agencies

1. Partnerships
2. A network was set up of Interested stakeholders
3. Stocktaking exercise of current SMU best practices in combination with a study tour on SMU model
4. Networking (communities, local/central government agencies, private sector, CSOs)
5. Citizen involvement especially at the community level
 | * The intervention had good support from participating national government institutions.
* Understanding the importance of availing knowledge products and knowledge sharing. (2)
* Promote synergies among projects on SMU.
* The interviewees have opportunity to reflect their conflict sensitivity experiences of their organization
* Awareness that staff from different levels should learn
* They got new ideas to integrate
* Resulted in input to the Centre on Excellence as well as establishing a group of active members of the CoPs
* Transparency between donor and UNDP, which resulted in a closure of the project that was good.
* Promote the importance of conflict sensitivity in project management
* Aiming to secure political commitment and support
* Empowered EM to participate and contribute to national policy and program design and implementation (2)
* Evidence of strong commitment to ISNC application (2)
* Organize the partnership building for local implementation promoting the role of women in social-economic development (2017)
* Sound implementation approach, combining lessons learnt from ROK with best practices, delivering buy-in and putting ISNC approaches in place.
* For supporting community driven initiatives formulated and maintained in order to support the implementation of the NTPs 2016-2020.
* Raised awareness showing the needs and measures for tailoring and replicating
* Through TA from ISNC, the new approach of NTP-SPR (2016-2020) have been conducted, which resulted in consensus on the design of NTP-SPR (2016-2020) and its instruction papers.
 | 1. The country level institution and SU project implementers were very focused on implementing the SU model as was
2. Due to limited resources project did not enable the participation of stakeholders on ground.
 | * The ability to influence the SU Myanmar project was limited.
* Difficult to expect the impact of knowledge sharing could trickle down to the stakeholders on ground.
 | * A network of should be established and maintained to most effectively mobilize resources from different sources.
* Stronger buy-in from donor at all levels, with trickle-down messages to country level and project level offices and personnel.
* The project could expand to largely involve diverse group of stakeholders (2)
* Better choice of implementation organization given its relevance
 |
| **4** | **SCORINGS** | **7** | **8** | **2** | **1** | **6** |
| 4 | Administration:1. Timeliness
2. Procedures
3. Funds/budget versus activities
4. HQ Support
5. UNDP HQ coordination
 | 1. The administrative, financial and reporting requirements were fairly simple and straightforward.
2. UNDP took all administration tasks which went well
3. Support received from HQ was helpful, responsive and timely.
4. ISNC approach integrated within the GOVN policy agenda and discourse (2)
5. At the local, delivery-level, the project was co-implemented
6. Implementing unit was well experienced
 | * The CO was able to draw in and align activities and resources to ongoing work plans, without setting-up new projects and accountability systems.
* All administration and logistical support run efficiently in all project activities
* Regional office in Africa was very supportive in knowledge management activities.
* Feedback and advice regarding closing of the project.
* favourable platform for advocating for ISNC with policymakers
* Effectively met the needs and generated changes in mind set and design of PR policies and program.
* Links and feedback mechanism between implementation and policy levels were ensured.
* A network of INSC champions have been established at all levels
 | 1. Inflexibility of budget (2)
 | * More than half of the activities were implemented in the last year with a very packed timeline.
 | * UNDP has practiced needs based technical supports which is very relevant to VN.
* Continue coordination with UNDP, as a good example others
* Context fit is important. then with appropriate support and facilitation.
* The CO would have benefitted from stronger technical advisory support.
* More flexible reallocation of the annual budget to other implementation
* Proper activity procedures and follow up e.g. invitations for workshops.
 |
| **5** | **SCORINGS** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 5\* | Organization of the work:1. Systems
2. Structures
3. Staffing
4. Knowledge/skills
5. Infrastructure
6. Coordination
 | 1. Annual global workshops
 | * Knowledge sharing and networking among project managers of other countries
 | 1. Lacking expertise at the CO level and required much support
 | * Reception of the training elements by stakeholders could have worked better.
 | * More allocation of budget to hire a project manager with the expertise at the CO level.
 |
| **6** | **SCORINGS** | **7** | **5** | **3** | **2** | **2** |
| 6 | Gender mainstreaming:1. Gender in sector policy
2. Gender in activity design
3. Gender in monitoring
4. Gender in reporting
 | 1. In the training, research – gender-conflict interface was included.
2. Gender empowerment was one of the categories of the platform for knowledge sharing.
3. Gender in reporting
4. ISNC project had technical inputs which highlighted gender sensitivity
5. Gender sensitivity is always considered in all project activities both in research and training
6. In Lao the project completed the Country Gender Profile 2017, highlighting key gender issues in various sectors in Lao PDR. The Gender Profile collected data from government agencies and relevant multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, lNGOs, NPAs and research institutes, on gender and development issues and trends, with emphasis on the gender dimension
7. The ISNC project has used gender-sensitive approach for many project activities and created benefits predominantly for women. Key target groups of livelihood or vocational training were women, accounting for 80 percent of the target groups
 | * Awareness about the gender-conflict interface among participating government institutions.
* Stress the importance of gender component into intervention by stakeholders.
* Gender was mainstreamed in the main report by CO.
* Specifically integrated into poverty reduction and sustainable development strategies

