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ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS: COLOMBIA
The Evaluation Office of UNDP conducts independent country-level evaluation called Assessment of Development Results (ADR), to assess the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP’s support and its contributions to the country’s development over a given period of time. The aim of the ADR is to generate lessons for strengthening country-level programming and to contribute to the organization’s effectiveness and substantive accountability.

An ADR was conducted in Colombia covering two country cooperation frameworks from 1998 to 2006. Colombia was selected to undertake an evaluation for a number of reasons: it is a middle income country and UNDP has a portfolio of projects mobilizing a significant amount of third party resources from national and international partners. UNDP in Colombia has interventions contributing to foster democratic governance and poverty reduction in the midst of conflict. The chronic conflict that has affected the country since the 1960s has been fueled by international drug trafficking making peace building initiatives much more complex. Important lessons could be drawn from that experience. In recent years, Colombia has achieved rapid economic growth, which has been amongst the fastest in South America. Despite the economic growth, Colombia faces several challenges related to inequalities among regions and among rural and urban areas. Over 49 percent of Colombia’s population lives in poverty, and 14.7 percent of its people are indigent.

In that context, the evaluation found that overall UNDP has contributed to foster democratic governance and the rule of law, by promoting institutional capacity building of national and sub national institutions, as well as by promoting dialogue among development actors on national needs, including incorporation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) into national planning. However, the evaluation also found that in an effort to generate additional operational resources, and to respond to the demands of government and international agencies, UNDP began expanding its role in development support services (DSS) spreading the portfolio too thinly. This modus operandi carried costs in terms of the programme’s relevance and considerable risks to UNDP’s reputation (mostly by association with DSS activities involving procurement).

The production of national and sub national human development reports in Colombia has helped develop the analytical capacities needed to address sensitive aspects of human development and conflict. These reports have also served as advocacy tools and played an important role in the agenda-setting process in Colombia. A participatory process was followed in the design, production and dissemination of the reports, which proved key in developing national ownership and promoting their use.

UNDP demonstrated considerable leadership in its coordinating role to facilitate the G-24 London-Cartagena forum. Through this venue the Government of Colombia, together with the international community and civil society organizations, discussed crucial peace and development issues and established a development agenda.

The programme of interventions supported by UNDP in Colombia during the period 1998–2006 contributed to development results that strengthened the country’s peace and development process. This ADR identifies risks that should be managed and opportunities that can be pursued to consolidate peace and foster sustainable human development in Colombia.

The evaluation recommends that UNDP concentrate its resources on areas of crucial importance to Colombia, such as democratic governance and peace-building. In doing so, it should draw on its
worldwide expertise and its neutrality, keeping its involvement in development support services to the minimum. UNDP’s credibility is one key asset which must be maintained, and which enhances its effectiveness in politically sensitive areas such as social policy with a human development perspective.

A number of people contributed to this evaluation, particularly the evaluation team composed of Osvaldo Feinstein, team leader, Fernando Medellin, a locally-recruited team member, and Oscar A. Garcia, the Evaluation Office team member and task manager. We would also like to thank Natalia Perez for her background research, and Kutisha Ebron and Anish Pradhan for their administrative support.

The research and preparation of the evaluation was also completed thanks to the collaboration and openness of the staff of the UNDP Country Office in Colombia, led by Resident Representative Bruno Moro and by Country Director Barbara Pesce. I would also like to thank the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, particularly Director Rebeca Grynspan.

This report would not have been possible without the commitment and support of the Government of Colombia. In particular, the evaluation team would like to thank the Agency for Social Action and International Cooperation for its time and insights as the government focal point for the evaluation. The team is also indebted to those representatives from civil society, non-governmental organizations, universities, donor countries, international financial institutions and the United Nations Country Team, who generously gave their time and frank views.

I hope that the findings and recommendations of this report will assist UNDP in responding to the country’s challenges and provide broader lessons that may be of relevance to UNDP and its partners internationally.

Saraswathi Menon
Director, Evaluation Office
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This report presents the findings of an Assessment of Development Results (ADR) for Colombia. The purpose of the ADR was to assess UNDP’s overall performance and contribution to development results as well as to draw lessons for future strategies. Specifically, it analysed programmes and projects undertaken by UNDP in Colombia under the 1998-2006 Country Cooperation Frameworks, with emphasis on 2002-2006 and UNDP’s strategic positioning. The ADR was carried out between May and September 2006. Its results are based on field work that took place during July 2006, in which more than 140 interviews were conducted in Colombia. This was complemented by interviews held at UNDP Headquarters and an extensive and intensive documentation review, as well as a content analysis of the Colombian media.

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY PRACTICE AREA

The activities of UNDP in Colombia were clustered in four practice areas: poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), fostering democratic governance, supporting energy and environment for sustainable development and crisis prevention and recovery.

POVERTY REDUCTION

UNDP has provided valuable support for the measurement and analysis of the Millennium Development Goals at the national, departmental/subnational and municipal levels. This work has been one of the few instances of effective inter-agency coordination. In addition, UNDP played an important role in mainstreaming the MDGs within the Colombian public sector, not only by supporting research and analysis at all three levels of government, but also by assisting in the elaboration of a policy document setting out targets and strategies designed to allow the Government of Colombia to incorporate the MDGs into its national development policies.

A related area of UNDP support has been the development of policy frameworks for poverty reduction and the production and dissemination of several relevant studies dealing with critical poverty reduction issues.

Recommendations. An important task for the UNDP office in Colombia is to disseminate and deepen the debate around the first MDG monitoring report for Colombia, based on the valuable work that has already been done by the Colombian Government with support from the UN system and UNDP.1

The sustainability of UNDP poverty reduction activities depends on future actions, particularly on developing alliances with other development agencies that can build on UNDP’s achievements (especially those organizations of the UN system that are actively involved in the productive sectors, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the UN Industrial Development Organization and the World Bank). UNDP could play a brokering role with these agencies, enabling it to bolster peace and recovery efforts through productive activities and other development projects, thus contributing to greater development effectiveness in Colombia of the UN system as a whole.

UNDP’s relevance could be further enhanced by engaging in a dialogue about the eventual consequences of the government’s social and fiscal policy, which is currently based on a

---

1 According to Colombian Country Office the report was published at the end of 2006 and its launching date is to be agreed upon with the National Government, during 2007.
combination of transfers and subsidies, and whose equity, effectiveness and sustainability is doubtful. UNDP’s perceived neutrality could allow it to enter into, and contribute to, this debate in a way that would not be feasible for the international financial institutions.

Finally, UNDP could draw further from the expertise of its regional and/or international centres, and mobilize South-South cooperation, to provide its country programmes with additional human resources, experience and support that could significantly increase their substantive added value.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE
UNDP contributions to democratic governance in Colombia have focused primarily on improving the monitoring of government decision-making at all levels. The ‘Fight against Corruption’ and ‘Citizens’ Participation’ projects, implemented with the government’s Comptroller General’s Office, provide positive examples of the results of UNDP involvement in public administration reform and anti-corruption efforts. Through these projects, citizens’ ‘Monitoring and Evaluation Committees’ were institutionalized as a form of fiscal control, and ‘Citizens’ Agendas’ became a formal mechanism for the articulation of civil society in social policy.

The persistence of conflict in the country over the last five decades has made peace-building an obligatory component of UNDP interventions in the area of governance. The main UNDP activities in this area during the 2002-2006 programming cycle consisted of four projects under the Reconciliation and Development Programme (REDES). The basic formula of activating civil society, strengthening local governmental institutions and building alliances among local, regional, national and international actors is not entirely new. However, it offers a promising approach for introducing development activities in conflict-ridden areas where the national government has a limited presence and no effective tools for fostering subnational or local development.

UNDP’s capabilities for adding value through technical assistance are greatest at the level of subnational/municipal governments, as the positive results achieved in Bogotá indicate. Outside the city of Bogotá, which is rapidly gaining institutional capacities and expertise, other major metropolitan areas, intermediate cities and rural communities throughout Colombia still have considerable need for UNDP financial management services, technical expertise and knowledge transfers.

Recommendations. With just three years’ experience, replication of the REDES programme is premature. However, results so far are encouraging. Systematic evaluation, at regular intervals, of the REDES approach to peace-building, conflict resolution and strengthening of democratic governance at the local level should be required in the next UNDP programming cycle.

To extend the successes achieved in Bogotá to other regions and localities in Colombia, UNDP should undertake investments in knowledge-creation and in distilling lessons learned from those interventions so as to facilitate their incorporation by local-level planners and decision-makers.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
During the 2002-2006 programming cycle, UNDP’s interventions have aimed to help the Government of Colombia and civil society organizations achieve sustainable development through the effective use and management of the country’s natural resources. UNDP strategies for this area have prioritized environmental governance, climate change, and linkages between sustainable environmental management practices and other biological resources. UNDP’s contribution to results in these areas, however, has been modest and of limited effectiveness. UNDP’s energy and environment programmes were largely demand-driven and more reactive than proactive. Moreover, UNDP was not able to effectively anticipate development challenges in this area. UNDP-Colombia is generally perceived as a resource administrator, and not as a real source of technical expertise with useful knowledge.
relevant to addressing the country’s major sustainable development challenges at the national or subnational levels.

**Recommendations.** Issues related to Colombia’s indigenous populations now form part of UNDP’s energy and environment portfolio. However, there is no evidence that UNDP has developed a systematic strategy towards Colombia’s multi-faceted indigenous problems. Such a strategy would effectively integrate population issues into UNDP’s ongoing conflict-resolution, peace-building, democratic governance and sustainable development programmes. The lack of a comprehensive strategy should be taken into account in the upcoming UNDP country programme.

UNDP should also elaborate a strategy linking natural resource management to conflict prevention. Such an approach would make a significant contribution to knowledge and good practices in this area.

UNDP could also consider sponsoring an analysis of the recently completed US-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, to explore implications of resulting energy and environmental regulations for Colombia’s competitiveness.

Finally, UNDP should take advantage of its neutrality to convene a national dialogue on key environmental and energy challenges to sustainable development in Colombia.

**CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY**

Among the most important UNDP initiatives in this area are those that encouraged peace-building and recovery in several widely dispersed conflict zones (primarily REDES and the landmine programmes), and that attempted to resolve disputes and conflicts affecting the country’s indigenous populations. One result of REDES has been the development of a methodology for fostering peace-building at the local level in Colombia. REDES’ basic strategy involves the activation or mobilization of local actors from both civil society and government through the formation of local associations and networks that facilitate cooperation among civil society groups and between civil society organizations and local governmental officials on subnational and municipal development projects. Initial and still tentative evidence suggests that this approach is helping to reduce local conflicts and to provide alternative mechanisms for dispute resolution. The sustainability of the REDES projects, however, remains to be demonstrated.

So far, UNDP interventions involving indigenous populations have not been incorporated into the REDES programme. And although there are some links between REDES and activities involving landmines and unexploded ordnance, there is a dispersion of activities in this area. This is partly a consequence of UNDP’s reactive approach—that is, trying to respond to multiple demands from different national and international organizations.

**Recommendations.** The next UNDP programming cycle should consider expanding UNDP interventions to the country’s indigenous and Afro-Colombian populations. To guide such efforts, the ADR recommends the elaboration of a strategy for UNDP activities involving Colombia’s indigenous and Afro-Colombian peoples, with particular attention to the integration of these groups within the REDES and landmine programmes.

The prevention strategy covering antipersonnel mines and active abandoned munitions requires more effective coordination within the UN system (especially between UNDP and the UN Children’s Fund) and between the UN system agencies and the Vice Presidency’s Mine Observatory to improve the overall results of the anti-mine campaign.

**CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The excessive use of ‘development support services’ poses a risk to UNDP’s reputation. Colombia is a middle-income country. As a consequence, UNDP core funds have been
limited and have not provided sufficient resources to meet the multidimensional challenges of peace and development in a context of chronic internal armed conflict. (It should be noted that the conflict has been fuelled by international drug trafficking, thus becoming an issue of global public concern.) In an effort to generate additional operational resources, and to respond to the demands of government and international agencies, UNDP began expanding its role in development support services (DSS). In fact, these services were largely administrative in nature rather than development-oriented, and included activities such as procurement and the payment of payrolls. Over the 2001-2006 period, 70 percent of UNDP’s project portfolio in Colombia corresponded to DSS.

While initially successful, this modus operandi carried significant costs in terms of the programme’s relevance and considerable risks to UNDP’s reputation (mostly by association with DSS activities involving procurement). The principal lesson from UNDP’s experience in Colombia is that the incentives to self-finance a country office can lead to an over-expansion of development support services. In the process, UNDP’s development contribution, and its reputation, can be jeopardized, a fact that has yet to be acknowledged by the UNDP office in Colombia.

On the other hand, through such services, UNDP was able to facilitate the operations of several international cooperation agencies—bilaterals but mainly international financial institutions. Indeed, by responding to the demands of government agencies and these international partners, UNDP-Colombia developed a portfolio of 180 projects. However, these projects lacked focus and often had limited relevance to national development priorities.

The production and dissemination of human development reports generated a number of good practices. The production of national and subnational human development reports in Colombia since 2003 has helped develop the analytical capacities needed to address sensitive aspects of human development and conflict. These reports have also served as advocacy tools and played an important role in the agenda-setting process in Colombia. A participatory process was followed in the design, production and dissemination of the reports, which proved key in developing national ownership and promoting their use.

UNDP demonstrated leadership in its coordination of civil society, government and the international community, but played a limited coordination role among UN organizations. UNDP demonstrated considerable leadership in its coordinating role to facilitate the G-24 London-Cartagena forum. Through this venue, the Government of Colombia, together with the international community and civil society organizations, discussed crucial peace and development issues and established a development agenda prioritizing six thematic issues: 1) forests, 2) reintegration of armed combatants into civilian life, 3) productive and alternative development, 4) strengthening the rule of law and human rights, 5) subnational development and peace programmes, and 6) forced displacement and humanitarian assistance. The forum provided a unique platform for dialogue among various social actors, allowing, among other things, a more fluent interaction between civil society organizations, the national government and international cooperation agencies. That said, a frequently cited concern among UN organizations in Colombia was the very limited role that UNDP has played so far in UN system coordination.

