

UNDP Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development (Phase III)

Final Evaluation

September 2022

Contents

UNDP Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development (Phase III) 1

 Executive Summary & Recommendations..... 3

 Programme Context..... 5

 Evaluation Purpose 6

 Methodology..... 6

 Findings 7

 Global Level..... 8

 Country Level 11

 Programme Management Level 16

Conclusion and Recommendations 20

 Annex 1 22

 Annex 2 25

 Annex 3 27

Executive Summary & Recommendations

UNDP's Global Programme is the UN's primary means of managing and delivering a coherent global approach to effectively support improvements in the rule of law and human rights. This final evaluation of Phase 3 of the Global Programme's work assessed the success of implementation and provides guidance for UNDP as it moves to implement Phase 4. The evaluation assessed the Global Programme in terms of its effects at the global level, the country level, and in terms of the quality of its programme management.

The evaluation finds the Global Programme to be a highly successful model, which has effectively managed and enabled UN global support to needed reforms in the rule of law, security, and human rights. The programme is unusual within UNDP, but it shows clear advantages in integrating the distributed capability of UNDP and other UN rule of law and human rights organisations. The Global Programme has broadly operated as a learning system, and while improvements are still possible, Phase 3 can be seen to have involved continued adaptation and adjustment to systems and processes in ways that are consistent with improving the outcomes it supports.

The Global Programme has succeeded by pairing policy and technical expertise, integration of the Regional Hubs, and a strong funding capability to create an effective system to link headquarters capabilities with the field to coordinate and deliver development efforts. Wider use of the Global Programme model would improve the effectiveness of the approach by making it a standard method of global management and delivery, rather than an exception.

1. UNDP should assess the Global Programme approach, and see to what extent it can be more widely used as a template.
2. The Global Programme should continue to look for opportunities to strengthen its decentralised approach and reinforce the success of its development in partnership with the Regional Hubs.

The most notable improvements implemented during Phase 3 focus on reinforcing knowledge development and sharing; defining and resourcing a lead role in some thematic areas; and improving the overall integration and use of MEL by rule of law, security and human rights projects. Progress here has been significant, with far more sharing occurring, and clear strengths appearing in specific areas. To maintain this initial success and translate it into enduring strengths for the Global programme requires careful management of the development of these capabilities to reinforce their effectiveness and integration into how UNDP supports the rule of law and human rights.

3. The Global Programme should consider what meta structure is used for managing and defining forms of knowledge sharing, then reinforce that system to ensure that sharing contributes to knowledge being used effectively. The CoLab is an obvious candidate for this structure, but may not be the only option, and needs to have its resource demands demonstrated.
4. The Global Programme should set out clear guidelines for how to pilot and develop potential thematics which it may use as a focus to provide policy and practice leadership. Success in doing so requires that they are given time to develop, are resourced adequately, do not overlap or compete with approaches and remits implemented by other UN organisations. It is also critical that the Global Programme be realistic about how many can be supported.

5. The Global Programme should prioritise support to guidance for internal country project learning processes designed to leverage the improved focus on identifying and measuring outcomes. Implementation of processes to use that outcome focus to support more agile and adaptive country project approaches will support the achievement of more outcomes, and link MEL with a more effective Global Programme.

The Global Programme role is fundamentally one of enabling coherence of UN efforts within the rule of law and human rights domain. Due to the wide range of UN system actors involved, and the globally distributed nature of the organisational units and work, supporting coherence is a complex and political activity which requires ongoing efforts to mediate and encourage coordinated effects. The evaluation finds that the Global Programme has been effective in navigating the politics of its position and role, but can do more to build strong and effective relationships within the UN and with its donors.

6. The Global Programme should assess options to spread the leadership influence role to ensure that it can be effective in the situations where hierarchy matters. This may include greater leveraging of its hierarchy in the Crisis Bureau.
7. The Global Programme should deliberately use the modality of joint projects to continue to invest in its partnerships with other UN actors. While effortful to initiate, and often requiring more management investment than a UNDP project, the value add of system coherence is significantly greater from jointly planned and implemented projects.
8. The Global Programme should identify options where it could use partner political support or action to reinforce its projects and efforts. It is likely that this may only rarely result in coordinated action, but the investment in diversifying the terms of the relationship are potentially useful by themselves.

Programme Context

UNDP is the knowledge frontier organization for sustainable development in the UN Development System and serves as the integrator for collective action to realize the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). UNDP's policy work carried out at HQ, Regional and Country Office levels, forms a contiguous spectrum of deep local knowledge to cutting-edge global perspectives and advocacy. In this context, UNDP invests in the Global Policy Network (GPN), a network of field-based and global technical expertise across a wide range of knowledge domains and in support of the signature solutions and organizational capabilities envisioned in the Strategic Plan. Within the GPN, the Crisis Bureau guides UNDP's corporate crisis-related strategies and vision for crisis prevention, response and recovery.

The Crisis Bureau has the responsibility for support to prevention, crisis response, resilience and recovery work under the auspices of UNDP's Strategic Plan. Part of the Crisis Bureau, the Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) team is primarily¹ responsible for practice and policy development in the areas of rule of law, justice, security, and human rights as they relate to crisis prevention, response and recovery in conflict and disaster settings through the implementation of the Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development (the Global Programme). The Global Programme aims to mobilize funds, provide technical and strategic expertise, and collaborate and coordinate across UN entities to enable more holistic, coherent and comprehensive responses to rule of law, justice, security and human rights challenges. It provides tailored, context-specific technical, financial and strategic support to contexts across the development spectrum. Phase III of the Global Programme concluded in December 2021.

The Global Programme has built a core set of strong partnerships within the UN system to guide and implement a coherent response to rule of law and human rights. The team included the secretariat of the Global Focal Point for the Rule of Law (GFP), a coordination mechanism jointly chaired by UNDP and the Department of Peace Operations (DPO), which works to enhance the coherence and effectiveness of UN delivery of rule of law assistance. The Global Programme is also a key element of the Tripartite Partnership to Support National Human Rights Institutions, along with the Global Alliance of national Human Rights Institutions and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). It works with the Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) on the Saving Lives Entity to tackle armed violence and small arms. During Phase 3 the Global Programme developed the gender Justice Partnership with UN Women to address the recognised issues with improving the quality of, and access to, justice for women, girls and vulnerable and marginalised groups.