-* The information and situation of the gender mainstreaming process of Lao PDR was updated. In addition, LWU as an implementing partner, ensured that women and youth were active participants in the project
* Two livelihood support centers were established with gender libraries accessible to the public audience. These centers also provide consultation service on gender to their clients.
 | 1. While efforts were taken to ensure good gender balance in all training activities, the government’s ministerial structure is fairly male-dominated.
2. Due to the nature of the key output at the CO level incorporation of gender in monitoring was limited
3. Gender mainstreaming wasn’t majorly considered
 | * Low women participation in training activities.
* It could have been minimized the potential participation of women.
* Gender mainstreaming was not achieved
 | * Crossing-issues should be mainstreamed into Government programs/policies
* Systematic inclusion of gender mainstreaming be considered from planning, designing stage of a project.
 |
| **7** | **SCORINGS** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 7 | Environmental measures through:1. Minimizing risks
2. Mitigating risks
3. Managing risks
 | 1. Involving partners could help in managing environmental risks of climate change.
 | * The strength on environmental consideration in the SMU intervention could be promoted.
 | 1. There was no indicator to measure the environment impact or risk.
 | * The impact of the project in the environment could have not been clearly measured.
 | * Systematic inclusion on environment indicators
 |
| **8** | **SCORINGS** | **12** | **13** | **4** | **3** | **7** |
| 8 | Capacity Development, e.g.1. Communication/adv.
2. Training
3. Mentoring
 | 1. Stakeholders conducted and gained skills through capacity building activities (4)
2. Tools for knowledge sharing and experience capitalization were given to stakeholders to apply in their respective organizations
3. Use of resources to develop context specific research products and training materials
4. Trainings enhanced knowledge management,
5. Organizing a series of trainings with same stakeholders.
6. Mentoring from Knowledge Management Specialist.
7. Policy dialogues and papers published on ISNC
8. Policy makers were well-informed in rural development and poverty reduction
9. Generate comparative learning to inform local and community development approaches
 | * Improved skills (2)
* Increased awareness by officials of various contextual issues
* Provide technical support.
* Advocacy for knowledge documentation and allocating budget for activities.
* Ability for UNDP to build credibility as a knowledge organization.
* Requests from other institutions for replicating activities.
* Strong traction and interest from government.

* Understanding was enhanced, and its necessity was realized.
* Provided a good foundation for good discussions and reflection.
* This gave a basis for strong guidance during discussions.
* ISNC best practices were used in design of NTP-SPR 2016-2020
* Changing poverty views from depending on Government supports to promoting their own strengths.
 | 1. It is difficult to sustain interest.
2. Time to practice and understand trained material was limited.
3. The communication about the Centre of Excellence did not have the biggest outreach during the project.
4. Training
 | * Losing traction over the last few months of the intervention due to external circumstances.
* The gained knowledge from the training may not be utilized in their knowledge sharing practice.