UNDP STRATEGIC POSITIONING
In positioning itself for the future, UNDP-Colombia should avoid spreading itself too thinly. Rather, it should concentrate its resources on areas of crucial importance to Colombia, such as peace-building. In doing so, it should draw on its worldwide expertise and its perceived neutrality, keeping to the minimum its involvement in development support services. UNDP’s credibility is one of its key assets, which must be maintained, and which enhances its effectiveness in politically sensitive areas such as social policy.
In light of this credibility, UNDP could also help Colombia close the ‘development information gap’—that is, to overcome the lack of reliable and comprehensive information required to design, implement, monitor and evaluate peace and development policies and interventions. UNDP could further contribute, in partnership with Colombian and international organizations, by cooperating to strengthen Colombian’s statistical system.

To maximize its added value and improve its response to the country’s development needs, the UNDP office in Colombia will have to increase the proportion of staff and consultants with substantive knowledge. At the same time, UNDP-Colombia should rely more heavily on UNDP’s global knowledge network to strengthen its development effectiveness.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION
UNDP interventions in Colombia have lacked an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system. It would be worthwhile for UNDP-Colombia to ensure that its new operations include adequate provisions for monitoring and evaluation as part of their design, and that such systems are implemented. Furthermore, the terms of reference for completion of interim implementation reports should include an explicit request to consider the role of UNDP in the intervention. Finally, a programme of outcome evaluations should be developed and implemented by the country office in Colombia.

UNDP PRESENCE AT THE SUBNATIONAL LEVEL
UNDP has undertaken a decentralization process in Colombia by creating subnational offices (two of which are still functioning). The Manizales and the Cartagena offices have become a focal point for development initiatives in each region, involving local institutions from both the private and the public sector, including universities and municipal governments. However, the potential of the subnational office model for effective coordination of UN-system activities in Colombia has been exploited only to a limited extent. In the future, Colombia’s subnational offices could play a much more important role in the coordination of the UN system.

SUMMING UP
The programme of interventions supported by UNDP in Colombia during the period 2002-2006 contributed to development results that strengthened the country’s peace and development process. This ADR identifies risks that should be managed and opportunities that can be pursued to consolidate peace and foster sustainable human development in Colombia.
Assessments of Development Results (ADR) are independent evaluations that assess UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level. They seek to ensure UNDP’s accountability as a development organization, provide an evidence base for learning on substantive matters, and support programming at the country-office level.

In the case of Colombia, a key challenge is fostering human development in a conflict situation. This is discussed in the second part of this chapter, after a brief presentation of the objectives and methodology of the ADR. Chapter 2 analyses UNDP’s strategic positioning in Colombia and summarizes development results in four thematic areas: democratic governance, poverty reduction, energy and environment, and crisis prevention and recovery. Chapter 3 presents the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from UNDP’s experience in Colombia.

1.1 OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH OF THE COLOMBIA ADR

Colombia was selected as an ADR topic in 2006 for several reasons. First, UNDP’s programme in Colombia is important in terms of its success in resource mobilization. Additionally, it has contributed to democratic governance and poverty reduction in a country characterized by chronic conflict. Important lessons can be drawn from this experience and applied to other conflict-ridden countries and regions. (It should be noted that Colombia was not included in a 2002 evaluation of the role of UNDP in crisis and post conflict-situations.) Second, the completion of the 2002–2006 Country Cooperation Framework presents an opportunity to evaluate the achievements and results of UNDP activities in Colombia over the recent and earlier programme cycles. Third, the findings of this evaluation will provide valuable inputs in the formulation of the 2008–2011 Country Programme for Colombia within the context of the new United Nations Development Assistance Framework. And finally, the appointment in early 2006 of a new UNDP Resident Representative in Colombia provides an opportunity to enhance accountability in future UNDP programmes and to facilitate learning based on UNDP experiences.

The evaluation has two primary objectives: 1) to analyse the extent to which UNDP has positioned itself strategically in Colombia to add value in response to national needs and changes in the national development context, and 2) to provide an overall assessment of development results achieved through direct UNDP support and through UNDP partnerships with other key development actors. Based on this analysis of positioning and achievements, the evaluation then summarizes the principal findings, draws key lessons and highlights major recommendations.

The questions guiding this evaluation are as follows:

- What significant changes have taken place at the national and subnational level in the four UNDP programme areas: democratic governance, poverty reduction, energy and environment, and crisis prevention and recovery?
- What are the achievements of UNDP interventions in these areas?

---

Which are the limitations of those interventions?

What are the foreseen and unforeseen changes, both positive and negative, that affected UNDP’s interventions?

What lessons have emerged from UNDP’s experience in Colombia?

These questions, combined with the standard evaluation criteria presented below, are used to systematically explore the four thematic areas outlined above.

The internationally accepted evaluation criteria used by the ADR are:

- **Relevance**: the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and the policies of partners and donors.

- **Effectiveness**: the extent to which the objectives of the interventions were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

- **Efficiency**: a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.

- **Sustainability**: the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed.

The ADR is based on field work that took place in Colombia during July 2006. A participatory approach was adopted, involving key stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process (for details about the methodology used, see Annex 1). The field work was complemented by interviews held at UNDP Headquarters, an extensive and intensive documentation review and a media analysis of UNDP in Colombia (see Annexes 2 and 3 for a list of people and documents consulted, and Annex 4 for a description of and findings from the media analysis).

### 1.2 COUNTRY CONTEXT

This section provides a brief overview of Colombia to clarify the context in which UNDP operated during the 2002-2006 programming cycle. It does not attempt to represent the rich and complex reality of the country, but rather focuses on a few key facts that may be useful in contextualizing UNDP’s interventions.

#### 1.2.1 THE LAND AND ITS PEOPLE

Colombia is located in the northwestern corner of South America, and has a total area of over 1 million square kilometres. The country shares borders with Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Panama. According to the 2005 census, Colombia’s total population is 41.2 million—the third most populous country in Latin America. Over 3 million Colombians live abroad (Colombia’s Central Bank estimated that remittances represented 3.2 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) in 2004), and nearly the same number have been displaced from their homes. Colombia is among three countries in the world with the highest numbers of internally displaced persons (IDPs), and it has the largest number of IDPs in Latin America. Colombia’s annual population growth rate is currently estimated at 1.02 percent, half the 1985 rate. Blacks (or Afro-Colombians) represent 8 percent of the country’s total population. Like the country’s indigenous groups (less than 1 percent of the population), Afro-Colombians are among the poorest segments of Colombian society.

Colombia ranks 70 out of 177 countries in the 2006 human development index (HDI). It is categorized

---


as a ‘medium human development’ country, with a life expectancy at birth of 72.6 years, an adult literacy rate of 92.8 percent, and a HDI value of 0.790, which is below that of Latin America and the Caribbean as a whole (0.795).

Colombia is a democratic State, organized as a single republic. It is decentralized, with autonomous territorial entities divided into 32 departments, 4 special districts (Bogotá, Cartagena, Santa Marta and Barranquilla) and 1,120 municipalities.⁶

### 1.2.2 ECONOMIC GROWTH AND IMPACT ON THE POOR

During 2001–2005, economic growth accelerated in Colombia, inflation declined and the value of its currency appreciated (see Table 1). During this period, unemployment decreased from 15.7 percent in 2002 to 11.8 percent in 2005. In 2005, the consolidated public sector registered a fiscal balance, which had not been achieved since 1994.

Although Colombia’s economic achievements over the last five years have been impressive, some academic and opinion leaders regard the results as unsatisfactory, considering the pace of regional economic expansion. A report from the Comptroller General’s Office and the National University of Colombia⁷ concludes that, during this period, the government benefited from favourable external circumstances that are unlikely to occur again (high prices for coffee, coal and ferror nickel, among other Colombian exports) and that, given this extremely positive set of external factors, results could have been much better.

---

Table 1. Economic indicators for Colombia, 2001–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>2001⁶</th>
<th>2002⁶</th>
<th>2003⁶</th>
<th>2004⁶</th>
<th>2005⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP at market prices (trillions of Colombian pesos)</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>254.4</td>
<td>283.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (US$ billions)</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>122.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP growth (%)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer price inflation (average; %)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports of goods fob (US$ millions)</td>
<td>12,848.0</td>
<td>12,315.0</td>
<td>13,813.0</td>
<td>17,225.0</td>
<td>21,726.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports of goods fob (US$ millions)</td>
<td>12,268.0</td>
<td>12,079.0</td>
<td>13,257.0</td>
<td>15,878.0</td>
<td>20,132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current-account balance (US$ millions)</td>
<td>-1,088.0</td>
<td>-1,359.0</td>
<td>-974.0</td>
<td>-938.0</td>
<td>-1,931.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-exchange reserves excluding gold (US$ millions)</td>
<td>10,154.0</td>
<td>10,732.0</td>
<td>10,784.0</td>
<td>13,394.0</td>
<td>14,787.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total external debt (US$ billions)</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>34.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt-service ration, paid (%)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>39.3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate (average) Colombian pesos: US$</td>
<td>2,299.9</td>
<td>2,504.7</td>
<td>2,877.5</td>
<td>2,628.4</td>
<td>2,321.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 49 percent of Colombia’s population live in poverty, and 14.7 percent of its people are indigent.\(^8\) The poverty index in the rural sector is 1.5 times greater than in the urban sector, while rural indigence is 2.2 times greater than in the urban sector.\(^9\)

Over the past few years, debate has been heated over the various approaches used to measure poverty, indigence and exclusion in Colombia.\(^10\) According to the national government, based on information provided by its ‘Mission Against Poverty’ report, the number of people living below the poverty line was reduced by 7.8 percentage points between 2002 and 2005, reaching 49.2 percent (an alternative estimate of 64 percent will be discussed in Chapter 2). Similarly, the share of indigent people declined from 20.7 percent in 2002 to 14.7 percent in 2005. During the last several years there were advances in the fight against inequality, poverty and exclusion, with a reduction in the Gini coefficient from 0.57 in 2002 to 0.55 in 2005. Nevertheless, according to the ‘Mission against Poverty’, Colombian society faces the challenge of further reducing indigence and poverty both in rural and urban areas.

A report from the Comptroller General’s Office and the National University of Colombia indicated that inequality and poverty will not be reduced substantially in Colombia if economic growth is not accompanied by effective measures to improve income distribution. The report also noted that growth is dependent on reducing the high concentration of rural and urban land in the hands of a few wealthy landowners and on democratizing capital markets.\(^11\)

### 1.2.3 INTERNAL CONFLICT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Since the 1940s, Colombia has suffered from serious internal violence. Guerrilla groups became active in the mid-1960s, and since the 1980s, three additional factors have come into play: paramilitary groups (or illegal defence forces), illegal crops in zones controlled by guerrillas or paramilitary fronts (which created even more conflict in order to obtain control over these areas), and drug trafficking, which provides important resources for combatants and also affects Colombia’s public life (that is, politics and the judicial system, among other areas). Violence in Colombia has also hampered the country’s development. The 2003 national human development report, entitled Colombia’s Conflict: Deadlock with a Way Out, introduced a human development index adjusted for violence. When considering a fourth variable (rate of homicides) to the index, the value of Colombia’s HDI fell from 0.772 to 0.643.\(^12\)

The first peace negotiations with guerrilla groups took place between 1982 and 1986, resulting in the demobilization of 4,000 combatants during 1986-1990. With the goal of changing the Constitution, a referendum was carried out in 1990 for the democratic election of a Constitutional Assembly.

Between 1989 and 1994, most of the guerrilla movements forged agreements with the State. Still active are the Armed Revolutionary Forces of Colombia—People’s Army (FARC-EP)—and the National Liberation Army (ELN), both of which originated in the mid-1960s.

Between 1998 and 2002, a dialogue began with insurgent groups in Colombia and, especially,
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8 Department of National Planning. 2006. ‘Results balance for the 2005 National Development Plan’. Indigence refers to those living below the ‘indigence line’, that is, people whose income is below the cost of a food basket that satisfies the minimum nutritional requirements of a household.

9 Department of National Planning. 2006. ‘Visión Colombia 2019’.


with the FARC-EP. The humanitarian situation in Colombia worsened as the negotiation process ensued, exacerbated by difficult social conditions, an economic recession in 1999, and serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law.

The peace process ended in 2002. The ‘democratic security’ policy became a pillar of Álvaro Uribe’s presidential campaign, and he won in the first round of elections with 53 percent of the votes. The first period of the Uribe presidency (2002–2006) strengthened military action against illegally armed groups (guerrillas and the paramilitary). Progress was also made in the parallel development of a peace and demobilization process of the paramilitary structures (which had increased in strength over the last ten years).

In comparing the human rights situation of 2005 with that of 2002, official data show that homicides were reduced by 37 percent, the number of massacre victims declined by 82 percent, kidnappings decreased by 78 percent, forced displacement was down by 51 percent, and attacks on small towns decreased by 94 percent. On the other hand, accidents and victims of antipersonnel mines and abandoned active munitions grew continuously from 2000 to 2006.

Over this period, nearly 42,000 combatants abandoned their weapons. And, in 2005, the Colombian Congress issued Law 975 on ‘justice and peace’, which enabled former members of illegally organized forces to integrate into civil society. Despite these positive trends, tensions developed between the national government, human rights organizations and some agencies of the United Nations during the period 2002–2006 as a result of reports on Colombia’s human rights situation (including those issued by Human Rights Watch and the Colombian Commission for Human Rights, among others).

The human rights crisis in Colombia still exists, manifest in part by extreme inequality and political exclusion. Human rights organizations also claim that the democratic security policy and acts carried out by the armed forces have seriously affected the civilian population. In response, the Government of Colombia has expressed the desire to forge a relationship with international agencies based on cooperation, “mutual consultation and agreement” on human rights issues.

In this context it should be noted that, in 2005, over two thirds of the world’s supply of cocaine (640 tons) originated from crops in Colombia. Moreover, such crops were distributed through 23 of the 32 departments in the country. International drug trafficking has exacerbated the conflict in Colombia for several reasons: because 1) it provides resources to violent groups, 2) it supports the illegal activities of those who participate in the drug business under the ‘protection’ of armed groups, and 3) it promotes among revolutionary or anti-insurgent organizations the adoption of methods and practices associated with the drug industry. It has also become an issue of global public concern.