Major donor partners of the Global Programme Phase III included the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Japan, and the United States among others. During its lifecycle, the Global Programme also enhanced partnerships with Sweden's Folke Bernadotte Academy and Prison and Probation Service, the Ministry of Justice of Japan.

Phase III of the Global Programme commenced implementation in October 2016. Through December 2021, the programme engaged in multiple rule of law and human rights initiatives at the country level and regularly received positive feedback from the Country Teams on the ground. It also formed the basis for multiple global and policy development initiatives and had a broad range of substantive partners. The Global Programme management team periodically reviewed and adjusted the standard operating

¹ Team functions such as the Human Rights component also serve to provide that expertise for the GPN.

procedures of the programme to address any inefficiencies in the programme implementation. Phase III of the Global Programme was implemented in the following five regions: Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa, Arab States, Latin America/Americas, with the majority of priority contexts located in Africa.

The Global Programme undertook an interim evaluation in 2021, focusing on the implementation period of January 2016 to December 2020.

Evaluation Purpose

The main purpose of this evaluation was to develop and extend the findings and implementation of the Mid Term Evaluation, to draw out what has been learnt since then and identify further action needed to ensure proper implementation and performance of the Global Programme for Phase IV.

The evaluation collected information and provided assessment on several fundamental issues for the Global Programme, including the effectiveness of UNDP as a provider of rule of law, security and human rights programme support on a global scale; the ability of it to develop international policy and demonstrate thought leadership; its effectiveness in coordination and partnership of UN system actors; its progress in developing and implementing stronger outcomes focused reporting and results; and the overall ability of the Global Programme to deliver a well managed programme of support that meets justice and human rights needs of populations and adapts to changing contexts to do so effectively.

The scope of the evaluation was to assess Global Programme efforts from January 2020 through to the end of Phase 3 in December 2021. However in practise the evaluation built upon the findings from the Mid Term Evaluation delivered in May 2021, and will consider the specific timeframe within the context of the Global Programme as a holistic long-term effort by UNDP to guide better implementation of support to the rule of law and human rights.

Methodology

The Global Programme is a complex and widely geographically distributed programme, requiring an evaluation methodology that was realistically tailored to efficiently collect relevant data and provide an overall sense of outcomes in terms of the key evaluation questions. The approach adopted involved two primary components: a deep dive into the global aspects of the programme along with its programme management, and two case study investigations of specific country projects supported by the Global Programme. In the case of one of these countries, Kyrgyzstan, a one-week country visit was conducted

The evaluation collected evidence to support findings on how the planned implementation of Phase 4 uses the evidence that has been developed at the end of Phase 3 during implementation and from the mid-term evaluation. It combined three levels of data analysis. The first level was UNDP primary source documentation, including yearly planning documents, process maps, monitoring reports, previous evaluations, and other relevant programme and project documents identified by UNDP staff.

The second level of data collection used semi-structured interviews of key respondents. Once again the global scale of the programme did not allow for comprehensive interviewing, so the evaluation built from the interview list used for the Mid-term evaluation. This was refined in discussion with UNDP, with some new follow up interviews identified as the result of interviews identifying further relevant respondents. Overall, the interviews covered three groups of respondents; firstly UNDP staff including management

and programme staff, from both headquarters and from the field; secondly staff from key UN partner agencies; and finally key Global Programme donors.

The third level of data collection was the case studies of specific country projects supported by ROLSHR. The primary effort here will be the field visit to one project, in Kyrgyzstan, which enabled observation of project implementation and locations. One further country project, in Mali, had an extended set of project interviews to allow some assessment of the specifics of Global Programme support in that context. The cases studies are intended to validate and provide details regarding the effects of ROLSHR, and so did not evaluate the country projects themselves beyond understanding how effectively the Global Programme has supported their efforts.

Across all levels of data collection the evaluation attempted to identify both qualitative and quantitative indicators, and where possible will justify findings using both forms of information. Analysis attempted to focus on outcome and impact level data and did not assess the much larger amount of project implementation data available. However, as the Midterm evaluation had already identified, there are significant limitations to the available outcome focused data collected by the ROLSHR team, and interviews did not commonly provide monitoring or related reporting that could illustrate perceptions with strong independent data. As a result the primary data used for analysis was interview statements, supported by process maps or Global Programme outputs, and cross checked through follow up questions with related partners. In practice interviewees did not contradict each other, and potential evaluation findings tended to be reinforced as shared perceptions, with different experiences cited in support of the assessment, all of which provided a level of triangulation to the below findings.

As was noted in the evaluability analysis section of the inception report, the Global Programme is a difficult case to evaluate, and there are limits to what a process such as this can do to provide comprehensive guidance to inform decision making across all programme aspects. The geographically dispersed structure involved in a wide range of forms of security, justice and human rights work, and with a primary focus on supporting country project outcomes (which is thus a second order outcome of Global Programme activities) means that identifying and assessing effect or contribution is inherently difficult. As was noted above, country projects are still in the process of implementing better outcomes monitoring, so solid validated data is typically limited for first order effects, let alone any demonstration of Global Programme contribution to these outcomes. While the programme was found to be evaluable, this report deliberately focuses on a subset of issues where evidence could be developed to describe the form of issue adequately, show what its effect is on the Global Programme functions and outcomes, and where options to adapt and improve could be identified.

Findings

The findings are organised according to the three levels of question identified with UNDP: the Global level, or how the programme has functioned to leverage its system wide coordination, knowledge development, and rule of law/human rights strengthening; the Country level, or how effective the programme is at its direct support to countries; and the Programme Management level, or how the ROLSHR team is structured and works to achieve its effects.

Global Level

There is no question that the Global Programme construct has been a successful model for UNDP, one that strengthens and reinforces the UNDP approach to global rule of law and human rights support. The effectiveness of ROLSHR stands in clear contrast to several other models of global support and coordination that are used by UNDP to manage global thematic areas of support. Interviews indicated that the key aspect that contributes to effectiveness is the combination of financial and technical support under a system with adequate resources to manage and apply both across the range of programme countries. This was contrasted with other UNDP models of global support, which lack one or more of: the implementation timeframe, adequate financial backing, or a wide and clear theme. The continuity and multiple phases of implementation also contributed to its current success, as it had taken time for the programme to work out how to leverage its strengths effectively and consistently in the complex UN global system of supporting development. Respondents note that Phase 3 saw significant improvements across implementation, and consistently perceived that Phase 4 seems to be built from those lessons.