(See under Sustainability)* The facilitator was not good at helping learners understand what they should and why
 | * Widen and specify ISNC spirits in social assistance schemes.
* Continued improvement of community leadership training materials and TOT courses in the new context
* on Decentralization, empowerment and democracy
* conduct an assessments and careful design of training plans by an expert
* Better communication and information sharing about the development of the CoE could have helped secure bigger and stronger CoPs.
* Communication: invitations should be sent on time
* Invite a friendly facilitator
 |
| **9** | **SCORINGS** | **4** | **3** | **8** | **4** | **8** |
|  | Sustainability of:a) Systems establishedb) Networks establishedc) Knowledge and skillsd) Existence of exit strategy | 1. Stakeholders gained skills through capacity building workshops on knowledge management.
2. Tools for knowledge sharing and experience capitalization were given to stakeholders to apply in their respective organizations
3. Inter-govt agency associations were created.
4. Sharing of research findings especially at organization strategic planning workshop and partners meetings.
 | * Improved skills in knowledge documentation, community of practices and knowledge management concept.
* Advocacy for knowledge documentation and allocating budget for KM activities.
* Production of 2 research studies in Myanmar language and English; the first indicator framework on conflict sensitivity in Myanmar.
 | 1. Overall project time was spent for activity planning and consultation. More time should have been allocated to the implementation and strengthening the system and network established by the project.
2. Existence if exit strategy
3. It is difficult to sustain interest.
4. Exit strategy was not strategically planned in terms of resources e.g. to support the online center of excellence.
5. Lack of a continuous support to operationalize interventions. E.g. CoE
6. Interventions launched during the end of the project, which created a gap of a continuous support to operationalize e.g. online CoE
7. The contract for the moderator was within the timeline of the project and it affected the operationalization of the online center of excellence
8. Knowledge and skills not at good level
 | * This may hinder the further sustainability of the project.
* Despite stakeholders being involved in CD (communication) sustainability of COP could be impacted.
* Lack of dedicated staff to support operationalization of the online center of excellence.
* Few stakeholders continued to upload knowledge products in online center of excellence.
 | * Institutionalization of ISNC into the Government legal document
* Mainstream ISNC spirits into poverty reduction and social assistance policies and programs (2021-2030)
* Ensure national legal documents (NTP SPR, NTP NRD 2016-2020) are effectively and sustainably implemented in reality.
* Build and link ISNC indicators with SDGs in terms of sustainable poverty reduction/new rural development, climate change responsiveness, environmental protection and inclusive social protection.
* Another phase support would be needed.
* Better and stronger communication and information sharing could have potentially secured a stronger phasing out of the project.
* More could have been done to make use of the momentum of the project duration, to ensure increased ownership of the CoPs even after the ending of the project
* Existence of exit strategy plus ownership
 |
| **10** | **SCORINGS** | **3** | **2** | **0** | **0** | **2** |
| 10 | Other items | 1. The online center of excellence is well designed and is user friendly. Stakeholders were trained on the use of the online center of excellence and attracted attentions of many ministries and NGOs.
2. Community of practice were created based on thematic area for offline and online discussions/workshops
3. With the support of the ISNC component, cross-cutting issues have been raised, discussed, considered by high level policymakers and reflected in the draft documentation, guidelines, M&E framework and implementation handbooks of the two NTPs for the 2016 – 2020 period
 | * Available repository of best practices, toolkits, and lesson learned from projects implemented by NGOs, Government Institutions and Private sector.
* Participants learned approaches for engaging community to sustain projects activities though offline dialogue.
 |  |  | * GOV to develop the new strategy on social protection, including poverty reduction policies within the SP frame in period of 2021-2030.
* UNDP should continue supporting govt. innovative approaches in the new strategy.
 |

**ANNEX 7**

Result Frameworks

**RESULTS FRAMEWORK – CONSOLIDATED TYPE A**

The ISNC project intended to:

(1) identify proven approaches and policy options for inclusive and sustainable local development, drawing on the expertise of *Saemaul a*nd other relevant solutions from development partners, including those from the South;

(2) achieve impact of the integrated local development approaches known as Inclusive and Sustainable New Communities at both the local and national policy levels through its application to an initial set of countries; and

(3) facilitate South-South and Triangular cooperation and knowledge exchange through support to centres of excellence to disseminate evidence-based results and experiences from the initial applications, with the aim of achieving impact at the regional and global levels

Bolivia, Lao PDR and Uganda were selected as Type Acountries

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AREA OF WORK/????** | **DETAILS** | **ACHIEVEMENT UGANDA** | **ACHIVEMENT LAO PDR** | **ACHIEVEMENTS BOLIVIA** |
| Policy work |  |  | * Built on:

7th National Socio-Economic Development Plan, the National Nutrition Policy (2008) and the National Nutrition Strategy and Plan of Action (2010-2015). In particular, the Multi-sectoral (Convergence) Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) Action Plan. |  |
| 1. Introduction
 | Selection of communities | * 15 communities in 3 districts selected
 | * The national Round Table Process helps to bring on board key development stakeholders to consult and exchange ways to address major development issues

This resulted in:* Raised awareness of the existing directives and policy on local empowerment and policy planning including Sam Sang, the NSEDP both 7th and 8th, Food and Nutrition Security Convergence Action, and the new SU implementation by KOICA
 | * UNDP Bolivia partnered with the Ministry of Productive Development and Plural Economy for the project as well as with other ministries such as Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Protection; Ministry of Rural Development and Land Regional Government of Cochabamba (Gobernación) and seven municipalities of the metropolitan area.
* They encourage the participation of civil society, community organizations, indigenous organizations, productive sector, universities, development agencies and the representation of State structures
 |
| Introduction of SMU principles | * Compiled a generic Training Curriculum for Community Leaders on Self-Help, Diligence and Cooperation
 | * Training on inclusive village project implementation and management
* Workshop on understanding village livelihood and access to resources (localizing SDGs)
* Workshop on inclusive development, youth engagement, gender equality and women's empowerment
* Workshop on innovation, appropriate technology, and sustainable village development
* Workshop on youth employability and village livelihood
* Training on inclusive village project implementation and management
* Training courses on Gender Sensitive Planning for provincial and district leaders
 |  |
| Establish village systems and structures | * Increased the number of SMU Champions in the target communities from the initial 15 to include the members of the PDCs and LG Technical Staff
* Programme Implementation was mainstreamed into the existing LG structures
* LG Staff in the host Sub Counties adopted SMU Principles as pillars for Community Driven Development
* Revived the PDCs as integral structures of upstream participatory planning
* Increased interface between the Communities and Lower Local Government (LLG) Staff who periodically attended the PDC Planning meetings
* Established a partnership between NFLC and MoLG to promote SMU, Nationalism and Patriotism through training programs for different actors at all levels in the Local Government Sector.
* Motivation of the SMU Champions in the communities to continue promoting and applying the principles of Self-help, Diligence and Cooperation resulting in increased spirit of volunteerism

The above resulted in:* 200 Active SMU Groups that supported the functions of the PDCs. Of these groups 51% were women.
* 200 SMU groups actively convening planning meetings
* 200 SMU groups carrying out Self-Help Community Activities (cleaning trading centres, cleaning water sources, opening community access roads, constructing kitchens for the elderly and female members) on a voluntary basis
 | * Each village selected their own village representatives to attend the strategic planning workshop in which they were able to identify their communities' priorities and needs
 |  |
| Development of policy briefs | Developed five Policy Briefs on: 1. Financing mechanisms for Community Driven Development initiatives;
2. Reinvigorating grassroots service delivery structures;
3. Re-engineering the role of the Parish Chief as an agent of Local Development and Monitoring;
4. Resuscitating Self-Help, Cooperation and Diligence as critical pillars in the Service Delivery chain; and
5. ISNC-SMU as a vehicle for Wealth Creation at the community level.

Best practices on this were shared as SSC |  |  |
| Creating national-local linkages:* Support Communities, to develop concrete all-inclusive, integrated development strategy of their locality
 | Preparation of village development plans | * 15 Transect Walk Diagrams outlining the characteristics of the communities, opportunities, weaknesses and strengths

These stimulated:* A shared vision for “better living condition” amongst the communities
* Commitments amongst the communities to work towards achieving the shared vision focusing on maximising the existing local resources
* Sensitized 75 men and 25 women on the need for cooperation and collective action as well as need for appropriate platform for dialoguing with the government and other actors
* Held meetings and dialogues at LG level to discuss Community Development Strategies and agree on interventions that shall be financed through the Annual LG Workplans and Budgets

This resulted:* Increase in local Resources mobilized by communities to implement community projects (Case: Vocational School in Maracha where communities mobilised 20,000 Bricks)
 | * Establish village profile constructed for 10 target villages and 3 districts
* The project team completed village need assessment including data collection on small enterprise and one district - one product

This resulted in:* The Gender Information Rooms were equipped with books, materials, and resources which are available to public users
* A total of 923 people (763 males and 160 females) participated in the village road maintenance in the 10 villages. Village contributions included labor, soil, sand, cement and other materials.
* Two Livelihood Support Centers have been established and launched in Saravan and TaOy district. The new centers have clear mandates, roles, and assigned staff and are providing vocational training in weaving, dressmaking, and organic farming.