13 See the report of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Colombia for 2005.
This chapter discusses UNDP’s strategic positioning in Colombia, taking into account the country context and results achieved in four thematic areas.

2.1 UNDP’S STRATEGIC POSITIONING IN COLOMBIA

UNDP has been an active development partner in Colombia since 1974. The UNDP country office in Colombia is one of the largest in the world in terms of delivery, with a long history of addressing the country’s main development challenges. In the last eight years, UNDP has responded to the demands of its Colombian counterparts by sponsoring directly and/or supporting a broad and diverse portfolio of projects. During the period under review, the UNDP country office averaged more than 100 projects a year; as of December 2004, it had reached a total of 211 active projects with an annual delivery of $144 million. Both types of projects fall within the main programming areas of UNDP, according to the Multi-year Funding Framework, which identifies five global goals or practice areas and 33 service lines. Each UNDP country office selects the priority goals and service lines through which it proposes to achieve results. The goals and service lines chosen in Colombia for the 2002-2006 programme cycle are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Service lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and reducing human poverty</td>
<td>Service line 1.1  MDG country reporting and poverty monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 1.3  Local poverty initiatives, including microfinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 1.5  Private sector development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 1.6  Gender mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fostering democratic governance</td>
<td>Service line 2.6  Decentralization, local governance and urban/rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 2.7  Public administration reform and anti-corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Energy and environment for sustainable development</td>
<td>Service line 3.5  Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 3.6  National/sectoral policy and planning to control emissions of ozone-depleting substances and persistent organic pollutants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crisis prevention and recovery</td>
<td>Service line 4.1  Conflict prevention and peace-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service line 4.2  Recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the contributions of UNDP in each practice area is presented in section 2.3 of this chapter. The evaluation concentrated on three main modalities of intervention provided by UNDP-Colombia: 1) development support services, 2) advisory and knowledge-based services, and 3) coordination and facilitation.

2.1.1 RELEVANCE OF THE UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME

In assessing the relevance of UNDP’s country programme, it is necessary to first consider Colombia’s national development priorities as defined by the government’s 2002 National Development Plan.19 The main objectives were as follows:

1. Overcome the violence imposed by different criminal organizations in Colombia.
2. Restore economic growth and reduce the fiscal gap in order to reduce poverty and improve the country’s worsening social indicators.
3. Address the lack of a social safety net to protect the poorest sectors of society.
4. Address the erosion of public confidence in the capacity of the state to respond to society’s basic needs.

To achieve these priorities, the Government of Colombia outlined the following policy objectives in its development plan:

1. Strengthen democratic security.
2. Promote sustainable economic growth and job creation.
3. Increase social equality by improving the quality of social expenditure.
4. Enhance the state’s transparency and efficiency.

According to a study carried out by the UN system in 2001,20 Colombia faced a situation of extreme economic, social and political exclusion that hindered the emergence of a culture conducive to peaceful resolution of the country’s problems. The UN assessment stated that the absence of a civic culture founded on full respect for human rights was the primary obstacle to peace and harmonious relations in Colombia, to economic growth and to reasonable conditions for development.

This diagnosis of Colombia’s main development problems differed from that of the government, which was put forward in its National Development Plan. These differences in emphasis are important to note since national development needs do not always coincide with the government’s priorities or the priorities identified by international cooperation.

UNDP’s perspective on Colombia’s national development priorities was in basic alignment with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), but it adopted a slightly different approach. The main priority for UNDP in Colombia was identified in the UNDAF as peace-building and reconciliation. UNDP proposed to achieve this goal by promoting poverty reduction initiatives, generating conditions for local development and for peaceful resolution of conflicts, and by fostering respect for human rights, democratic governance and the rule of law.

Some discrepancies in the government’s national development priorities and those articulated by the UN system and by UNDP were apparent at the outset of the 2002-2006 UNDP programming cycle. However, these discrepancies did not prevent UNDP from undertaking interventions that were also highly relevant to the government’s overall development goals for that period. At the same time, demands from different government agencies, along with the need to make the UNDP office financially self-sufficient, led to the dispersion of UNDP’s interventions, some of which were relevant to neither the priorities of the government or UNDP. This issue is discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

2.1.2 CONTRIBUTION OF THE UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME

At the time that UNDP’s programme was being formulated, the debate over the exact extent of poverty in Colombia was heated and intense. UNDP contributed to Colombia’s ‘Mission against Poverty’ report by bringing international expertise on poverty measurement to Colombia to help clarify some of the crucial technical issues surrounding the debate. UNDP also supported government initiatives by helping to design social safety nets that targeted Colombia’s indigent population. And from the very outset of the 2002-2006 programming cycle, UNDP stressed the need to develop policies that specifically target the poorest segments of Colombian society (though UNDP did not, directly, contribute to reducing unemployment).

Despite some differences in priorities and approach between UNDP and the Government of Colombia, UNDP’s interventions in the area of poverty reduction were relevant to national development priorities, with some exceptions. As far as overall impact, the Government of Colombia claims that economic growth increased and that poverty and inequality were reduced over the period 2002-2006 (see Figures 1, 2 and 3), though it is impossible to attribute the impact resulting from UNDP assistance.

UNDP’s interventions in the area of democratic governance during the 2002-2006 programming cycle focused on institution-building. Activities at the national level, aimed at increasing the effectiveness of the State, were often substantially funded by resources provided to the Government of Colombia by the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank. A second set of UNDP interventions concentrated on giving voice to Colombia’s poor and on improving the accountability of local governments. Finally, a third set of interventions sought to foster more effective control of corruption, through the regalías (royalties corresponding to oil exports, transferred from the central to the subnational government) project and anti-corruption initiatives sponsored by the Vice-President’s Office. Independent of their effectiveness in terms of results (as discussed in section 2.3.1), these various UNDP interventions at different levels of
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**Figure 1. Growth in Colombia’s gross domestic product, 1995-2005**
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government in Colombia were relevant to the Government of Colombia’s stated development priorities during the 2002-2006 period. And while it is impossible to measure their impact on development outcomes, the Government of Colombia has cited progress in the area of democratic governance over the period in which UNDP contributed using governance indicators developed by the World Bank Institute (see Figure 4).21

2.2 DEVELOPMENT RESULTS BY MODALITY OF OPERATION

2.2.1 DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Between 1998 and 2004, 70 percent of UNDP’s project portfolio in Colombia fell into the category of development support services (DSS), resulting in an average delivery of $130 million a year. These services, largely geared towards resource administration and procurement, generated substantial income for the country office. However, in most cases they were more administrative than development-oriented, and were eventually called into question by the government.

In 2004, the Government of Colombia, through the Attorney General’s Office (Procuraduría), looked into the country’s Basic Standard Agreement with UNDP, which set out the model of national execution. The agreement was challenged on the grounds that some government agencies, by availing themselves of UNDP’s special legal status, were avoiding national contracting laws that regulated procurement involving the use of government funds. If the government had demanded the strict application of Colombian contracting laws for all UNDP’s procurement activities, such a decision would have deprived the UNDP country office of its primary source of cost-sharing contributions. Instead, negotiations with the government ultimately produced an agreement in which UNDP is expected to keep the terms of the original agreement and provide technical assistance in all its present and future development activities.

During this same period (2004), an internal study by the UNDP country office concluded that the UNDP portfolio: 1) was largely demand-driven, with no significant added value in terms of development, 2) involved too many projects and thematic areas, 3) posed numerous unidentified risks, and 4) contained no cost-benefit analysis.

**Figure 4. Progress in governance in Colombia, 2000-2005**
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In addition, the office was seen to be operationally weak, to have limited monitoring and evaluation capabilities and to suffer from poor-quality project formulation. A strategic review of the portfolio was undertaken to refocus UNDP activities in the country on fewer thematic areas and clients, to reduce potential risks, and to rationalize the number of projects and the workloads of programme officers. An action plan was developed and UNDP’s portfolio was restructured, declining from 211 projects at the end of 2004 to 168 projects in December 2005. Total UNDP delivery was correspondingly reduced from $153 million at end 2004 to $98 million at end 2005 and was concentrated in the following five areas:

1. Local development, including crisis prevention and recovery as well as peace-building activities
2. Public administration and reform, covering the main projects for democratic governance
3. Institutional development financed by international financial institutions, also in the area of democratic governance
4. Energy and environment
5. Poverty reduction and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
Results and risks. The evaluation team verified through its interviews and documentation review that national counterparts perceive that UNDP is providing good operational support for resource administration through development support services, although some delays were cited. An example of UNDP’s positive role in this area was its management of funds and ancillary support services for the city of Bogotá in the implementation of the Transmilenio—a mass transit system that carries more than 2.7 million passengers daily via a surface metro system, significantly reducing commuting time. A second example cited was UNDP’s support for the reconstruction of the Coffee Zone (El Eje Cafetero) following the 1998 earthquake in Armenia, Colombia. This ambitious undertaking involved the construction of 36,000 new houses, the repair and restoration of 90,000 homes and the construction of more than 1,800 facilities, including schools, hospitals and parks. Furthermore, the modernization of the State Comptroller (Contraloria) may not have been possible without UNDP’s participation. The project involved the development and implementation of online communications throughout Colombia that connected local and departmental-level Comptroller’s offices with the State Comptroller in Bogotá for the first time. The new system also enabled citizens to register complaints electronically regarding potential corruption cases, thereby enhancing social fiscal control of public expenditure and investment.

Such activities, and other projects carried out over the 2002-2006 period, developed largely in response to the demands of several government as well as international cooperation agencies. At the same time, some operations, including procurement and the financing of payrolls of state agencies, also exposed UNDP to unnecessary risks to its reputation. (Figure 6 illustrates the causal chain of risks to UNDP’s reputation.)

Such risks were confirmed by a recent analysis of media coverage of UNDP in Colombia over the period 2002-2006 (see Annex 4), which suggested that procurement was a particular area of vulnerability for UNDP in terms of public perception. The area in which press coverage was unfavourable to UNDP was that of procurement, for which 50 percent of the messages indicated that ‘UNDP permits corruption’. Though 29 percent of the messages highlighted the positive response by UNDP, in ‘correcting mistakes’, procurement is clearly a high-risk area that could result in a severe damage to UNDP’s reputation.

A 2002 Internal Audit Report, commissioned by UNDP Headquarters, had already pointed out that procurement was a weak area in the Colombia country office. So, given this context, to engage heavily in development support services could easily have jeopardized UNDP’s perceived neutrality and transparency, which is especially important given the intensity of the conflict situation in Colombia. However, there is no evidence that these risks to its reputation were acknowledged by the country office. An effort to realign the UNDP portfolio in Colombia was initiated in 2004, but this process of realignment...
needs further emphasis to increase its focus on the country’s development priorities.

In the newly distributed portfolio, following revisions made in 2004, the current average number of projects per programme officer is 23, with an average expenditure per officer of $19.6 million. Moreover, in light of the fact that small projects require essentially the same amount of operational activity as do larger ones, this project load has adversely affected the quality of the follow-up provided by each programme officer. It has also limited the country office’s ability to deliver follow-up services in general. (This was confirmed by a customer satisfaction survey among a sample of stakeholders conducted by the UNDP country office in 2005.) Project counterparts repeatedly complained about the high turnover in the UNDP country office, which may be attributed in part to heavy workloads. Counterparts also indicated to the ADR mission that UNDP staff in the country office had limited problem-solving skills and only seldom were able to provide technical assistance.

2.2.2 ADVISORY AND KNOWLEDGE-BASED SERVICES

Official development assistance in Colombia represents only 0.3 percent of GDP. Given this very modest contribution in external financing, international cooperation as a whole, and UNDP’s contribution in particular, should primarily highlight knowledge-sharing and the normative role that the UN system plays in promoting the UN Charter, the mandate for human development, the MDGs and other international conventions and protocols.

Four of UNDP’s interventions in Colombia underscore its normative role in promoting respect for human life and human rights: the preparation and publication of the 2003 national human development report, on the theme of conflict; the institutional strengthening of the Personería of Bogotá as a way to protect citizens’ rights from the actions of local government; the setting up and support of the National Programme for Human Development; and the work carried out through the Local Governance with Assets of Citizenship programme.

The production of national human development reports has helped to develop the analytical capacities the country needs to address sensitive human development issues. These reports have also served as advocacy tools and played an important role in the agenda-setting process. Part of the success of the reports, particularly the 2003 report, lies in the participatory approach that was used in their design, production and dissemination. Indeed, these broad-based consultations proved to be key in developing ownership of the reports and to promote their use. (For a list of other good practices, see Box 1.)

### Box 1. Good practices used in the 2003 national human development report for Colombia

- Identification of a niche or issue relevant to the country and an approach that reinforces UNDP’s perspective
- High academic and research standards with a careful use of data and evidence
- Participatory processes, including consultations with a broad range of development actors, to reflect different perspectives and concerns regarding the selected issue before, during and after the launch of the reports
- Use of accessible language to communicate with a broad audience
- Constructive relationships with the government that simultaneously permit maintenance of the intellectual independence of the reports while commanding official attention to the issues covered in them
- Practical public policy recommendations
- An active dissemination campaign starting at the outset of the process and involving broad consultation.
A second example of UNDP’s effectiveness in delivering advisory services to Colombia is its support to the Personería of Bogotá. Like an ombudsperson, the Personero is responsible for monitoring human rights and protecting citizens from the arbitrary actions of local government in the Federal District of Bogotá. UNDP provided technical assistance for the reorganization of the Personero’s office and operations, with particular attention to the office’s role in the defence of economic, social and cultural rights.

A third example is UNDP’s technical assistance to Colombia in the establishment, in 1998, of an analytical unit within Colombia’s National Planning Department. This initiative, known as the National Programme for Human Development, has functioned continuously since 1998 with UNDP support, and is jointly funded by the National Planning Department, the Colombian Agency for International Cooperation and UNDP. The programme was initially responsible for the national human development reports and has been carrying out research and producing and disseminating analytical reports, including the ‘Mission against Poverty’, in order to orient and monitor social policies.