Coordination across regions

A major aspect of this success has been the ongoing improvements in how the Global Programme works with and supports Regional Hubs. The distribution of staff from a HQ programme across the regional hubs was part of an overall UNDP effort to decentralise, and during the initial years of Phase 3 the programme struggled to fill posts in the hubs and give staff in those locations a clear sense of their role. As a result, the integration of the Regional Hubs into the Global Programme approach took some time. Now that all Regional Hubs have at least one Global Programme staff member, and the remit of those staff in support of their regional country offices has been clarified, the system is working as intended. A common feature of feedback was that the Global Programme has made itself more useful to the Regional Hubs, by integrating capability into their systems. It was also seen to have improved how the Global Programme includes the Regional Hub as joint decision makers on pipeline funding processes and has made funds available at the regional level itself. The practical utility of a well-funded programme, bringing the relevant expertise, aligned with the Regional Hub priorities and efforts, has been significant in practice and is consistently highly regarded. This is not to suggest that there are not continued tensions, due to differences in priorities between headquarters and the regions, however these seem to have been typically well managed.

The tensions between UNDP areas on issues of resources and priorities are entirely predictable, and the Global Programme has done well to develop a dispersed team that is well integrated into the Regional Hubs. However, several respondents pointed to the criticality of personal relationships in managing these issues, with the head of the Global Programme often being required due to the seniority of the relationships. That this has gone well is a positive sign, but the system must be limited by the capacity of the single incumbent to manage all global relationships. Given that the influence of hierarchy within the UN system is unlikely to decline, the Global Programme should consider what options exist to spread the work of influencing areas to support coherent outcomes, and ensure that it has adequately empowered staff who have the seniority to be successful in influencing the political dynamics within the organisation.

UN system coordination

The Global Programme has also invested significantly in improving UN system coordination on Rule of Law development. There have been a number of successes in this area, both in terms of progress in the

key system coordination bodies such as the Global Focal Point for the Rule of Law (GFP), but also strong practical progress in forging effective partnerships such as the one with UN Women on the Gender Justice Platform.

The most notable have been some positive steps in the effectiveness of the GFP construct over the last few years. One of the UN system results from the onset of the covid pandemic was that the GFP received an increased dedicated budget for seed initiatives, which contributed directly to greater relevance to country offices. The GFP team used small seed project funding in contexts where UN mission and UNDP action was less coordinated than needed, with funding contingent on joint projects. The funding capability generated engagement and awareness of the GFP as a capability, which has led to stronger relationships and more influence.

The GFP remains a useful space for UNDP and DPO to work together, given their divergent natures and mandates. It likewise provides a format for coordination of effort with UN Women, UNODC, OHCHR, and other key partners. However, the GFP construct will remain limited in overall effectiveness due to its remit being to encourage rather than enforce, and its resources being small when compared to the scale of the issues. While the GFP can point to several successful efforts in countries such as DRC and Somalia, resulting in specific gains in joint work, country coordination outcomes continue to be primarily influenced by within country relationships between UN actors. The GFP also excludes certain types of coordination role, such as those involving a DPPA remit. As an example, the GFP played no role in UN efforts to coordinate the UN response to political instability in Kyrgyzstan, while the response itself clearly involved a significant adjustment to joint rule of law assistance, because the overall framing of the issue was as a political issue.

Leadership in policy and practice

The last two years of Phase 3 have seen a significant strengthening in the Global programmes approaches to holding a clear and demonstrable role in leading rule of law policy and practice, with the Business and Human Rights thematic being a good example of how a specific area was identified and then developed, sufficient to position UNDP as a global leader in this space. However, while several specific thematic successes are evident, it is less clear what the mechanism is for the Global Programme to consistently lead the whole of UN global approach to Rule of Law and Human Rights. The proliferation of systems and approaches, along with the predictable cultural and prioritisation differences that exist between organisations, place clear limits on the extent to which consistent leadership is possible.

The best example of the Global Programme leading and contributing to global rule of law and human rights policy and practice is the Business and Human Rights thematic area. In this case Global Programme staff identified business as a notable gap in governance and rule of law. A successful pilot project in the Asia Region developed evidence of the potential relevance and importance of the area to a range of countries. The pilot and associated advocacy enabled the Global Programme to identify and engage donor interest, with Japan being willing to fund an expanded global effort in a wider range of pilot countries. The result has been to position UNDP as a global leader in this area, to expand the thematic with sufficient resources and technical expertise to contribute to development of it as a clear policy area and Global Programme capability. Finally the area also increases the extent to which the Global Programme works with private sector partners, which is a useful adjustment in terms of the strategic need for UNDP to engage more with non-government entities to support human rights and rule of law development.

The development of the Business and Human Rights area is a good demonstration of the flexibility and thought leadership of the Global Programme, as BHR was not a strong thematic or identified priority in the Phase 3 programme document. The pilot and demonstration of the possibilities and importance of the thematic led to it becoming one across implementation. This dynamic may be a predictable context, given that underserved areas of rule of law and human rights support are, by definition, typically poorly known and identified. The BHR approach also points to the time and resource requirements for developing any thematic into a coherent and effective area of Global Programme focus. Business and human rights has benefited from a dedicated technical expert, who has staying in role for the extended period required for the area to mature. The area also leveraged Sweden's initial funding support to build awareness and follow-on funding from other donors. Finally, the whole thematic lacked significant competition from other competing UN agencies or projects with a similar focus.

The success of Business and Human Rights as a focal thematic also raises interesting questions for Global programme management. Firstly, the resource commitment required to make this an effective thematic is not insignificant, placing clear restrictions on how many thematic's the Global programme can meaningfully support. Secondly, even a relatively tightly defined thematic such as Business and Human Rights can rapidly identify more potential forms of investment than can reasonably be managed and supported, which requires the Global Programme to set and maintain clear priorities for impact. It is not clear so far that the Global Programme has a strong process for making such prioritisation decisions.