Training on cooking and food processing using local resources.* About 178 households received goat-raising fund, 199 households for the chicken fund, 3 households pig fund, 58 households the organic farming fund, and 98 households involved in mushroom growing activities
 | * All groups have worked collaboratively to determine the characteristics. They were able to identify that 70 percent of producers (4,311- 40% women and 60% men) in those municipalities live under the poverty line with primary school education. They also identified that local producers face market constraints is selling their produce, low market prices, lack of technical assistance, high costs of production, among others. Based on this analysis, project selection criteria were developed.

This resulted in:* UNDP and KOICA approved 25 productive projects which aim to benefit over 1000 families (2,500 people).
* A Multi-stakeholder working group was created conformed of public (municipalities, departmental government and national government), private (organizations of producers) and social (University of Cochabamba, NGOs) stakeholders.
* In addition, two local groups have been created (in Tiquipaya and Sacaba) and one Departmental Group
 |
| Establishment of systems and structures supporting enhanced living conditions | * Organised the communities in thematic clusters of five priority enterprises namely: Banana, Maize, Rice, Cassava and Piggery.
* Communities begun producing, marketing and addressing challenges together
* Held meetings and dialogues at LG level to discuss Community Development Strategies and agree on interventions that shall be financed through the Annual LG Workplans and Budgets.
* Up to 1,980 (1,002 women and 878 men) community members participated in the joint planning process and development of the Community Development Strategies of their localities

This resulted in:* At least 30% of interventions prioritised by the communities were integrated into the Annual Work Plans for the Sub Counties.
* Increased awareness of the LG Planning and Budgeting Cycle amongst the communities
* Opened over 200kms of Community Access Roads; Cleaned Community Water Sources; Constructed Kitchens for households headed by vulnerable people – elderly & widows through volunteerism
* Formed Cooperatives of Farmers in Maize, Banana, Rice;
* Developed the Maize and Banana Value Chain in Luuka & Bunyangabu respectively – provided bulking centers & milling facilities in Luuka

Direct financing of Women Led Initiatives * Affirmative Action on ensuring representation of Women, Youth, Elderly and PWDs at relevant decision-making platforms in the Community

Resulted in:* Vocational School to provide skills to Youth and Women in Luuka, Bukanga S/C, Biwoologoma Village
* Trained over 60 youths and women in tailoring and hair weaving
* Empowered women to actively participate in decision making processes at community level
* Promoted innovations especially in areas such as making of eco-stoves using local resources
 |  | * Resilient support of infrastructure and equipment was transferred to the family unit and the systematization of the entire project
 |
| Impact at local level* Strengthen community groups to form higher level institutions, e.g. Cooperatives
 |  | * Rapid Appraisal of the existing Community Savings and Credit Initiatives in the Host Sub Counties conducted to assess their functionality and identify existing financial institutions that they can be linked to for financial services
* Developed a Training Curriculum and Training Materials for Community Savings and Credit
* Trained 15 Communities in Community Savings and Credit

Resulted in:* Formed 15 Community Savings and Credit Associations
* 30% increase in number of Community Loans for investment into Income Generating Projects
* Trained the 15 Communities on the Basic Principles of Cooperatives, Advantages and the Process for Establishing a Cooperative

Resulted in: * All the Thematic Clusters were upgraded into Cooperatives (7 Cooperatives were registered)
* Each Host Sub County formed a Savings and Credit Cooperative as the apex body for the Community Savings and Credit Initiatives in their jurisdiction (3 SACCOs at Sub County Level).
 | * Rapid Appraisal of the existing Community Savings and Credit Initiatives in the Host Sub Counties conducted to assess their functionality and identify existing financial institutions that they can be linked to for financial services
* Developed a Training Curriculum and Training Materials for Community Savings and Credit
* Trained 15 Communities in Community Savings and Credit