The experience of UNDP in Colombia shows that humanitarian crises brought about by violent conflict require direct interventions at the local level to effectively address victims’ basic needs. Thus, UNDP has aimed to strengthen local democratic governance by building local institutional capacities, empowering civil society organizations and fostering dialogue among development actors to mitigate, if not prevent, the devastating effects of conflict. The programme on Local Governance with Assets of Citizenship, launched initially in Cartagena, Bolivar, and Soacha, Cundinamarca (cities with large populations of internally displaced persons), exemplifies this type of UNDP intervention. Among other things, the programme seeks to channel the results of ‘governance dialogues’ it sponsors into productive and sustainable responses to the development needs of affected regions.

UNDP has contributed significantly to the production of relevant analyses and knowledge to improve the situation of human development in Colombia. Its role as a provider of technical assistance with valuable expertise in the areas of democratic governance, crisis prevention and recovery is recognized in Colombia. Nevertheless, UNDP-Colombia does not fully utilize its resources as a global knowledge network. Moreover, the quality of the technical assistance provided varies greatly according to the level of expertise, experience and proficiency of the individual programme officers involved.

2.2.3 COORDINATION AND FACILITATION

A key role for UNDP in Colombia is that of a coordinator and facilitator of dialogue. The role is enhanced by the organization’s reputation as a neutral and impartial partner, which gives it prestige and legitimacy among subnational, national and international development partners. In Colombia, UNDP has the potential to perform this role at three levels: 1) ‘horizontally’, between different sectors and players, such as central government institutions, private sector organizations, churches and international donors (for example, in roundtables organized by the G-24), 2) ‘vertically’, between central, departmental and municipal governmental entities (as in the reconstruction of Armenia), and 3) internally, among the 21 UN agencies active in Colombia.

UNDP’s capacity for horizontal cooperation was demonstrated in its leadership in coordinating the G-24 London-Cartagena forum. Through this process, the Government of Colombia, jointly with the international community and civil society organizations, discussed crucial peace and development issues and established a development agenda prioritizing six thematic issues. These included: 1) forests, 2) reintegretion of armed combatants into civilian life, 3) productive and alternative development, 4) strengthening the rule of law and human rights, 5) subnational development and peace programmes, and 6) forced displacement and humanitarian assistance. The forum has provided a platform for dialogue among various...
social actors, allowing, among other things, a more fluent interaction between civil society organizations, the government and international cooperation agencies.\(^{23}\)

UNDP’s role in facilitating horizontal coordination was also demonstrated in cities such as Manizales and San Buenaventura. There, various development actors were brought together for dialogues on projects such as the subnational human development report for Eje Cafetero and ‘localizing’ the MDGs for the port of San Buenaventura. The role of UNDP in this work at the local level appeared to be more effective than in its interactions with the Federation of Colombian Municipalities and with non-governmental organizations nationwide.

UNDP in Colombia can and should play a more significant role in terms of dialogue facilitation and coordination. Its leadership is sought by both national and international counterparts. It is at local level, however, that UNDP interventions have had their most significant results. The Reconciliation and Development programme and the Local Governance with Assets of Citizenship programme are the most notable examples of UNDP’s coordinating role at the local level. UNDP facilitation has also helped forge important agreements at the subnational and subregional levels, as demonstrated by the post-earthquake reconstruction in Armenia and surrounding areas and the subnational human development report for Eje Cafetero.

Where UNDP has been less effective is in its coordinating role within the UN system itself. An often repeated theme in interviews conducted by the evaluation team was the absence of effective UNDP coordination of the various UN agencies operating in Colombia. Granted, the different and sometimes conflicting mandates among UN agencies have made coordination difficult. For instance, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights has denounced abuses of human rights in conflict zones. In those same zones, representatives of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime are supporting the eradication of coca crops by the army, sending conflicting messages to the peasants of these villages, both under the UN flag. The major exception to the widespread complaint of weak coordination was UNDP’s follow-up role in coordinating the ‘Millennium Development Goals Report’, in conjunction with the National Planning Department, and in preparing the Common Country Assessment in 2006.

### 2.3 DEVELOPMENT RESULTS BY PRACTICE AREA

This section presents the ADR’s findings in each of the four programme areas emphasized by UNDP during the 2002-2006 programming cycle: democratic governance, poverty reduction, energy and environment, and crisis prevention and recovery.

#### 2.3.1 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

UNDP contributions to democratic governance in Colombia have focused primarily on institution-building at the national, regional/departmental and local/municipal levels. This included interventions aimed at strengthening political institutions, facilitating State decentralization, improving government information systems, designing and implementing anti-corruption measures, and fostering citizen participation in—and monitoring of—government decision-making processes at all levels. The persistence of conflict in the country over the last five decades has made peace-building an obligatory component of UNDP interventions in the democratic governance sphere.

UNDP has approached governance from the perspective of human development. The key elements of this approach were cogently articulated in the 2003 national human development report,\(^{24}\) which generated nationwide discussion
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on the basic causes and principal characteristics of Colombia’s ongoing conflict and its possible solutions. It also spawned a series of subsequent subnational human development reports in which civil society actors, subnational authorities, and private sector leaders actively participated.

UNDP’s interventions in the field of democratic governance during the 2002-2006 programming cycle can be grouped into three main areas of activity: 1) public sector administration and anti-corruption, 2) decentralization and resource allocation to subnational entities, and 3) governance and local development. As of end 2005, UNDP was funding a total of 80 projects (52 percent of all UNDP projects in Colombia at the time) that fell under the category of democratic governance.

Public sector reform and anti-corruption. The main projects supported by UNDP in this area included the Public Financial Administration Modernization project, implemented by the Ministry of the Treasury; the Fight against Impunity project, implemented by the Ministry of Interior and Justice; the Fight against Corruption and Citizens’ Participation projects, implemented by the central government’s Comptroller General’s Office; the Bogotá Anti-corruption project, implemented by the Bogotá Comptroller’s Office; and the Public Administration Reform project, implemented by the Attorney General’s Office. These projects sought to enhance the institutional capacities and develop the legal and policy tools needed by the national government and Bogotá’s district government to enforce greater accountability and transparency in public service. They also sought to promote higher levels of civil society participation in democratic governance.

UNDP support in the Fight against Corruption and Citizens’ Participation projects provides one positive example of the results of UNDP involvement in public administration reform and anti-corruption. Jointly with the Netherlands, UNDP supported the Comptroller General’s Office in an innovative approach to promote citizens’ participation and the formation of social capital as tools to fight corruption. The project institutionalized participatory fiscal control arrangements, such as the piloting of citizens’ ‘Monitoring and Evaluation Committees’ to control the use of royalties. It also established 32 ‘Citizens’ Agendas’ at the departmental level (one for each department and some at the municipal level), which became a formal mechanism for the articulation of civil society viewpoints among public sector agencies implementing social policies and the Comptroller General’s Office. These agendas were complemented by ‘Articulated Audits’, which promote civil society involvement in audits conducted by the Comptroller General’s Office. Additionally, the project sponsored studies that provided a conceptual framework for social capital initiatives and for social fiscal control.

UNDP also provided administrative and technical support, particularly for the dissemination of information concerning participatory fiscal control tools and experiences, through a nationwide community radio programme called ‘Manos Amigas’.

Decentralization and subnational resource allocation. The main projects supported by UNDP in this area included the Regional Planning for Bogotá and the Department of Cundinamarca project; the Cadastral Registry Modernization project, implemented by the Agustín Codazzi Geographic Institute; the Bogotá Public Services project, implemented by the Bogotá municipal government; the Private Sector Participation and Infrastructure project;
and multiple projects undertaken with the office of the Personero of Bogotá. The basic goal of all of these projects was to develop capacities and foster alliances among subnational/local governmental and civil society actors to improve policy formulation, service delivery and resource management at the subnational and local levels.

Several of UNDP’s activities in decentralization and subnational resource allocation were described as ‘successful’ by various Bogotá municipal government officials interviewed by the evaluation team. The results from UNDP’s interventions in infrastructure development in Bogotá, especially in the planning and construction of the Transmilenio mass transit system, were highly appreciated.

UNDP’s support for strengthening the Personeria of Bogotá produced highly positive results in terms of institutionalizing mechanisms for participatory monitoring and the defence of human and civil rights, according to interviews conducted by the evaluation team with officials in that office. Newly created associations for citizens, families, students, youth, women and displaced persons, among others, reportedly increased levels of social protection for such groups and their ability to seek redress of grievances from government institutions in the Federal District.29

Governance and local development. The bulk of UNDP support in this area was directed to four projects under the Reconciliation and Development programme (known as REDES). The REDES programme grew out of UNDP’s experience with the Peace and Development Programme in the Magdalena Medio region of central Colombia (which was initiated by a Jesuit priest, Father Francisco de Roux, in 1996). The REDES programme was launched in mid-2003 in Meta and then expanded to the Montes de Maria (2004), Eastern Antioquia (2005) and Huila (2006) regions.

The main objective of the REDES programme is to contribute to peace-building and conflict resolution through a combined strategy of peace and development, grounded in the creation of strategic alliances among key actors (drawn from civil society, local, subnational, and national governments, various UN agencies, and other members of the international community). The programme assumes that only through the creation of strong alliances will it be possible to design, implement and sustain the policy reforms, development initiatives and peace-building mechanisms needed to establish and maintain democratic governance in Colombia’s conflict-ridden communities. (For this reason, the REDES programme is analysed both under the democratic governance section and the crisis prevention and recovery section of this report.)

The Montes de Maria project, which is analysed in more detail in this section, is the most advanced of the four REDES projects currently under way. The Montes de Maria region is a mountainous, conflict-plagued area of northern Colombia that straddles the departments of Bolivar and Sucre (15 municipalities) located about 150 kilometres from the Atlantic Coast. The area’s 350,000 inhabitants live primarily from agriculture, cattle-raising and handicraft production. The region has been hard hit by violence stemming from guerrillas and paramilitary bands, the extensive use of landmines, forced recruitment (especially of children), systematic violations of human rights, and intense flows of displaced persons and illicit drugs over the last two decades.

The Montes de Maria project has been promoted by UNDP in collaboration with three dioceses of the Catholic Church, the local branch of the Mennonite Church, several subnational businesses and a variety of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). It is funded primarily by the World Bank and the Government of Colombia. It has sought to activate the participation of civil society organizations, to strengthen local governmental

institutions, and to foster alliances among local actors in an effort to stimulate subnational economic and institutional development. These goals have been implemented through governance projects ranging from landmine clearance and women's and youth group formation to human rights, security and disaster preparedness initiatives to the development of a network of local mayors, and subnational public policy, employment and business councils. The initial two-year phase concentrated on forging cooperative relations among different sectors and institutions in the region as a platform for building trust. The approach succeeded in creating the ‘Montesmariana Network’, which includes the Catholic and Mennonite churches, 15 local town councils and mayors, various universities and business enterprises, several chambers of commerce and some 5,000 local residents. It has also fostered the creation of a Montes de María Foundation, under the auspices of the Catholic Church, which has played a positive role.

**Summing-up.** The democratic governance service line is the largest delivery area in the UNDP portfolio as indicated by budgetary data from UNDP’s Multi-year Funding Framework. The bulk of these projects, however, fall into the ‘resource administration’ (DSS) category and have limited added value in terms of UNDP technical assistance. This is especially true of most of the UNDP interventions at the national level, with the notable exception of the Fight against Corruption and Citizens’ Participation projects and some of the poverty reduction projects discussed below.

UNDP’s capabilities for adding value through technical assistance are greater at the subnational level of regional/municipal governments, as the positive results achieved in Bogotá indicate. Outside of Bogotá (which is rapidly gaining institutional capacities and expertise), the need for UNDP financial management services, technical expertise and knowledge transfer in other metropolitan areas and intermediate cities throughout Colombia remains high.

Efforts to extend UNDP’s successful interventions in Bogotá (the mass transit system, for example, along with infrastructural development and the experience with Bogotá’s Personero) to other parts of the country could provide major opportunities for highly relevant UNDP contributions to effective democratic governance in Colombia. This would require an investment in knowledge creation, especially in distilling lessons learned from those interventions that could be easily absorbed by local-level planners and decision-makers.

The REDES interventions in local peace-building and democratic governance appear promising. The basic formula of activating civil society, strengthening local governmental institutions and alliance-building among local, subnational, national and international actors, although not entirely new, offers a strategy that facilitates the introduction of development projects in conflict-ridden areas where the government has a limited presence. This capacity for local-level involvement is one of the key strengths of UNDP’s REDES programme from the perspective of government authorities in Bogotá. However, with less than three years’ experience, and without a functioning monitoring and evaluation system (which is being designed several years after implementation), it is premature to consider REDES a success. It is also risky for UNDP to propose the replication of REDES before producing evidence of its accomplishments.

They are, however, the only local governance and development initiatives in Colombia’s conflict zones that, at least potentially, provide a formula for peace-building and economic and institutional development at the local/subnational level. They should, therefore, be strengthened while undergoing careful monitoring and evaluation during the next UNDP programming cycle. The findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons

---

30 It should be noted that, within the budget categories, ‘ART/GOLD’ projects are classified by UNDP as interventions in local democratic governance. However, given that these initiatives are designed as poverty reduction interventions, they are discussed below, in section 2.3.2.
learned that will be reported in the forthcoming external evaluation of the REDES programme should provide valuable insights for shaping the programme in the next UNDP programming cycle.

2.3.2 POVERTY REDUCTION
UNDP support for poverty reduction in Colombia has focused primarily on two areas: 1) measuring poverty and inequality, and 2) developing policy frameworks for poverty reduction.

Measuring poverty and inequality. UNDP has provided support for the measurement and analysis of MDGs at the national, departmental/regional, and municipal levels (the latter focusing on health, education and poverty reduction to establish a baseline at the municipal level). In addition, UNDP played an important role in mainstreaming the MDGs within the Colombian public sector, not only by supporting research and analysis at all three levels of Colombia’s government, but also by assisting in the elaboration of a policy document (called CONPES), which sets out targets and strategies for incorporating the MDGs into the government’s national development policies.