Other examples of good Global Programme leadership of policy and practice come from the Tripartite Partnership to Support National Human Rights Institutes (NHRI), E-Justice and from the partnership with UN Women on the Gender Justice Platform. In the case of E-Justice, the Global programme's response to the Covid pandemic forced the rapid adoption of this focus to enable supported justice systems to adapt to the limitations on personal contact during lockdowns. There have been a notable set of successes in supporting the role out of e-justice systems, something highlighted by the Justice CoLab. However it is not yet clear to what extent this will be reinforced and become a consistently supported thematic of the Global Programme, and how this will be managed and promoted to be coherent and effective consistently.

The Tripartite partnership is another good example of the Global Programme leading the development of a more effective UN system for supporting NHRI. While initially conceived as primarily a coordination relationship, the partnership has developed into a strong programmatic tool through Phase 3. It has directly contributed to greater awareness and prominence of NHRI in Human Rights Council and General Assembly, influencing the content of a number of resolutions.

It would not be appropriate to call the partnership with UN Women a case of the Global Programme demonstrating leadership, however it is a case of a joint effort that is increasingly well grounded in the relative strengths of the two organisations, matched with efficient use of donor funding pathways. UN Women reported being better able to leverage the greater global reach of UNDP and the Global Programme in support of achieving shared goals in gender justice. The extent to which gender justice aspects are integrated into planning for Phase 4 has improved significantly, contributed too directly by the Netherlands donor expectation of a strong gender focus to the strategy and workplan. This is important in a context where justice is a relatively minor focus for UN Women, and as a result will never be significantly resourced internally.

The issue of partnerships with other UN system actors foregrounds the limitations on the extent to which the Global Programme can lead overall UN policy and practice despite the above specific successes. UNDP's approach through the Global Programme is unique, both in how UNDP itself organises most of its work, and in terms of the global development management other UN partners use. No other UN system actor organises, coordinates or resources their global rule of law or human rights work in this way. As a result, the Global Programme lacks matching institutional structures in key partner UN agencies with which to coordinate, set the agenda, and work together on achieving results. The outcome from this is that that policy and practice leadership and coherence is commonly done country by country, as the headquarters elements of UN partners do not hold similar roles and responsibilities for ensuring coherence. This puts clear limits to the leadership possible, given that country level dynamics will encourage a diversity of approaches, and the GP can neither be in all countries, nor does it have effective influence in all locations where it is present. We can say that the Global Programme does have a significant effect, as in the absence of strong other systems of coordination it has less competition. This is most effective where the issues being addressed are not clear priority areas for other UN actors, such as Business and Human Rights.

Country Level

The Global Programme approaches to supporting country offices are both relevant to and broadly effective in addressing the needs of those offices and the rule of law and human rights contexts they work with. Country Offices reported that there have been clear improvements in the consistency and scale of Global Programme support, a fact that they primarily saw as driven by success in filling the Regional Hub staff roles, along with a good level of continuity of staff in those roles. While not directly identified in interviews, it seems likely that improvements in joint Regional Hub – Global Programme prioritisation will have also contributed to more effective Country Office support.

Effectiveness of support

In terms of the specifics that are valued, the first mentioned was unsurprisingly the funding pipeline. The key advantage that the Global Programme brings to country projects is that ability to enable specific project work to occur, allowing for activities to occur to develop further donor interest and involvement. This results in a wide range of instances where the Global Programme role, even if not financially huge, has been very significant in ensuring Rule of Law and Human Rights development efforts have been maintained or strengthened.

Access to needed technical expertise also represents a significant advantage of the Global Programme, albeit one that's value varied significantly by location. Countries with smaller overall investment in rule of law programming had a significantly greater need for access to specific technical skills, and valued this aspect of Global Programme support highly. Simple activities such as identification of suitable experts from the global network, or review and tailoring of proposals to meet donor expectations, represent very useful forms of support that can enable a small country team to navigate project management efficiently and be able to deliver on project aims. Some, but not all, larger country teams also used the Global Programme in a similar way, to facilitate processes and ensure that they had the right expertise available. It is useful to note that the overheads around accessing these types of support were considered low, making it an efficient experience for most country offices. This is a non-trivial finding for headquarters based UN support. This variability in country team capability is a basic aspect of country difference, and the continued investment of the Global Programme into this type of support is clearly fundamental.

Kyrgyzstan and the Global Programme

Subject to notable political instability over the current period of project implementation, the country offices relationship with the Global Programme has resulted in a strongly adaptive effort to maintain and further develop the quality of rule of law and human rights. When the long-term work of supporting reform of the countries legal frameworks was disrupted, the project responded rapidly to engage with new change processes and ensure that many of the key international norms and concepts remained embedded into laws. The Kyrgyzstan rule of law work is also characterised by strong UN system partnerships, with joint projects such as the Spotlight Initiative characterised by all actors as truly joint.

The Global Programme support was seen to be fundamental to the success of the project, with the flexibility of support being especially valued in a time of change. The role of the Global Programme Regional Advisor was singled out for ensuring that the country office had access to high quality and contextually grounded advice consistently, and had assistance in navigating the options for support.

The country office had integrated Global Programme support across activities and project lines widely. This was arguably catalytic, as it allowed the team to strengthen and support multiple lines of effort, including those funded by other donors, to ensure that specific gaps were addressed and issues did not disrupt the overall aim and progress. An example of this was the country office identification of the impact of justice system approaches on business as an important issue for country prosperity and human rights. Having conducted a successful project addressing aspects of how business is treated by the Kyrgyzstani courts, the country office was well positioned to participate in the pilot of the Business and Human Rights initiative, allowing this line of work to develop and increasing the probability of sustainable improvements being achieved.

While the role of the Regional advisors and specialists has become a real strength of the Global Programme, there remains an interesting complexity to how responsibility for country support is assigned, with some countries continuing to be managed by New York based staff. While headquarters staff retaining some direct responsibilities for country office contact makes for a sensible mechanism to maintain a field focus, and to avoid the New York based group become disconnected from field contexts, it is not the case that all HQ staff have country relationship responsibilities. The process for assigning country relationship responsibilities appeared to be fairly unstructured. While the evaluation did not find any instances where this had a clear negative impact on the performance and support of the Global Programme, a number of staff did indicate that it was difficult for country office personnel to understand how to navigate the Global Programme system to get quickly to the right expertise for the specific situation, suggesting that it contributes to some inefficiency. This is part of a broader lack of clarity around structure and process in the Global Programme that will be discussed in more detail under the programme management section.