Resulted in:* Formed 15 Community Savings and Credit Associations
* 30% increase in number of Community Loans for investment into Income Generating Projects
* Trained the 15 Communities on the Basic Principles of Cooperatives, Advantages and the Process for Establishing a Cooperative

Resulted in: * All the Thematic Clusters were upgraded into Cooperatives (7 Cooperatives were registered)

Each Host Sub County formed a Savings and Credit Cooperative as the apex body for the Community Savings and Credit Initiatives in their jurisdiction (3 SACCOs at Sub County Level). | * The leadership school for women and youth in the Sacaba municipality.
 |
| Advocacy/SSC |  | * Published a story book on ISNC Experiences and Best Practices
 |  | * A video has been developed to showcase mechanisms of SSC and lessons learnt. The Government of Ecuador expressed interest in rolling out the ISNC model in its country.
* Impact assessment (15) where the main results appear in accordance with the main indicators, mind set transformation, and lessons learned.
* Case studies on gender mainstreaming efforts in four associations
* The incorporation of the human rights approach was made visible
 |

**RESULTS FRAMEWORK – CONSOLIDATED TYPE B**

**Type B** implementation focused on policy advices and contribute knowledge to the centres of excellence. In addition, develop policy advices, contributing knowledge to the model through centres of excellence, and promoting South-South cooperation (SSC),

Myanmar, Rwanda and Viet Nam were selected as Type B.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AREA OF WORK/????** | **DETAILS** | **ACHIEVEMENT MYANMAR** | **ACHIVEMENT VIET NAM** | **ACHIEVEMENTS RWANDA** |
| Policy advices | Establishing national collaboration and defining needs | * In October 2015, UNDP conducted a workshop aimed at strengthening social cohesion competencies of senior officials of the Ministry of Border Affairs.
* In November 2015, UNDP organized a meeting with the Ministry of Border Affairs on 4 November 2015 in Nay Pyi Taw to discuss and develop an action plan for planned under the ISNC project. UNDP noted high interest from the Ministry of Border Affairs for stronger capacity on social cohesion and conflict sensitivity in local development and poverty eradication programmes In January 2016, UNDP entered the partnership with Alert on technical advisory services for the project.

Resulted in:* Concrete plan of actions developed and agreed upon by both the parties
* In May 2016, the first inter-ministerial meeting on conflict sensitive community development and livelihoods programming was held

Resulted in:* Establishment of an Inter-Ministerial Study Group on Conflict Sensitivity, with 19 representatives from Ministry of Border Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation and Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement.

The study group served as a mechanism for information-sharing and dialogue.  | * Policy makers (the Government, National Assembly, Party’s Committees) are well-informed of self-reliance spirit, community leadership for possible application in rural development and poverty reduction.

Resulted in – at central level:* Awareness and commitment at highest policy level of the country seen in the presidential participation the UN General Assembly side event on ISNC in September 2015
* Passing of 1 resolution and 4 Decisions
* First time 3-5-year national budget for poverty reduction
* Gender (women) cross-cutting First-time issue in all poverty reduction
* Multi-dimensional poverty at National Assembly and GOVN level.

Resulted in – at local level:* Good self-reliance and community mobilization practices identified, supported at local levels in 8 provinces of Viet Nam and consolidated for review and formulation of new NTPs 2016-2020;
* Networks (incl. capacity building) of communities, local/central government agencies, private sector, CSOs for supporting community driven initiatives formulated*.*

ISNC institutionalized for the 1st time in the National Targeted Programs (NTPs) on New Rural Development (Prime Minister’s Decision 1600 on the 16th of August ***2016)*** and on Sustainable Poverty Reduction (Prime Minister’s Decision 1722 on the 2nd of Sep 2016) for the period 2016-2020.Resulted in:* Financial resource: NTP-NRD US$ 8.6 billion, NTP-SPR US$ 2.1 billion (from the State Budget)
* Highlights of the two NTP documents:
	+ Promotion of community strengths (self-help, self-resilience and supportive/ISNC for the poor to escape from poverty by themselves) are emphasized in NTPs framework, component projects, circulars, hand books;
	+ Minimizing subsidy from the Government, replacing by loans;
	+ Placing poor people, ethnic minorities as Programs’ partners, not passive beneficiaries*.*
	+ A separate capacity building component with focus on grass-root democracy and community development
 | * A national forum on ISNC was organized for policy dialogue on ISNC approach vis a vis local solutions and promoting inclusion and community ownership for development.