Just two out of eight years in the period between 1997 and 2004 (that is, 2000 and 2003) were ‘pro-poor’ growth years in Colombia. The growth elasticity of the income of the poorest segments of the country’s population is 0.5, which means that if GDP grows at 4 percent, the income of the poor grows by just 2 percent. Poverty is widespread in Colombia, by any calculation (49.7 percent of the population is classified as living below the poverty line, according to the government’s own estimates; alternative estimates, which were used in the preparation of national human development reports, have placed the figure as high as 64 percent). Nevertheless, the government’s external cooperation strategy does not specifically include poverty reduction among its six priority areas. Instead, the government appears to have adopted a trickle-down approach to poverty reduction, based on the expectation that higher rates of economic growth will lead to lower levels of poverty. Given the limited growth of the incomes of the poor despite rising national economic growth, such an assumption is unwarranted. In Colombia, there is a clear need for appropriate targeting of social policies towards the poor (which requires more and better information that is appropriately disaggregated, a point that is further developed in Chapter 3), and for an evaluation of the effectiveness of those policies.

UNDP support for poverty reduction has focused on gender dimensions, specifically Millennium Development Goals 3 and 5 (on gender equality and maternal health, respectively). The data gathered in these areas have been used for HDI estimates at Colombia’s three levels of government. This work has resulted in more comprehensive diagnoses of the extent and patterns of poverty.

35 See Núñez y González, 2006, pp. 11-12.
36 Colombian Agency for International Cooperation. 2005. ‘Strategy for International Cooperation’. Cartagena: Ministry of External Relations, p. 77. Although the strategy includes a ‘thematic unit’ on productive and alternative development, the latter aspect overshadows the former.
37 On the importance of evaluating social expenditure programmes, see Wiesner, E. 1997. ‘La efectividad de políticas públicas en Colombia’. Santa Fe de Bogotá: Tercer Mundo, p. 283. SINERGIA plays an important role in this respect, and UNDP, as well as other development cooperation agencies, could make much more use of it.
poverty in the country, which take into account significant variations at the inter- and intra-regional levels. In turn, these diagnoses can be used (and to some extent have already been used) to design more targeted interventions and for fund-raising (particularly in the case of regions such as the Eje Cafetero, whose HDI reflects a considerably worse situation than the traditional indicators in terms of poverty levels and unsatisfied basic needs). However, it should be noted that the HDI estimates at the municipal level require very strong assumptions to compensate for the lack of actual data at this administrative level. Consequently the final HDI estimates are not as robust as they may appear to most readers of the report (and decision-makers using it).\(^\text{38}\) These fragile estimates indeed pose an additional potential risk to UNDP’s reputation.

**Developing policy frameworks for poverty reduction.** A second area in which UNDP has focused its efforts in poverty reduction is in supporting related policy frameworks. This work reflects, in part, the expertise of the director/chief economist at UNDP’s International Poverty Centre in Brasilia, and included the preparation and launching of several studies addressing poverty-related issues, including the MDGs, in Colombia (see Box 2 for the list of publications).

**Other poverty-related initiatives.** Another line of action followed by UNDP has been support for the preparation of development plans at the local or municipal level, such as the plan for Buenaventura, which recently led to the design of a government policy to improve living conditions for that city’s poverty-stricken population.\(^\text{39}\)

Local development interventions (such as those dealing with indigenous peoples) that are relevant to poverty reduction are analysed in other sections of this report. However, the ART/

---

\(^{38}\) In the 2002 *Human Development Report* it was pointed out that the concept of human development is much richer than the human development index. See also: Sen, A. 2006. ‘Human Development Index’, in Clark, D. A. (ed.): *The Elgar Companion to Development Studies*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar, on the limits of the human development index even at the national level, and the broader and more important concept of human development.

\(^{39}\) See: http://www.presidencia.gov.co/sne/2006/febrero/20/13202006.htm
GOLD programme, discussed below, is noteworthy. (‘ART’ corresponds to the French acronym for ‘local or area networks’, and ‘GOLD’ is an abbreviation of ‘governance and local development’). 40

ART/GOLD is an internationally sponsored initiative that brings together programmes and activities of various United Nations organizations to work cooperatively with local communities and actors to implement the MDGs. The aim is to produce subnational and local development plans with the joint involvement of civil society associations and UN agencies at all three levels of government. Over the last three years, the UNDP office in Colombia and the ART/GOLD programme have initiated activities in several municipalities of Colombia with the financial and technical support of two bilateral donors (Italy and France). However, these activities have been carried out in virtual isolation from other UN agencies working in Colombia. Moreover, instead of cooperating in the preparation of development plans, ART/GOLD has been involved primarily in the support of ‘business plans’. Although the programme has helped UNDP establish a valuable field presence at the local level, much more active coordination is needed among interventions promoting democratic governance and local poverty reduction initiatives. The forging of effective cooperative relationships with various UN agencies already present in Colombia, such as the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), would significantly increase the potential ‘value added’ of future ART/GOLD activities.

Another poverty-related initiative supported by UNDP is seeking to address temporary unemployment among people who are between jobs or searching for new jobs. The project is based on the Swedish matching model, which involves the development of an information system connecting labour supply with demand. Although the initiative has the potential to shorten the duration of unemployment in Colombia, it risks being overshadowed by a recently approved World Bank loan for $200 million that will address labour reform and social development policy. 41

Finally, it should be noted that UNDP is using the mechanism of technical cooperation among developing countries, or ‘South-South’ cooperation, to support the government’s poverty reduction efforts. For example, through the efforts of UNDP, Colombian officials have become acquainted with Chile’s experience in poverty reduction.

Summing-up. The books and reports produced by UNDP-Colombia on poverty reduction have addressed key aspects of economic growth and development in the country and have been of significant value to the national government and UNDP (as well as to other development cooperation agencies). They also provided crucial inputs for anti-poverty policy initiatives. They have examined closely issues such as social protection, labour markets, royalties (regalías), inter- and intra-regional income disparities, and human development. They are, therefore, highly relevant, as is the work done on the MDGs. A glaring limitation of, or gap in, the work produced to date, however, is the lack of attention directed at the country’s large and deeply impoverished Afro-Colombian population.

The UNDP resources required to produce these publications have been quite modest. Indeed, the only publication whose cost was significant was the 2003 national human development report, which was funded largely through the contribution of bilateral donors. Hence, these valuable documents were efficiently produced. Their ultimate effectiveness, however, depends on how they are used. Evidence suggests that the only publications that have been widely used are the

41 Information about this recently approved World Bank operation is available at: http://web.worldbank.org/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:21004983~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,00.html
national human development reports and, to a more limited extent, the subnational human development report for Eje Cafetero.

It is worthwhile to note that, despite the richness of the documentation produced in the area of poverty reduction (partly reflected in Box 2), the section on lessons learned that corresponds to this practice area in the UNDP-Colombia website is empty. It would be worthwhile to prepare a set of brief notes distilling lessons in this area.

2.3.3 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Balancing the growing demand for energy with environmentally sustainable development practices is one of the major challenges that Colombia faces. UNDP strategies in this area have prioritized environmental governance, climate change and links between sustainable environmental management practices and other biological resources. UNDP’s main interventions in the energy and environment area include:

- Promoting dialogue among various social actors on the dimensions of environmental damage and options for recovery
- Building and strengthening local and national institutional capacities for the diagnosis, design and monitoring of alternatives practices that preserve the environment and promote sustainable use of energy, land, water and forests
- Supporting activities that facilitate preparation and follow-up of international conventions, protocols, agreements and programmes
- Administering resources from the international donor community and international financial institutions for programmes in environmental protection and regeneration
- Administering resources from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.

Issues related to Colombia’s indigenous peoples also fall into UNDP’s energy and environment portfolio. The proclamation of the International Decade of the World’s Indigenous Peoples, on 10 December 1994, and the establishment of the Permanent Forum for Indigenous Affairs as a subsidiary body of the Social and Economic Council in 2000, helped spur the creation of a programme for indigenous peoples within UNDP-Colombia in 2003. Since that time, UNDP interventions in areas relating to Colombia’s indigenous peoples have involved three main activities: 1) support in the formulation of public policy, 2) support for humanitarian assistance programmes in indigenous communities, and 3) strengthening of Indian organizations in zones or territories inhabited by indigenous populations.

UNDP-Colombia concentrated these activities in four regions of the country: the Colombian Macizo, the Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta, the Sierra de la Macarena and the Department of Guaviare. In total, UNDP has supported more than 30 projects related to energy and the environment in the last 12 years. During 2006, 16 projects were under way and a similar number of projects were in various stages of preparation. In 2005, delivery in this sector totalled $5.6 million; in 2006, delivery is estimated $6.442

UNDP’s Environment and Energy Unit has worked in recent years with a range of partners, including the National Parks Unit of the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development; the Macarena Development Corporation; the Municipality of Cali; and the Mines-Energy Planning Unit of the National Planning Department. The major donors providing financial backing for UNDP projects in energy and the environment included the GEF, the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, Spanish international cooperation agencies and the Government of the Netherlands. Negotiations were under way in 2006 to develop projects and alliances with the Autonomous Corporation of the Valle del Cauca, the Humboldt Research Institute and the government of Cauca, as well as with potential contributors,

---

such as the Natura Foundation, the Nature Conservancy and the World Wildlife Fund.43

**Biodiversity conservation.** UNDP’s main contributions in this area since 1994 are summarized as follows: First, during the second half of the 1990s, UNDP played an active role in the formulation and implementation of the Colombian Bio-Pacific Development Project, financed by the GEF. This pilot project was designed to help protect and conserve the biodiversity of Colombia’s Pacific coastal region and contiguous inland areas while fostering sustainable development projects among the region’s predominantly poor, rural populations of Afro-Colombian and indigenous descent. The project also sought to promote intercultural dialogue among the diverse population groups inhabiting the region and to establish the basis for future land titling and certification processes for peasant farmers residing there.

The Bio-Pacific project was the first project supported by UNDP-Colombia involving biodiversity. During the 2002-2006 programming cycle, two additional projects were launched: the Bio-Macizo project in southern Colombia and the Bio-Macarena project in the Sierra de la Macarena in the country’s eastern plains. These most recent projects were designed to encourage biodiversity protection and conservation processes through the participation of local populations (indigenous and peasant colonists) that inhabit these delicate, biologically diverse zones. UNDP acts as an implementing agency for the GEF and the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund. There is no evidence on results that can be attributed to these interventions, partly due to their time frame and partly due to the lack of appropriate monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

**Institution-building.** From the mid- to late-1990s, UNDP supported the strengthening of the National Environmental System and the Ministry of Environment during the start-up and consolidation phases of these two innovative Colombian institutions. This support contributed especially to human resource development and to public policy formulation in the Ministry of the Environment. In 2003, however, ten years after the ministry was created, it was merged with the Development Ministry, to become the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (MAVDT). Following this ministerial reorganization, under the newly inaugurated administration of President Álvaro Uribe Velez (2002-2006), the MAVDT focused primarily on fulfilling new functions rather than on addressing environmental issues.44 Colombian experts consulted by the ADR mission repeatedly pointed out that this shift in priorities under the Uribe Government led to the rapid loss of environmental expertise that had been developed with earlier support from UNDP.

Finally, during the 2002-2006 programming cycle, UNDP-Colombia administered resources from the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund to support the creation of an Ozone Technical Unit within the MAVDT. UNDP also helped to design and execute the country programme that was intended to eliminate the use of ozone-depleting substances. As a result of these two programmes, Colombia is now among the countries that has done the most to comply with its treaty obligations to eliminate ozone-depleting emissions.45

**Summing-up.** While UNDP assistance in the area of energy and the environment has not been insignificant, its added value has been limited. First, UNDP’s institution-building within the

---

43 Ibid.
44 During the first Uribe Administration, the Government of Colombia focused MAVDT activities primarily on the provision of housing subsidies and credits, construction of and improvements in potable water and basic sewage systems, the promotion of the Territorial Organization Plans (Planes de Organización Territorial, or POT) at the municipal level, the creation of housing construction materials banks, and strengthening the finances of the country’s 32 Regional Autonomous Corporations (Corporaciones Regionales Autónomas, or CARs). In terms of environmental policy, the newly reorganized ministry concentrated its attention mainly on the protection of the country’s flora and fauna (parques naturales), on the development of environmental controls, and on the establishment of ‘green’ markets.
45 The domestic and industrial refrigerator industry, as well as foam-producing industries, were retrofitted to conform to treaty obligations. The challenge now is to address the issue among small companies that are difficult to locate and that are involved in refrigerator maintenance.
original Ministry of the Environment focused primarily on the development of human capital rather than on knowledge management. As a result, when the ministry was reorganized and environmental issues were de-emphasized, in 2003, the ‘installed technical capacity’ within the institution was rapidly depleted by the departures of key technical personnel. Hence, UNDP’s early contributions to the environment were unsustainable.

Second, although UNDP is commonly perceived as a helpful (though expensive) resource manager for energy and environment projects, it has not generally been viewed as an important source of technical expertise.

Third, although indigenous issues now form part of UNDP’s energy and environment portfolio, there is no evidence to date that UNDP has developed a systematic strategy in dealing with the multifaceted problems related to Colombia’s indigenous peoples. Such a strategy should effectively integrate population issues (such as gender, age and ethnic-group affiliation) into UNDP’s ongoing conflict-resolution, peace-building, democratic governance and sustainable development programmes. In other words, UNDP’s environment projects in strategic regions of the country should reflect a coherent approach that incorporates issues related to natural resources, indigenous populations and conflict into a holistic strategy for sustainable development.

UNDP has a positive reputation as an impartial and reliable organization supportive of, and committed to, sustainable development initiatives at the national, subnational, local and community levels in Colombia. Nevertheless, UNDP’s environment interventions, by and large, have been more reactive than proactive.