Catalytic effects

The Global Programme was seen to have been critical to the existence of effective UNDP rule of law and human rights efforts in a wide range of cases, and indeed was regularly commended as a UNDP approach that was well designed to achieve such effects. The flexible implementation of funding and

expertise was seen to drive effects in contexts where such technically grounded investments were absolutely required if any progress was to be achieved. An example of a catalytic effect was the Global Programme support to fund and hire a senior rule of law expert for the Mali office. Due to the scale of UN investment into rule of law in Mali, and issues in coordination and outcomes, the Global Programme concluded that in this instance it should create a position to coordinate the work, and fund that position initially to ensure it was done. This post has been fundamental in shaping the capability of the team to engage in and shape strategic dialogue with partners and the national government.

Mali and the Global Programme

The Global Programme's support to Mali has demonstrated a high degree of flexibility in adapting to the changing circumstance. It has maintained a whole of country focus on improving security and justice, in contrast to a general donor focus on the north. It has developed an effective ability to hold strategic dialogues with partners and influence the overall vision for rule of law despite setbacks in the democratic governance of the country. This has established the rule of law programme as a valued strategic partner both with the national institutions and donors.

Given the difficulty of supporting an undemocratic regime, the programme has focused on strengthening links between local communities and their security providers. UNDP has worked to support the development of local security committees involving mayors, police and local people, to create a space for community dialogues and improve awareness on security needs.

The Mali programme also works closely with MINUSMA to split up responsibilities for supporting justice and security. While MINUSMA has a focus on conflict areas and a shorter term remit, the justice section hold the same objectives as the UNDP programme, and make efforts to align approaches. Both the localisation of security and justice provision, and the strong relationship between UNDP and MINUSMA were influenced by the Global Programme's approach to Mali, and the way in which it tailored its support to the needs it identified.

Global Programme support in Lesotho was credited with enabling all rule of law work that was occurring. The initial small seed funding led to the country team being able to demonstrate the scale of the problems in case management, and specifically around gender-based violence. It was able to do this not only through the funding, but also by using the expertise available through the Global Programme to assess the issues and identify potential entry points for project work.

While the evaluation considers the Global Programme to be functioning well in terms of supporting catalytic effects, it remains difficult to collect evidence of these effects beyond statements from staff members. Part of the issue is that what constitutes a catalytic effect is poorly defined and, in the absence of strong outcomes data, is often reduced to cases where seed funding led to more donor funding. The success of the Global Programme in developing the Business and Human Rights thematic to make UNDP a thought leader in this space is clearly a catalytic outcome, but measuring that catalytic effect would require understanding what other development actors have done as a result of learning from UNDP. Monitoring outcomes in such an unstructured conceptual area of impact is difficult, and currently beyond the capability of the Global Programme.

Knowledge dissemination

One of the most positive changes in the Global programme has been the significant improvements in how it facilitates and resources efforts to share information and develop knowledge for the international community. The resourcing can be seen in increased numbers of within-region events dedicated to experience sharing on a thematic or issue-based context, and more between region sharing events tailored to break down silos that develop naturally between regions. The weakness of the Global Programme in promoting sharing was noted in the Mid-term evaluation, making this a strong programme response in the last two years. Country Offices regarded such efforts highly, especially making note of opportunities they had to share their experiences.

One continuing good example of the dissemination effort has been the annual meeting, which has consistently been used as an opportunity to bring together both UNDP staff and global partners to hold focused discussions on key issues. The pandemic forced this online, which allowed greater participation at the cost of less engagement and fewer opportunities for conversations and informal interactions, however the meeting itself remained an important and useful knowledge dissemination activity.

Beyond the headline events, individual Global Programme staff provided many examples of simple sharing systems (such as community of practice groups run on WhatsApp, requiring fairly limited levels of effort but provide a space for sharing. The utility of these was well perceived, and the low resource effort to maintain them is a clear positive for staff with high workloads and broad responsibilities. Unfortunately, the Global Programme has not yet developed any process to assess such method to determine the extent to which they are effective in spreading information and lead to the adoption of new approaches or concepts when used. As such while simple low effort knowledge sharing systems hold promise, the effectiveness of these approaches could not be established. The development of such a process should be a monitoring priority under the new phase.

The Global Programme also supports knowledge dissemination through its role in supporting policy development for key UN structures like the Human Rights Council. The Global Programme provides the Human Rights Council with evidence and expertise on human rights development issues, which informs the global debate and UN decision making.

Overall, there was clearly now a lot of activity on knowledge sharing, and the Global Programme has demonstrated a real investment in leveraging its global knowledge development role. However, lots of activity is not the only core aspect of effective knowledge sharing, and there are two critical issues that the global programme will need to address to ensure an effective role in promoting learning. Firstly, it is not currently clear how the Global Programme identifies priorities and thus targets its sharing efforts. Secondly, while the process for identifying insights seems to be fairly effective, less has been done to consider the process for developing something from a country experience into a lesson that can be shared to effect change in project approaches in another context.

On prioritisation, between the simple knowledge networks and the variety of regional and thematic knowledge events organised by different member of the Global Programme, there are now a lot of sharing opportunities, but with the selection of focus being made on an ad hoc basis. Global Programme staff pointed to a range of conceptual issues around which learning events had been organised, and these were clearly relevant to country office issues. However, with sharing occurring at global and regional levels, on strategic issues, specific thematic content, or on a regional concern, several country office staff noted they were overwhelmed by the number of opportunities to engage in knowledge

sharing, which were not always clearly differentiated from each other. The scope of the Global Programme is so wide that there is no real limit to the number of possible thematic or issue-based focuses that could be adopted, all of which could be relevant to some contexts, making this lack of any process to manage and direct topics an issue for the system. The Global Programme does have the support of a Crisis Bureau staff member who develops knowledge management and dissemination under an overall Community of Practice. However, the proliferation of regional and thematic COP's has expanded, which is both a sign of interest in knowledge dissemination and the variety of communities of interest across the Global Programme. A simple immediate response to assist with this could be to categorize the range of current options and create a simple set of branding of forms of knowledge sharing events, to clarify to staff how any specific event sits in the range of internal learning options.