The participants were orientated on how they can access the grant from National Fund for Environment for green projects |
|  |  | * Initiated and completed a scoping on Myanmar’s good practice and learning from mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development
 |  |  |
|  | Developing effective tools and channels for strengthening leadership capacity at different levels for adaptation, scaling up and institutionalization of the SU |  | * Development of handbook on community leadership and facilitation skills to promote community development for targeted group of community leaders, village heads, farmer group leaders, civil social organizations/associations, etc.
* ISNC Festival piloted the first time at national level.
* A festival promoting ISNC spirit for (women) ethnic minority groups, organized by MOLISA.
* ISNC festival handbook developed by local officers
* Training courses for 19 districts, 19 communes and villages of 08 provinces of community leadership and facilitation skills in NTPs implementation.
* Technical assistance provided to Poverty Reduction Coordination Office (PRCO) – MOLISA to design and conduct TOT training courses for 63 provinces and cities and 710 districts nationwide
 |  |
| Knowledge/advocacy products | Facilitate local, regional, national and international knowledge-sharing | * Initiated and completed a scoping on Myanmar’s good practice and learning from mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development.
* Launch of report of Myanmar’s good practice and learning from mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into local and community development.

The launch event was attended by 75 persons from government institutions, donor organizations, development partners, academics and civil society.* Knowledge-management workshop that presents models, best practices and lessons on facilitating social cohesion through local development

Resulted in:* The knowledge products disseminated to 100 organizations in Myanmar.
 | **Communication/advocacy*** Developed 02 papers with advocacy messages which is used for integration into NTP SPR and NTP NRD 2016-2020.
* Organized technical meetings and discussions about advocacy messages on self-reliance and community mobilization in New Rural Development and Poverty Reduction.
* Developed a detailed component on self-reliance and community mobilization to mainstream into two national targeted programs (Capacity building, monitoring and evaluation and communication for both 02 national targeted programs: New rural development and Poverty reduction).
* Developed of a public communication program on leadership development for promoting and realization of the SU principles of self-help, community mobilization and cooperation.
* Contributed to the communication of good practices during the process of promoting community spirit internally and with other countries within South-South cooperation.
	+ *Policy dialogues in Viet Nam Television: Theme 1 - Stories of rural development in ROK through SU and Theme 2 - Withdrawn experiences and lessons learnt on promoting community spirit for Viet Nam rural development*
	+ *Policy dialogues in Voice of Viet Nam*
	+ *Papers published via newspapers: Community-based rural development - experiences from Viet Nam and Promoting community spirits - theory and practices*
* Key national policy makers attended the training in Samuel Undong Center in ROK and organize study visit for high level decision makers/policy makers to ROK.
* Organized study visits for policy makers (National Assembly, Government and Communist Party) to best-practice models within Viet Nam.

**Training/mentoring*** Developed a training curriculum and capacity building program, based on the best practices learned from ROK and within Viet Nam to contribute to communication of good practices during the process of promoting community spirit internally and with other countries within South-South cooperation
* Piloted the initiative “ethnic minority women economic empowerment” to improve their livelihood and social participation in selected provinces. Key partners include: MOLISA/PRCO, VCCI, CEMA, PRPP province, Youth Union, Women Union, Farmer Association, Mass media), where mentors from enterprises and mentees from local community groups are matched in products’ value chains.
* Provided Training of Trainers (ToTs) and trainings to selected leaders of national and local government institutions, mass and community organizations; and organization of trainings and communication strategy throughout the locations of national targeted
 | * Comparative analysis report on Saemaul projects vis-a-vis Rwanda home-grown solutions. Nine best practices and nine case studies have been produced as part of the study
* The online portal was developed, and stakeholders were trained on the use of online centre of excellence for knowledge sharing
* Organization of an international/ regional conference on lessons learned and sharing best practice on rural and community development in Africa.
 |
| South-South cooperation (SSC)Centre of Excellence | The communication about the Centre of Excellence did not have the biggest outreach during the project |
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