2.3.4 CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY

During the 2002–2006 programming cycle, UNDP-Colombia undertook a number of interventions in the area of crisis prevention and recovery. Among the most important of these were activities to encourage peace-building and recovery in several widely dispersed conflict zones (through REDES and the landmine programmes), and to resolve disputes and conflicts affecting the country’s indigenous populations. This section concludes with a description of UNDP-supported reconstruction efforts following an earthquake in Armenia, Colombia. Though work there concluded at the beginning of the 2002–2006 UNDP programme cycle, it is still an untapped source of lessons for the future.

The Reconstruction and Development Programme. As described in section 2.3.1, the REDES (Reconciliation and Development) programme was launched in mid-2003 as a peace-building strategy oriented towards human development in four regions of the country. So far, the programme has facilitated the creation of public-private partnerships, promoted knowledge management on the topics of conflict and development, and supported the design and implementation of public policies at the local, subnational and national levels.

Another important result of the REDES programme has been the development of a methodology for encouraging peace-building at the local level in Colombia. REDES’ basic strategy involves the activation or mobilization of local actors from both civil society and government through the formation of local associations and networks (such as agricultural producers, artisans, businesspeople, mayors, church members, women and youth). Cooperation on municipal and subnational development projects is facilitated among civil society groups and between civil society organizations and local governmental officials. The keys to the success of this methodology are 1) UNDP promotion or facilitation of the formation of such networks, and 2) systematic capacity-building efforts on the part of UNDP personnel (and UNDP’s international development partners) to develop, train and sustain these networks. The methodology does not involve new techniques of community organization (the same basic techniques have been known and used for decades in various countries, including Colombia). But when such techniques are applied in Colombia’s conflict zones, they seem to provide valuable tools for stimulating
local cooperation on development projects despite the presence of conflict.\textsuperscript{46}

UNDP has also designed a programme for Colombia’s indigenous populations that has built into it a conflict-prevention approach. The basic goal of the programme is to support indigenous communities in claiming their rights and preserving the core elements of their culture. The programme focuses on issues of indigenous land-use planning in reservation areas; biodiversity preservation on reservation lands and surrounding, publicly held ecological reserves; minimizing risk of environmental deterioration; humanitarian matters; and the relationship between indigenous communities and entities of the Colombian government. The conflict-prevention and resolution components of this UNDP programme involve accompaniment (acompañamiento) and mediation activities of UNDP personnel in support of indigenous communities involved in violent confrontations with illegal armed groups (guerrillas and paramilitaries), land disputes, and protest demonstrations against government policies and/or local landowners. No solid evidence on results is available as yet due to the time frame of these interventions and the lack of an appropriate and operational monitoring and evaluation system.

**Action against landmines and unexploded ordnance.** UNDP also supported interventions dealing with antipersonnel mines and active abandoned munitions. Colombia is one of the countries that originally signed and subsequently ratified the Ottawa Convention. This international treaty prohibits the use, storage, production and transfer of antipersonnel mines. The Convention entered into effect in March 2001 and, since then, the Government of Colombia has been under treaty obligation to destroy mines produced and stored by government forces, to remove mines and active abandoned munitions from affected areas, and to provide relief and restitution to victims of these devices.

The problem of mines and unexploded ordnance has been one of the most serious and fastest growing human rights issues (in terms of accidents and victims) in Colombia over the last decade. The government’s work to date on this issue encompasses five main areas: 1) compliance with the Ottawa Convention, 2) risk prevention and reduction in the number of mine victims (involving education, communication and advocacy), 3) comprehensive assistance to victims, 4) institutional adaptation and strengthening, and 5) follow-up and evaluation.

Through UNDP’s REDES programme, activities involving mines and unexploded ordnance have been carried out in three regions of Colombia (Eastern Antioquia, Meta and Montes de María) over the 2003-2006 period. Interventions supported by REDES include: 1) strengthening departmental committees for integrated action against mines, 2) organizing meetings among victims, and 3) supporting decentralization and consolidation of integrated action committees at the municipal level. An educational campaign on risk prevention has been carried out by UNICEF in conjunction with the programme.

**Other initiatives.** Other UNDP-supported peace-building programmes include a joint effort with ‘Fundación Social’ and local authorities in Tolima in a subnational development and peace programme covering 18 Tolima municipalities, which started in 2003. In collaboration with other agencies, the programme has also supported development and peace initiatives in Eastern Piedemonte and the Northeast region of Colombia, although there are no evaluations of these programmes as yet.\textsuperscript{47}

In terms of recovery efforts, the most noteworthy example is UNDP’s support for the reconstruction of affected areas.
of the Coffee Zone (El Eje Cafetero) following the 1998 Armenia earthquake. As mentioned earlier, this ambitious undertaking involved the construction or restoration of more than 100,000 homes and public facilities.

**Summing-up.** As indicated in section 2.3.1, it is still too early to assess the contribution of REDES as a conflict-prevention approach (an external evaluation of REDES was scheduled to begin in September 2006, after the completion of this ADR’s field work). The initial results, especially in the Montes de Maria region along Colombia’s Atlantic Coast, are encouraging. However, the lack of a monitoring and evaluation system (which several years after implementation is in the process of being developed) significantly limits the extent to which assessments can be made. The emphasis placed by the REDES programme on rebuilding or strengthening the social fabric in violence-torn areas and on developing local governments’ institutional capacities appears to have provided a practical methodology for mobilizing development funds from both the national government and external donors, while stimulating closer cooperation between civil society and the local government. The initial and still tentative evidence available suggests that this approach does help to reduce local conflicts and to provide alternative mechanisms for dispute resolution (via efforts to organize citizens and greater participation on the part of citizens in the local political process). The sustainability of these REDES projects, however, remains to be demonstrated.

UNDP’s conflict-resolution interventions in defence of indigenous rights, in regions such as Cauca (Paez and Guambianos) and the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Aruhuacos and Kogis), have fostered valuable dialogue. They have also produced initial agreements over land use and restoration of reservation land while preventing the escalation of potentially violent confrontations. The UNDP team involved in such programme activities is, however, very limited, both in terms of available personnel and resources.\(^{48}\)

In terms of landmines and unexploded ordnance, significant resources have been mobilized for activities in this area, partly as a result of UNDP support for the government’s advocacy role in the anti-mine campaign in Colombia, both at national and international levels. However, communication difficulties between the experts provided by UNDP, along with a lack of knowledge regarding mine removal in the midst of conflict, hampered the effectiveness of technical assistance provided.

As far as recovery efforts are concerned, an intervention model dealing with natural disasters was developed empirically by a team of UNDP consultants, working in close relationship with UNDP’s Colombia office, in the process of reconstructing Armenia. Though the model involved significant participation on the part of the civil society and private sector (in whose development UNDP played a crucial role), it has not been comprehensively documented for the benefit of others seeking guidance in coping with similar natural disasters. Though there are a couple of publications dealing with the reconstruction process,\(^{49}\) none of them lays out UNDP’s experience in Armenia in a systematic way, which would be useful not only for Colombia but for other countries as well. This is an area where UNDP’s office in Colombia may be able to develop a ‘knowledge product’ (such as a good practices note). UNDP could also organize an international conference on natural disasters, where lessons learned, including those from Armenia, could be shared.\(^{50}\)

---

\(^{48}\) For a discussion of UNDP and its activities in the Paez community in the Cauca region, see Wilches-Chaux, 2005, pp. 5-26.

\(^{49}\) Gomez, D., et al. (2001) includes only one reference, in passing, to UNDP, whereas in Lafourcade, O., et al. (2002), there is a valuable and brief chapter by L.D. Campos on UN system attempts to deal with disasters. This could be a starting point for the systematization of UNDP’s experience in the reconstruction of Armenia.

\(^{50}\) The recently released evaluation of natural disasters by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank could also be presented at such a conference.
This final chapter provides a synthesis of the major conclusions emerging from the report. It also identifies a number of lessons and recommendations that could assist UNDP in strategically positioning its support in order to increase its development effectiveness in Colombia.

3.1 POSITIONING UNDP-COLOMBIA FOR THE FUTURE

Colombia is a middle-income country. As a consequence, UNDP core funds have been limited and have not provided UNDP’s country programme with sufficient resources to meet the multidimensional challenges of peace and development in a context of chronic internal armed conflict. This situation led UNDP’s leadership in Colombia to spread its portfolio too thinly across a variety of activities categorized as development support services to generate operational resources. In doing so, the country office adopted a responsive approach to the demands generated by agencies of the Government of Colombia and international financial institutions. While initially successful, this way of working carried significant costs in terms of UNDP’s relevance and risks to its reputation (mostly stemming from its involvement in procurement). The government’s criticisms of UNDP’s involvement in development support services in 2004 negatively affected the organization’s image, but not to the point of permanently tarnishing UNDP’s reputation or preventing it from carrying out its mandate.

Indeed, UNDP’s 2002-2006 programme for Colombia achieved important results. A major accomplishment during this period was the development of a strong knowledge base on human development. The national and subnational human development reports are generally perceived to be useful and reliable sources of information and analysis. They have also been widely praised as effective instruments for public policy advocacy and for tackling sensitive human development issues such as violent conflict and social inequalities. Among the ‘best practices’ demonstrated in the production of the reports is broad consultation among multiple actors in society, thereby increasing local ownership of the reports and promoting their use.

UNDP has also played a useful role in facilitating dialogue in Colombia, and its leadership is sought by both national and international counterparts. At the national level, UNDP’s interventions in the G-24 consultation process proved critical in building bridges between the government, civil society organizations and international cooperation.

At the local level, UNDP interventions are also having promising results. The REDES programme is piloting the implementation of development initiatives in a context characterized by internal armed conflict. That programme, along with the Local Governance with Assets of Citizenship programme, are the most notable examples of the value of UNDP’s coordinating role at the local level. UNDP has been less effective in performing that role within the UN system itself.

Looking ahead, UNDP should capitalize on its considerable experience, and concentrate its country programme for 2008-2011 to a greater degree. This will involve managing certain risks and pursuing opportunities that can strengthen
and sustain Colombia’s peace and development process. For example, the future UNDP programme could take a rights-based approach, which is consistent with Colombia’s current—1991—Constitution, and focus on areas of critical importance to the country, such as peace-building. In doing so, UNDP should draw on its worldwide expertise and its perceived neutrality, keeping to the minimum its involvement in development support services.

This will mean transitioning from a demand-driven approach toward a more strategic way of working that will enable the organization to balance responsiveness to national development priorities with the need to maintain programmatic coherence (within prioritized areas of intervention) and financial stability. In this transition, development support services that involve only resource management operations are slated to be phased out as a key activity within UNDP’s portfolio, despite their past financial contributions to UNDP-Colombia’s operational budget.

UNDP’s credibility is one of its most important assets, which must be maintained. This credibility is especially important in the development of social policy, an area in which international financial institutions are not perceived as neutral. It could also help Colombia to close the ‘development information gap’, that is, to overcome the lack of reliable and comprehensive development information required to design, implement, monitor and evaluate peace and development policies and interventions. In partnership with Colombian and international organizations, UNDP could further contribute to filling this gap by working to strengthen the Colombian statistical system.

In better positioning itself for the future, UNDP-Colombia should also consider playing a brokering role with UN agencies dealing with productive sectors that are not based in Colombia, but that have a portfolio in the country (such as IFAD). Such a partnership could blend peace and recovery interventions with productive and other development activities, thereby contributing to greater development effectiveness in Colombia of the UN system as a whole.

3.1.1 LESSONS LEARNED
The principal lesson from UNDP’s experience in Colombia is that the pressure and incentives to self-finance a country office can lead to the overuse of development support services. Excessive dependence on such services can jeopardize UNDP’s development contribution and create problems that affect the overall image of the organization. The evaluation team recognizes that there are circumstances in which development support services can constitute a valuable modality of intervention for UNDP in Colombia. Such circumstances include:

- The lack of national capacity to implement a project
- Limited consensus among development actors to implement a project, combined with sound technical assistance capacity within UNDP
- A clear UNDP exit strategy.

Managing (or administering) resources can be justified if it conforms to the three criteria above. Just as important, UNDP’s counterparts need to know what services they can expect to receive from UNDP and the cost of those services from the outset of every project. Indeed, clarifying expectations from the beginning, according to the modality of service provided, should become standard operating procedure.

A second lesson has to do with UNDP’s development contribution. The organization has in the past, and can in the future, contribute greatly to capacity development, particularly where Colombia’s institutional capacity is fragile (such is the case of most subnational counterparts in Colombia). The quality of UNDP’s knowledge and advisory services, however, derives from a combination of analytical capacity and operational expertise related to problem-solving and capacity-building. These should be strengthened in the Colombia office, and draw more fully on UNDP’s resources as a global knowledge network.
3.2 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Avoid using UNDP’s administrative capacities to manage government payrolls, procurement needs or infrastructural projects with no added value. This will help ensure that UNDP’s resources are used in ways that will yield the greatest development effectiveness and avoid jeopardizing the organization’s reputation.

Realign development support services in accordance with a ‘rights-based’ development approach for the 2008-2011 programming cycle. Such services could be based on the following alternative cost-recovery strategies:

- Resource administration: Currently, UNDP cost-recovery is based on a fixed percentage of the total amount of resources involved in a particular project, resulting in a subsidy from large projects to small ones. Instead, a strategy calibrated by type of service should be formulated in which resource administration and procurement activities that require primarily operational follow-up on the part of UNDP would charge a lower overhead.

- Technical assistance and follow-up: Those UNDP activities that require more specialized technical assistance and/or qualified follow-up should charge a higher overhead.

Increase the proportion of staff and consultants with substantive knowledge to improve the response capabilities of the UNDP country office vis-à-vis Colombia’s development needs in the 2008-2011 programming cycle. At the same time, UNDP-Colombia should rely more on UNDP’s global knowledge network to strengthen its development effectiveness.

Strive for more effective internal coordination among the multiple UN agencies currently operating in Colombia. UNDP can and should play a pivotal role in bringing diverse development actors to the negotiation table. Demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants (under the auspices of the Justice and Peace Law) will be a key test of UNDP’s coordination capacity.

Include appropriate systems for monitoring and evaluation in the design of new programmes, and ensure that such systems are implemented. UNDP interventions in Colombia have lacked appropriate monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring has generally been restricted to financial aspects, and interim implementation reports (which were sometimes presented as evaluations) were completed for only 18 out of 167 UNDP-supported interventions. These reports mainly provided descriptions of the operations, without highlighting the role of UNDP. The contribution of these ‘evaluations’ in terms of knowledge and/or accountability is negligible (outcome evaluations were not performed at all).