The more difficult task is to move from simple sharing of knowledge towards a system that supports using that information to effectively integrate lessons into other contexts and projects. In the case of the larger events, the effort of preparing a presentation is probably directly useful to the country office that delivers it, as that process provides an opportunity to codify and organise what is perceived about a lesson. This evaluation found less evidence of guidance on how country staff should prepare lessons for sharing, or how other country offices could be supported to implement a lesson. Knowledge sharing events often appeared to be single efforts, with only limited resourcing or links to further efforts to use that knowledge. Lacking defined processes to give options for implementation of shared knowledge, it is likely that many of the sharing events are primarily useful in terms of staff feeling connected too and grounded in the current Global Programme work. This is a useful outcome but is not a full implementation of the programmes remit as a learning-based organisation.

While flexibility in implementation should not be abandoned, some level of structure or process around the learning and sharing is needed to guide resource allocation and systematise approaches. A potential approach can be seen in the recent development of the Justice Futures CoLab, which has defined a wider approach to developing and implementing what country projects learn. One of the important aspects is that it is an effort not just to have a space for the sharing of knowledge once developed, it is also intended (in theory) to be activated earlier when a new issue arises. The potential for the CoLab to be involved in the development of the lesson by working with the Country Office from their initial request for support, and using a CoLab discussion with wider range of stakeholders to plan for the response, is a pathway to building sharing into project development. The potential is for earlier identification of work synergies or shared issues, and then for the Global Programme responses to leverage already existent knowledge prior to design of a specific country project or activity. Linking the Global Programme's existing knowledge base and sharing system directly with project design, and consequently implementation, is a sensible improvement to how lessons are developed.

The CoLab approach does not address the prioritisation issue for the Global Programme, which remains a difficult issue to address in a context of too many potential areas of detailed work. Indeed, the CoLab approach will require more investment into specific sharing processes at an earlier stage, most critically of staff time. This process had not yet been done in practice at the time of the evaluation, and the Global Programme should monitor and assess the resources required to implement, along with its connection to outcomes for the project involved, to understand what the process needs to work effectively as a learning system. As a result of this increased resource requirement, greater use of deeper knowledge sharing systems by the Global Programme will put greater emphasis on prioritisation of effort, as relatively few issues can be investigated adequately in this approach.

Programme Management Level

The Global Programme is a complex effort that is difficult to manage, and its mandate to improve and coordinate whole of UN and global efforts on rule of law and human rights development represents an inherently political aim framed as a technical excellence target. This evaluation finds the programme management to be effective and overall efficient, and considers that the Phase 4 document shows evidence of the Global Programme learning from previous implementation and improving how its systems and processes function to support outcomes. That said this is an ongoing process of adaptation and improvement, and the evaluation has identified a number of issues of programme management to be considered.

Structure and resourcing

The overall structure of the Global Programme is a sensible and effective one that holds a clear relevance to the thematic areas of support. The most recent organigram shows a team split into a core programme team, a Global Focal Point team, key thematic areas (Justice, Human Rights, Community Security), and the Regional Hub advisors (Addis Ababa, Amman, Bangkok, Dakar, Istanbul, Panama). The implementation of Phase 4 has strengthened the programme through resourcing a Business and Human Rights sub-team in Geneva, and a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning sub-team in the Hague.

Given the range of support required from the Global Programme, the thematic structure remains relevant, but conceals significant differences in capability. In practice the justice team is most resourced, an allocation that seems sensible on the basis that the majority of UNDP's global work in the rule of law and human rights domain is primarily support to improvements in justice systems and delivery. This results in a team with more sense of being a team, and some internal structures to support joint work. Both the Security and Human Rights teams are significantly smaller, and in practice seem to be 1-2 permanent staff members. The extensive range of and types of support being delivered, along with the very small number of staff per sub team, results in some limits to the extent of interaction between teams. Consultations do occur, and all staff understood the roles and importance of the various capabilities, but there was rarely time to develop and seize opportunities for integration beyond simple coordination.

The difference in team resources contributes to limitations in the extent and quality of cross team interaction within the Global Programme. Staff describe a relatively low level of cross team sharing and interaction, with partner teams included where relevant, but in many cases the focus of the work not requiring active inclusion. This separation of teams appears to have been reinforced since 2020 as covid forced the adoption of remote working, removing or reducing the option for unstructured interactions in a shared team space². The team has invested effort into whole of ROLSHR communications through the resourcing and work of the core Global Programme sub-team, but the lack of face-to-face contact and interaction places limits on what can be achieved. While team members continue to hold positive attitudes regarding the distribution of capabilities and the relevance of all components of the Global Programme, it would be worth making more of an investment into bringing the whole team physically together, as part of an active effort to strengthen the positive team culture, and especially enable cross team links.

² On the other hand the pandemic seems to have improved the extent of overall team interaction between HQ and the regions, as regional advisors were more naturally included when all meetings were virtual.

This lack of core thematic capability also contrasts with the currently developing capability on Business and Human Rights, which now has more staff resources assigned than does the core Human Rights team. This evaluation is highly positive about the Global Programme's adoption of BHR as an area of competitive advantage, and one in which much good can be done. However, BHR staff themselves described their primary work as being strongly driven by the large projects they were managing within the sub-thematic, and less so in terms of their relationship with broader Human Rights work. Staff in this area come from a human rights development background, but the Global Programme should actively monitor and manage assignment of resources to ensure that this strong capability can both deliver on BHR goals and needs, but also contribute to a strong and effective overall Human Rights thematic. It is difficult to provide more specific recommendations than this given the donor funding driven nature of adequate resourcing of capabilities within the team.

The improved integration and functioning of the Regional Hub advisors as part of the Global Programme has already been noted as a major success in the last two years. It clearly took longer than ideal for the Global Programme to fill the necessary positions, and further time was then needed for new incumbents to learn both the needs of their respective county partners, and understand how each hub organises processes and decision making. This process was also complicated by the fact that the Global Programme remains an uncommon approach by UNDP, and as such Regional Hubs often had to learn how to integrate this capability without a blueprint from previous experience. While all hubs were now found to be effective in supporting their relevant regions, there remain strong differences in implementation of the regional advisors that influence how they work in practice.

The Bangkok hub can be used as an example of what is possible, given that the P5 Governance and Peacebuilding team lead is a Global Programme advisor, and has a second permanent staff member within his team. The result is that the Global Programme approaches and priorities are well understood by the Regional Hub leadership, and prioritisation discussions can be held with a clear sense of end goals, trade-offs, and resource flexibility and constraint. Bangkok, however, is one of three hubs with multiple permanent Global Programme staff³, and the only hub where the P5 Governance and Peacebuilding team lead role is filled with a Global Programme advisor.