The lack of a results-oriented system of self-evaluation deprives UNDP-Colombia from developing a knowledge base grounded in its operations that could facilitate learning and accountability. For this reason, it would be worthwhile for the office to include in the design of its new operations appropriate systems for monitoring and evaluation; mechanisms must also be put into place to ensure that they are implemented. Furthermore, the terms of reference of completion or interim implementation reports should include an explicit request to highlight the role of UNDP in the intervention. Finally, a programme of outcome evaluations should be developed and implemented by UNDP-Colombia.

Use the model of decentralized offices to enhance UNDP’s presence at the subnational level and increase UN system coordination. UNDP has undertaken a decentralization process in Colombia, which entailed the creation of five subnational offices (two of which are still functioning). One is located in Cartagena (for the Colombian-Caribbean region) and the second in Manizales (for the Eje Cafetero region). The offices develop projects and programmes for these regions in consultation with public and private actors, taking into account UNDP’s policies. The subnational offices also manage project implementation within each region. (UNDP operations in other regions of Colombia are developed and managed from UNDP’s main office in Bogotá).
The Manizales and the Cartagena offices have become a focal point for development initiatives in each region, involving local institutions from both the private and the public sector, such as the Colombian Coffee Producers’ Association and locally based universities and municipal governments. The preparation of human development reports for the regions is a joint venture involving multiple actors that helped build social capital at the subnational level.

Despite initial successes, the potential of the subnational office model for effective coordination of UN system activities in Colombia has not been fully exploited. In the future, Colombia’s subnational offices could play a much more important role in the coordination of the UN system, as demonstrated by subnational UNDP offices in other countries.

**3.3 RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY PRACTICE AREA**

**3.3.1 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE**

UNDP contributions to democratic governance in Colombia have focused primarily on improving the monitoring of government decision-making processes at all levels. The ‘Fight against Corruption’ and ‘Citizens' Participation’ projects, implemented with the Comptroller General’s Office, provide positive examples of the results of UNDP involvement in public administration reform and anti-corruption efforts. Through these projects, citizens’ Monitoring and Evaluation Committees were institutionalized as a form of fiscal control, and Citizens’ Agendas became a formal mechanism for the articulation of civil society in social policy.

The persistence of conflict in the country over the last five decades has made peace-building an obligatory component of UNDP interventions in the area of governance. The main UNDP interventions in this area during the 2002-2006 programme cycle consisted of four projects under the Reconciliation and Development Programme (REDES). The basic formula of activating civil society, strengthening local governmental institutions and building alliances among local, regional, national and international actors, although not entirely new, offers a viable approach for introducing development activities in conflict-ridden areas where the national government has a limited presence.

UNDP’s capabilities for adding value through technical assistance are greatest at the level of regional/municipal governments, as the positive results achieved in Bogotá—including the Transmilenio mass transit system, infrastructural development and the experience with Bogotá’s Personero—indicate. Outside the city of Bogotá (which is rapidly gaining institutional capacities and expertise), other major metropolitan areas, intermediate cities and rural communities throughout Colombia still have considerable need for UNDP financial management services, technical expertise and knowledge transfers.

**Recommendations.** With just three years’ experience, replication of the REDES programme is premature. However, results so far are promising. Systematic evaluation, at regular intervals, of the REDES approach to peace-building, conflict resolution and strengthening of democratic governance at the local level should be required in the next UNDP programming cycle.

Efforts to extend UNDP’s successful interventions in Bogotá to other parts of the country could provide major opportunities for UNDP to contribute to effective democratic governance and development in Colombia. UNDP should consider investing in knowledge-creation and in distilling lessons learned from those interventions so as to facilitate their application by local-level planners and decision-makers.

**3.3.2 POVERTY REDUCTION**

UNDP has provided valuable support for the measurement and analysis of the MDGs at the national, departmental/regional and municipal levels. In fact, this work has been one of the few instances of effective inter-agency coordination. In addition, UNDP played an important role in mainstreaming the MDGs within the Colombian
public sector, not only by supporting research and analysis at all three levels of government, but also by assisting in the elaboration of a policy document setting out targets and strategies designed to allow the Government of Colombia to incorporate the MDGs into its national development policies.

A related area of UNDP support has been the development of policy frameworks for poverty reduction and the production and dissemination of several studies dealing with critical poverty reduction issues.

**Recommendations.** UNDP’s relevance could be further enhanced by engaging in a dialogue about the eventual consequences of the government’s social and fiscal policy, which is based on a combination of transfers and subsidies and whose equity, effectiveness and sustainability is doubtful. UNDP’s perceived neutrality could allow it to enter into—and contribute to—this debate in a way that would not be feasible for international financial institutions.

The sustainability of some UNDP-funded poverty reduction activities depends on future actions, particularly alliances forged with other development agencies that can build on UNDP’s achievements (especially those agencies of the UN system that are actively involved in productive sectors, such as IFAD, UNIDO and the World Bank).

An important role that UNDP can play in Colombia is supporting the production and dissemination of poverty-related statistical information that can be used as input in improving the quality of poverty reduction policies, particularly those that target the poor. This would require an analysis of Colombia’s statistical system, which could be undertaken in partnership with other agencies (some bilateral agencies, such as the UK’s Department for International Development, have already been active in this area).

Finally, the expertise of UNDP’s regional and/or international centres (such as the International Poverty Centre, based in Brazil) and South-South cooperation should be exploited to provide UNDP-Colombia with additional human resources, experience and support, which could substantially increase its added value.

### 3.3.3 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

During the 2002-2006 programming cycle, UNDP’s interventions have aimed to help the Government of Colombia and civil society organizations achieve sustainable development through the effective use and management of the country’s natural resources. UNDP strategies for this area have prioritized environmental governance, climate change, and linkages between sustainable environmental management practices and other biological resources. UNDP’s contribution to results in these areas, however, has been modest and of limited effectiveness. UNDP’s energy and environment programmes were largely demand-driven and generally more reactive than proactive. Moreover, UNDP did not effectively anticipate development challenges in this area.

UNDP is generally perceived in Colombia as a resource administrator, and not as a real source of technical expertise with useful knowledge relevant to addressing the country’s major sustainable development challenges at the national or subnational levels.

The institution-building efforts undertaken by UNDP in the case of the Ministry of the Environment did not adopt a knowledge-management approach. Rather, they focused on the recruitment of human capital, while underestimating the need for, or neglecting altogether, the development of organizational capacities and a knowledge base within the ministry. Much of the technical expertise subsequently left when the ministry was reorganized by the Uribe Administration in 2003.

**Recommendations.** Indigenous issues now form part of UNDP’s energy and environment portfolio. However, there is no evidence that UNDP has developed a systematic strategy toward Colombia’s multifaceted indigenous problems that effectively integrates population...
issues into UNDP’s ongoing conflict-resolution, peace-building, democratic governance and sustainable development programmes. This should be taken into account in the future UNDP country programme.

UNDP should elaborate a strategy that links natural resource management to conflict prevention. Such an approach would make a significant contribution in terms of knowledge and good practices.

UNDP could also sponsor an analysis of the recently completed US-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, exploring the implications of energy and environmental regulations for Colombia’s competitiveness.

Finally, UNDP should take advantage of its neutrality to convene a national dialogue on key environmental and energy challenges to sustainable development in Colombia. This could involve partnership-building among subnational, national and international actors capable of designing and implementing sustainable development projects.

3.3.4 CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY

Among the most important UNDP initiatives in this area are those that encouraged peace-building and recovery in several widely dispersed conflict zones (primarily REDES and the landmine programmes), and that attempted to resolve disputes and conflicts affecting the country’s indigenous populations.

The REDES programme provides a promising approach for undertaking development interventions in conflict-ridden zones. Initial and still tentative evidence suggests that this approach is helping to reduce local conflicts and to provide alternative mechanisms for dispute resolution. The sustainability of the REDES projects, however, remains to be demonstrated.

So far, UNDP indigenous programmes have not been incorporated into REDES. And, although there are some relations between REDES and interventions involving landmines and unexploded ordnance, there is a dispersion of activities in this area. This is partly a consequence of UNDP’s reactive approach—that is, trying to respond to multiple demands from different national and international organizations.

Recommendations. The next UNDP programming cycle should consider expanding UNDP interventions to the country’s indigenous and Afro-Colombian populations. To guide such interventions, the ADR recommends the elaboration of a strategy for UNDP activities involving Colombia’s indigenous and Afro-Colombian peoples. The prevention strategy covering antipersonnel mines and active abandoned munitions requires more effective coordination within the UN system (especially between UNDP and UNICEF) and between the UN system agencies and the Vice Presidency’s Mine Observatory to improve the overall results of the anti-mine campaign.

UNDP should seek to strengthen subnational management of the integrated anti-mine programme, particularly with respect to: 1) the consolidation of departmental and municipal committees, 2) dissemination of standards regarding risk education and care of mine victims, 3) follow-up and control of policy implementation and the development of procedures, 4) political decentralization, and 5) retrieval and processing of information related to the diverse components of the campaign against mines.
1. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has launched a series of country evaluations, called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs), in order to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level. Undertaken in selected countries, the ADRs focus on outcomes and critically examine achievements and constraints in the UNDP thematic areas of focus, draw lessons learned, and provide recommendations for the future. The ADRs also provide strategic analysis for enhancing performance and strategically positioning UNDP support within national development priorities and UNDP corporate policy directions.

Colombia was among several Latin American countries considered for the ADR process. It was selected for a number of reasons: The completion of the 2002-2006 Country Cooperation Framework presents an opportunity to evaluate the achievements and results over the past programme cycle and before. The findings will be used as inputs to the 2008-2011 Country Programme within the context of the new UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). UNDP’s programme in Colombia is important in terms of resource mobilization, and in terms of its contribution to democratic governance and poverty reduction in the midst of chronic conflict. Colombia was not part of the countries considered in the evaluation of the role of UNDP in crisis and post-conflict situations. Further, a new UNDP Resident Representative in Colombia presents an excellent opportunity to establish a basis for enhanced accountability for results.

The evaluation will provide an in-depth analysis of poverty reduction under a human development perspective through strengthening of national, institutional and individual capacities, particularly analyzing three thematic areas: a) peace-building and conflict prevention, b) democratic governance, modernization of state and decentralization, c) poverty reduction and social development.

The overall goals of the ADRs are to:

1. Support the Administrator’s substantive accountability function to the Executive Board and serve as a vehicle for quality assurance of UNDP interventions at the country level

2. Generate lessons from experience to inform current and future programming at the country and corporate levels

3. Provide to stakeholders in the programme country an objective assessment of results (specifically outcomes) that have been achieved through UNDP support and partnerships with other key actors for a given multi-year period.

An ADR mission is planned for Colombia in July 2006. It will focus on the period of the current Country Programme, but will also capture the key results over the past five to seven years that the Evaluation Team may find relevant. It will refer to the UNDP activities under the Second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) 2002-2006 and, when necessary, to the first CCF 1997-2001.
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSESSMENT

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess UNDP’s contributions to development results and strategic positioning in Colombia, draw lessons learned and outline options for improvements. The ADR in Colombia will:

- Provide an independent assessment of development results at the country level, with particular emphasis on UNDP’s Country Programme, assessing the relevance and effectiveness achieved through UNDP support and in partnership with other development actors during the last five to seven years.
- Contribute to accountability and to learning from experience, taking into account self-evaluations (project and outcome evaluations) and the role of development partners.
- Provide an analysis of how UNDP has positioned itself to add value in response to national needs and changes in the national development context.
- Present key findings, draw key lessons, and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options for management to make adjustments in the current strategy and next Country Programme.

3. SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT

The evaluation will undertake a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio and activities during the period of review, with more in-depth focus on specific areas. Specifically, the ADR will cover the following:

A. Strategic positioning

- Ascertain the relevance of UNDP support to national needs, development goals and priorities, including linkages with the goal of reducing poverty and other Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This includes an analysis of the perceived comparative strengths of the programme versus the major national challenges to development.
- Assess how UNDP has anticipated and responded to significant changes in the national development context affecting specific thematic areas. The evaluation should consider key events at the national and political level that influenced (or will influence) the development context, notably the roundtable process as well as the risk management of UNDP, any missed opportunities for UNDP involvement and contribution, efforts at advocacy, and UNDP’s responsiveness versus concentration of efforts.
- The evaluation should consider the influence of systemic issues, i.e. policy and administrative constraints affecting the programme, on both the donor and programme country sides, as well as how the development results achieved and the partnerships established have contributed to ensure a relevant and strategic position of UNDP.

B. Development results

- Provide an examination of the effectiveness and sustainability of the UNDP programmes by i) highlighting main achievements (outcomes) at the national level in the last five years and UNDP’s contribution to these in terms of key outputs, ii) ascertaining current progress made in achieving outcomes in the given thematic areas and UNDP’s support to this. Qualify UNDP contribution to the outcomes with a fair degree of plausibility. Assess contribution to capacity development at the national and subnational level to the extent that it is implicit in the intended results. Consider anticipated and unanticipated, positive and negative outcomes.
- Provide an in-depth analysis of the main programme areas, assessing the anticipated progress in achieving intended outcomes under each of the objectives and programme areas.
- Identify and analyse the main factors influencing results, including the range and quality of development partnerships forged and their contribution to outcomes, and how the positioning of UNDP influences its results and partnership strategy.
C. Lessons learned

- Identify key lessons in the thematic areas of focus and on positioning that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNDP and its support to the country and for improving programme performance, results and effectiveness in the future. Draw lessons from unintended results.

D. Cross-cutting issues

- Assess implementation capacity as it pertains to the implementation of UNDP’s programmes and the achievement of results and impact.

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will employ a variety of data-gathering techniques, including desk reviews, stakeholder meetings, client surveys, and focus group interviews and selected site visits. The Evaluation Team will use triangulation of perceptions, documents and validations and will review national policy documents, such as the record of the roundtable meetings and sector policies and action plans, as well as programming frameworks (UNDAF, Common Country Assessment, CCF, Strategic Result Framework/Results-oriented Annual Report, etc.), which give an overall picture of the country context. The team will also consider select project documents and Programme Support Documents as well as any reports from monitoring and evaluation at the country level. Statistical data will be assessed where useful.

A stakeholder involvement and consultation process is envisaged. The Evaluation Team will meet with government ministries/agencies, other institutions, civil society organizations, NGOs, private sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral and bilateral donors, and beneficiaries. The team will visit project/field sites as required.

In terms of methodology, the ADR will follow guidance issued by EO in a phased approach:

Phase 1: Preparatory phase

- Desk review—Carried out by the EO in close consultation with the Evaluation Team Leader, the country office and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC) and based on the key questions for the evaluation developed by the EO Task Manager and Evaluation Team Leader in consultation with RBLAC.

- Scoping mission—Completed March 2006, the EO Task Manager together with the team leader and locally recruited consultant conducted a brief mission to the country to define the scope and to complete the evaluability assessment.

- Development of final evaluation design and plan—including the background to the evaluation, key evaluation questions, detailed methodology, information sources and instruments for data-collection, plan for data-collection, design for data analysis, and format for reporting.

Phase 2: Conducting the ADR and drafting the evaluation report

- ADR mission for data-collection and validation—The main mission of two weeks will be conducted by the independent Evaluation Team, led by the Evaluation Team Leader. The EO Task Manager is a member of the team.

- Stakeholder meeting—A meeting with the key stakeholders will be organized in the country after the end of the ADR mission. Their comments will be incorporated into the final evaluation report by the Evaluation Team Leader.

- Analysis and reporting—The final phase will be the analysis of all information collected and production of the draft ADR report by the Evaluation Team within three weeks after the departure of the team from the country. The draft will be subject to factual corrections by the key clients for the evaluation, and a technical review by the EO using expert evaluators. The Team Leader in close cooperation with the EO Task Manager shall finalize the ADR report based on these final reviews.
Phase 3: Follow-up

- Management response—The preparation of the management response and tracking its implementation will be undertaken internally by UNDP.
- Learning events—The dissemination of the report’s findings shall serve the purpose of organizational learning, as part of the overall EO dissemination and outreach strategy.

5. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The expected outputs are:

- A comprehensive final report: Assessment of Development Results—Colombia.

The final report of the ADR to be produced by the Evaluation Team should, at the least, contain:

- Executive summary of conclusions and recommendations
- Background, with analysis of country context
- Strategic positioning and programme relevance
- Programme performance
- Lessons learned and good practices
- Findings and recommendations
- Annexes (statistics, terms of reference, persons met, documentation reviewed, etc.).

At the end of their mission, and prior to leaving the country, the Evaluation Team will discuss its preliminary findings and recommendations with the Resident Representative and the country office staff. The team will use this feedback to finalize the report.

The team leader is responsible for submitting the draft report to the EO no later than three weeks after completion of the country mission.

6. EVALUATION TEAM

The composition of the Evaluation Team shall reflect the independence and the substantive results focus of the evaluation. The team leader and all members of the team will be selected by the EO. The team leader must have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice and in the evaluation of complex programmes in the field.

The team will comprise three consultants, one of whom will be the team leader, a team specialist with specific skills in topical areas relevant to the evaluation, a national consultant with extensive knowledge of the country situation, and a staff member from the EO as the Task Manager. The Task Manager will bring to the team the results-based management perspective, knowledge of the ADR methodology, familiarity with UNDP operations and knowledge of UNDP’s practice areas. The national consultant will support the team in securing access to key stakeholders and preparing analytical assessments.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The EO will manage the evaluation and ensure coordination and liaison with RBLAC and other concerned units at the Headquarters level. The EO Task Manager will lead the ADR process, in close consultation with RBLAC and Colombia country office management.

The UNDP country office will take a lead role in organizing dialogue and stakeholder meetings on the findings and recommendations, support the evaluation team in liaison with the key partners and discussions with the team, and make available to the team all the material that is available. The office will provide support to logistics and planning.

The EO will meet all costs directly related to conducting the ADR. These will include costs related to participation of the Team Leader, international and national/regional consultants and the EO Task Manager, as well as the preliminary research and the issuance of the final ADR report. The country office will contribute support in-kind. The EO will also cover costs of any stakeholder workshops during the ADR mission.
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1. METHODOLOGY

COMPILATION OF ARTICLES AND MEDIA RELEVANCE CRITERIA

This study of news coverage of UNDP activities in the major print media in Colombia was based on a compilation made by Jimeno Acevedo & Associates from electronic archives over the period 1 January 2002 to 16 July 2006.

The selection of daily newspapers and weekly magazines was based on the following criteria: 1) national circulation, 2) local circulation, 3) national influence, 4) local influence. They included:

- **El Tiempo**, largest national and local circulation (Bogotá), largest national influence, low local influence (outside Bogotá)
- **El Colombiano**, largest circulation in Medellín (Antioquia), low national influence, high local influence
- **El País**, largest circulation in Cali (Valle del Cauca), low national influence, high local influence
- **La Patria**, largest circulation in Manizales (Caldas—UNDP local headquarters), low national influence, high local influence
- **Portafolio**, medium local circulation (Bogotá), high local influence (Bogotá)
- **Revista Semana**, high national circulation, high national influence, high local influence (Bogotá)
- **El Espectador**, low national circulation, low national influence, medium local influence (Bogotá)

THEMES OF STUDY

Articles were selected that mentioned UNDP in three thematic areas:

- Human development
- Act No. 80 (procurement)
- Neutrality, peace and conflict

Results: 327 articles were found in the three thematic areas.

AUDIENCE IMPACT

(INFLUENCE OF MASS MEDIA)

Two categories, with a total of three variables, were used:

A) Circulation/number of readers (according to the 2006 General Media Study – First Wave):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000-50,000 copies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000 copies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-300,000 copies:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category was also used to weight the impact of news on different audiences on the basis of readership studies (number of readers per copy).

B) Level of influence: national/regional, based on 2006 Invamer-Gallup opinion studies.

General weight is constructed from these three variables with a maximum of 30 points (see Table A1).

TONE AND SCORE OF ARTICLES

Each article was analysed by a team of experts in mass media and rated in terms of tone (positive,
negative or neutral). Depending on the intensity of the positive or negative message (radical or moderate language), each article was given a score of 0 (negative limit) to 100 (positive limit), starting with 50 points (neutral). This scale allows for a nuanced determination of media impact.

In the present study, no article received an ‘extremely unfavourable’ rating, and this category does not appear in the tabulation of results.

**SOURCES**
The sources of news, cited in the text itself, were deduced from reading the articles, in the following categories:

- UNDP
- Mixed (UNDP, government, community)
- Opinion column
- Local government
- National government
- Other sources (experts, NGOs, public figures)
- No source cited
- Project beneficiaries
- Community

**IMPORTANCE**

Each article was characterized by the importance ascribed to UNDP: centred on the role of UNDP; major reference in the text; secondary reference in the text.

**LEAD**
Each article’s lead is presented with the section in which it appeared.

**MESSAGES**
The principal messages in each area were summarized and classified by their frequency of recurrence.

## 2. FINDINGS

During the 4.5-year period under study, UNDP took part in nearly 300 programmes in Colombia. In view of the variety and coverage of its activities, UNDP selected three areas that it considered to be of greatest relevance for analysis of the communication impact of its programmes.

The public agenda for the period under study (2002-2006) was centred on:

- Restoration of national security (control of...
economically important areas); military offensive against the FARC guerrillas

- Reduction of other causes of violence (demobilization of paramilitary and self-defence forces, fumigation of illegal crops)
- Climate of confidence and economic growth (investment, economic growth and recovery, reduction of unemployment, free trade agreement).

Two of the three thematic areas selected by the evaluators were in tune with the public agenda for the period, which explains the relatively high number of news items (327) broadly dominated by the human development theme. Attention is drawn to the Human Development Reports, which constituted a reference point for the mass media in terms of Colombia’s development status, followed by neutrality, peace and conflict. The third area, Act No. 80 (procurement), has a negative aspect, owing to the controversy surrounding the use by some official entities of the UNDP procurement mechanism to expedite or avoid administrative formalities applied to public procurement.

In general, it was observed that the major national media (El Tiempo and Semana) and regional media (El Colombiano) disseminated UNDP information in two principal areas (human development and neutrality, peace and conflict) in a full and positive manner, while media coverage of the third area was limited to a brief period.

The positioning of UNDP that was observed during the period under study can be summarized as follows:

- UNDP is a reference point for human development indicators. The presentation of reports stimulates debate, clarifications and explanations, for the most part positive.
- The positioning of UNDP in the regional press is ‘on the side of the community’ and of local governments through specific programmes that it carries out or supports in the region.
- Third, the role of UNDP reports on the impact of violence on development, particularly its effect on poverty, stands out.

It is important to point out that the impact of the articles on procurement was negative. These articles initially transmitted a message of doubt about UNDP (and other international agencies that were also accused of lending themselves to efforts to avoid the application of Act No. 80), presenting it as permissive, lax, or as enabling public entities to avoid fiscal oversight. Public opinion is highly sensitized to the ‘corruption’ issue; hence, the impact during the specific publication period was negative. However, with the passage of time and the way that the episode was resolved, with the changes announced by UNDP, the damage—which, we repeat, was limited to a period of several weeks in 2004—was cushioned.

**NEWS BY THEMATIC AREAS**

- Seventy-two percent of the news items analysed focused on human development. Of these, 52 percent appeared in El Tiempo, the newspaper with the largest circulation and national influence.
- Twenty-four percent of the news items centred on neutrality, peace and conflict.
- Six percent of all news focused on Act No. 80 (procurement).

**NEWS BY LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE AScribed TO THE ROLE OF UNDP**

- Thirty-seven percent of all news centred on the role of UNDP. Within all news on human development, the percentage is higher (43 percent).
- In 43 percent of all news, there are important references to the action or role of UNDP. In the controversy over Act No. 80 (procurement), 86 percent of the articles make an important reference to UNDP.
- One of every five articles makes a secondary reference to UNDP in the text.
NEWS BY TONE OF MESSAGE

- Eighty-five percent of the messages reflect a positive tone with regard to UNDP.
- In the newspaper *El Tiempo*, the tone is positive in 92 percent of the articles.
- The articles with a negative tone focused on Act No. 80 (procurement).

IMPACT OF NEWS ON AUDIENCES

- In measuring the impact of news (on a scale of 1 to 100, where under 50 points is negative and over 50 is positive), the average was 58 points (moderately favourable).
- In weighting the results against the three variables, it was found that in 44 percent of news (the percentage of news appearing in *El Tiempo*), the weighting was 27 out of a total of 30 points. This figure indicates a high impact on visibility/showing in the media and with decision-makers. A similar consideration applies with regard to the magazine *Semana*, which represents 16 percent of the news, with a score of 21 out of 30.

CONCLUSIONS BY MESSAGES

**Human development**
The main messages were focused on human development:

- Participation in regional projects and studies (29 percent). Message: UNDP is on the side of the communities in development projects.
- Presentation of overall and Colombian human development index figures (20 percent). Message: UNDP is the basis for assessing the results of local social and economic policies, and is an authority in comparing Colombian indicators with those of other countries at a similar relative level of development.
- Poverty increase alerts (17 percent). Consistent with the preceding item. Message: UNDP is the reference point on poverty indices.
- Millennium Development Goals (4.7 percent). Message (low impact): policies must be executed to meet the goals.

**Status of democracy in the region** (3.8 percent). Message (low impact): UNDP assesses the progress of democracy.

**Neutrality, peace and conflict area**
Messages obtained an average impact score of 56 points: moderately favourable. This score is related to the debate that took place at the time that the UNDP report on the Colombian conflict was published. The report led government representatives and some opinion-makers to dismiss the results and to question the role played by UNDP in the report’s findings. The messages centred on:

- Highlighting participation in regional projects and situations (33 percent). Message: UNDP is helping to mitigate the impact of the armed conflict.
- Highlighting the report on the Colombian conflict, ‘Callejón sin salida’ (26 percent). Message: UNDP does not see a quick solution to the conflict.
- Presenting the views of UNDP on aspects of the Colombian conflict (18 percent). Message: UNDP is proposing paths [to a solution].

**Act No. 80 (procurement area)**
The average message impact score was 48 points: slightly unfavourable. This rating derived from the high sensitivity of public opinion and the media to news involving corruption. The low percentage of news related to this thematic area (4 percent of the total) means that the final impact on the image of UNDP was low. Furthermore, what was involved was a short-term news item that did not develop subsequently, and that in the end reflected the interest of UNDP in ensuring that its conduct was transparent. Twenty-nine percent of the messages highlighted the positive response of UNDP. The messages focused on:

- Criticism of the way that resources are handled with international agencies (21 percent). Message: UNDP lends itself to Act No. 80 avoidance.
- Positive response by UNDP (29 percent). Message: UNDP corrects [mistakes].
OVERALL WEIGHT
The 44 percent of the news articles analysed were published in *El Tiempo*, which has a weighted rating of 27/30, showing that the messages reached the most important audiences.

In addition, there is the highly favourable rating of most of the news about UNDP and its projects. The second-ranking medium in terms of quantity of news—*Revista Semana*—has a weighting of 21/30. This has an important impact on the audiences that influence public decisions. Overall, 60 percent of the news items analysed were transmitted by national media having a high regional impact.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS
The assessment of all news items and the measurement of their impact on different audiences, particularly decision-makers and opinion-makers, reflect the following:

- High interest among the major print media in publishing news generated by UNDP.
- The thematic areas and messages derived from each news item were in tune with the public agenda of the time, which helps to explain why UNDP had medium-high visibility.
- During the period under study, UNDP was the reference point for analysing Colombia’s situation vis-à-vis its human development.
- The positioning of UNDP is higher at the subnational level than at the national level. This is related to the importance that was ascribed to projects undertaken or administered by UNDP in each region, which were reflected in actions visible in the communities and in the media.
- In the human development area, the average rating of the messages’ impact on audiences was 60 points (substantially favourable).