The politics around understanding of the Global Programme, priority setting and resource allocation will remain a challenge. The ideal solution is for more permanent resources at each hub, to manage the overall workload, strengthen support to country offices, and ensure more continuity of capability in each location. However the resource implications of shifting further Global programme capability into the Regional Hubs are significant, and it is difficult to see how this can be done under the current resourcing model without sacrificing the capability of the core team in New York, which is not advisable.

Switching to processes, the picture is more complicated. While the specific investment of effort into improving the pipeline funding process are highly relevant and have been positively received, this is occurring in an overall context where the Global Programme is poor at articulating its systems and processes to its partners. This is positive in that it can be seen to be contributing to the flexibility of the

³ In theory and somewhat in practice the Dakar position is a sub-hub of the Africa Hub in Addis Ababa, and works as a team with that regional advisor. However the position in the Dakar sub-hub also introduces a third UNDP hierarchy and set of priorities that adds complexity to the functioning of the advisors.

Global Programme in how it implements its support, but it is negative in that the Global Programme remains opaque and thus confusing to its partners in ways that do not assist good outcomes.

To start with the positive side, the recent adjustments to the Pipeline process have been specifically designed to improve how outcomes are set and described during conceptualisation of a project. The adjustments to the form and process include an increased involvement of the Regional Advisors in working with country teams during proposal development to shape the projects such that they both have clear intended outcomes, but also have a set of activities that realistically could result in the described outcomes. The first round of proposals conducted under this system are in implementation currently, and there was already some evidence that the quality of proposals was improving, however it is not possible to confirm that the system works as intended to produce more outcomes focused evidence. What is evident is that this is an effort by the Global Programme to engage with the difficulty of demonstrating outcomes, and with the known limitations of country team capability on outcome focused reporting. The approach is an excellent method of using a process, with greater support, aligned with incentives to address a fundamental problem for both the Global Programme and the country offices themselves.

The only issue with the pipeline process that is worthy of further consideration at this time is the issue of transparency in offers. The Global Programme's current approach is to preselect which country offices will be approached for any specific pipeline funding opportunity, in coordination with the Regional Hub. This is done to limit the number of project submissions to a manageable number, given the limited funds available for each process. However the lack of transparency about involvement creates significant uncertainty and annoyance at the country office level. The Global Programme should consider communicating overtly with all when a pipeline process is occurring, while still deciding with the Regional Hub who should make proposals. This would increase country office awareness of the range of areas being worked on, and enable them to ask questions regarding their eligibility or leverage that concept in discussions with other donors.

This connects to the wider issue that the Global Programme has, of a lack of clarity and transparency on how it functions. The Global Programme appears to lack a clear guide or collection to show people the options to engage with it, and how to navigate these systems and processes when they do. This extends to how it introduces new staff into the Global Programme itself, with several commenting that it took an extended period of time to understand how to function effectively within the team. Country office staff were in some cases uncertain who they could approach within the Global Programme to seek information⁴. While the internal issue of the role and remit of staff positions seems to have been improved significantly, especially regarding the Regional Advisor roles, this leaves the issue of describing clearly the programmes core processes, and then ensuring that staff and partners are able to access this information easily when they make or manage a novel issue.

As noted above, in some cases this lack of detailed process can be useful, as the programme is less constrained in seeking out a suitable solution to the current issue. An example of this is the implementation of the priority countries concept. While the priority countries list did have a significant

⁴ While coordination of communication through the relevant country point of contact is a useful model, it is not clear that the Global Programme is deliberately implementing a strong communication hierarchy, nor why this would be a sensible approach to encourage country teams getting to the right person for their questions.

impact on where resources were assigned, as was intended, the Global Programme were commended by the regional and country level partners for the extent to which they would work with regionally identified priorities to find ways to support them. The change to remove the explicit priority country list in Phase 4 is a sensible extension of this policy approach, as is the joint decision making process around resource allocation with the Regional Hubs. Maintaining a high degree of flexibility is important, so this evaluation is reluctant to suggest too much investment in defining process structures. However, consideration of some collection and documentation of current process would make it easier to onboard staff, explain options to country teams, and indeed better assess where more process might be needed.

Partner relationships

The Global Programmes management of relationships and partnerships is relatively good, and the process of implementing Phase 3 seems to have maintained these relationships. The partners consulted in this process had a uniformly high opinion of the worth and role of the Global Programme. Beyond this high level statement of support, most of the primary factors that influence partnership decisions, notably amongst key donors, are not amenable to anything the Global programme can control, and as such suggest only limited changes to relationship building would improve them, or mitigate and manage strategic risks.

The major changes in partnerships during Phase 3 seem to have resulted from donor side political changes, with the Global Programme work and approaches being unrelated to the decision. Partners that invest in the Global Programme have a strategic commitment to supporting rule of law, security and/or human rights development. Even the increased investments in the UN as an implementing partner appear to be driven by donor end political decisions, rather than any obvious appreciation of the advantages of the Global Programme.

Donors have articulated a desire for better communication from the Global Programme, both in terms of earlier awareness of events and efforts, on how their country can use embassies or strategic communications to reinforce outcomes, and around its reporting on outcomes. These are useful guidelines to where the Global Programme can focus its communication efforts with its partners, and where it can seek to strengthen the partnership through joint action beyond simple funding flows.

While some small improvements in the quality of communication and coordination are possible, partners were realistic about the extent to which this would address some of the fundamental constraints on how they work together. All partners noted that untied funding was desirable, but none could adjust their current national constraints to enable this more than they were already. Likewise, while partners were keen on timely and specific engagement from the Global Programme to enable more joint efforts, resource constraints within departments of Foreign Affairs and with number of Embassy staff were seen to place real limits to how often this would be possible in practice.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning

This evaluation is strongly positive about the steps being made by the Global Programme to address the identified weakness in monitoring and learning. The most obvious aspect is the clear commitment to a MEL support capability within the ROLSHR team under Phase 4. As that structure is in the process of being staffed, it is too early to observe its impact, but it represents a sensible and needed investment if outcome monitoring is to be improved. This investment is linked with process changes that foreground outcomes measurement, like the pipeline submission and approval process, thus improving the extent to which outcomes are considered from the start, integrated into the plan, and hopefully collected on

during implementation. It is also clearly aligned with the stronger emphasis on sharing and learning processes within the Global Programme.

Country team level limitations in project staff time and conceptualisation remain the fundamental constraint to successful MEL. The overall goal of this from an implementation perspective is to support country projects to use MEL to implement adaptive and problem-solving approaches to delivery. The provision of quality outcomes data to donors is a critical need to maintain funding, but MEL's use within the projects themselves is the most fundamental purpose to learning focused development systems. In that context, it is currently hard to see how the Global Programme support functions to enable the use of MEL by country teams rather than simply providing it for HQ and donor reporting.

The key issue here is that the collection of high-quality outcome data, while important, needs to be matched with a defined and implemented process to use that information to adjust country project approaches. Currently the Global Programme does not seem to have conceptualised and articulated a standardised approach to such internal project learning processes, and implementation of them is primarily an aspect of yearly planning processes. An option for the new MEL team would be to develop recommendations on how to implement a regular learning review at the project level, and then in conjunction with the Regional Advisors support the country teams to conduct them on at least a yearly basis. Some Country Projects do run these already, but some structured support from the Global Programme will help improve these, and create them in cases where they are currently not implemented. If implemented well, could both build country project staff knowledge of what data they have and how to use it, but also get them engaged in what more is needed.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Global Programme is a highly successful model, one that is evidently a relevant method of managing and providing a global level of support to needed reforms in the rule of law, security, and human rights. The second half of Phase 3 of the Global Programme can be characterised as one of continued adaptation and adjustment to systems and processes in ways that are consistent with improving the outcomes it supports.

It is notable that the Global Programme is quite an unusual approach within both the UNDP system of managing global work, and with its key UN partners. The pairing of policy and technical expertise, integration of the Regional Hubs, and a strong funding capability make for an effective system to link headquarters capabilities with the field to coordinate and deliver effective development efforts. It appears that UNDP is increasingly aware of this, at least within the Global Policy Network, and has made some efforts to adopt the model in other thematic areas. This is a useful outcome, given that one of the constraints identified by this evaluation was that the Global Programme is often poorly understood within UNDP, and so devotes significant efforts to integrating into areas like the Regional Hubs. Wider use of the Global Programme model would reduce this issue by making it a well-established approach to global management and delivery, rather than an exception.

1. UNDP should assess the Global Programme approach, and see to what extent it can be more widely used as a template.
2. The Global Programme should continue to look for opportunities to strengthen its decentralised approach and reinforce the success of its development in partnership with the Regional Hubs.

The most notable improvements that the Global Programme has implemented during the second part of Phase 3, and integrated into the design of Phase 4, focus on reinforcing knowledge development and sharing; defining and resourcing a lead role in some thematic areas; and improving the overall integration and use of MEL by rule of law, security and human rights projects. Progress here has been significant, with far more sharing occurring, and clear strengths appearing in specific areas. To maintain this initial success and translate it into enduring strengths for the Global programme requires careful management of the develop of these capabilities to reinforce their effectiveness and integration into how UNDP does this work.

3. The Global Programme should consider what meta structure is used for managing and defining forms of knowledge sharing, then reinforce that system to ensure that sharing contributes to knowledge being used effectively. The CoLab is an obvious candidate for this structure, but may not be the only option, and needs to have its resource demands demonstrated.
4. The Global Programme should set out clear guidelines for how to pilot and develop potential thematics which it may use as a focus to provide policy and practice leadership. Success in doing so requires that they are given time to develop, are resourced adequately⁵, do not overlap or compete with approaches and remits implemented by other UN entities. It is also critical that the Global Programme be realistic about how many can be supported.
5. The Global Programme should prioritise support to guidance for internal country project learning processes designed to leverage the improved focus on identifying and measuring outcomes. Implementation of processes to use that outcome focus to support more agile and adaptive country project approaches will support the achievement of more outcomes, and link MEL with a more effective Global Programme.

Finally, the Global Programme has been effective in navigating the politics of its position and role, but can do more to build strong and effective relationships within the UN and with its donors.

6. The Global Programme should assess options to spread the leadership influence role to ensure that it can be effective in the situations where hierarchy matters. This may include greater leveraging of its hierarchy in the Crisis Bureau.
7. The Global Programme should deliberately use the modality of joint projects to continue to invest in its partnerships with other UN actors. While effortful to initiate, and often requiring more management investment than a UNDP project, the value add of system coherence is significantly greater from jointly planned and implemented projects.
8. The Global Programme should identify options where it could use partner political support or action to reinforce its projects and efforts. It is likely that this may only rarely result in coordinated action, but the investment in diversifying the terms of the relationship are potentially useful by themselves.

⁵ Most notably in terms of how many ROLSHR team members will need to be assigned to support this.

Annex 1

Evaluation Questions and matrix

| Questions & Sub-questions | | Data Source | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|------|---------|-------|
| | | Document | Field Visit | UNDP | Partner | Donor |
| | GLOBAL | | | | | |
| Q1 | In what ways has ROLJSR promoted coordinated approaches, and how successful has it been in doing this? | | | | | |
| 1.1 | To what extent has the Global Programme promoted coordination and partnership with national counterparts, donor partners, and across the UN system? | X | X | X | X | X |
| 1.2 | How does the Global Programme support joint engagement across the UN pillars? | X | X | X | | |
| 1.3 | Is the Global Programme an effective platform for financially and operationally supporting the Global Focal Point for Rule of Law (with DPO and other UN partners)? | X | | X | | X |
| Q2 | To what extent is ROLJSR leading and contributing to global rule of law/human rights policy and practice? | | | | | |
| 2.1 | How has the Global Programme shaped UNDP's relevance as an international leader and/or partner in the rule of law and human rights field(s)? | X | | X | X | X |
| 2.2 | Is UNDP recognized as a key actor on rule of law, security and human rights programming in complex contexts and what has the impact of this been on the organization? | X | | X | X | X |
| 2.3 | What is the contribution of the Global Programme to the Sustaining Peace and Prevention agendas of the Secretary-General? | | | X | | X |
| Q3 | How does ROLJSR strengthen and add value to UNDP's global efforts on rule of law, security and human rights? | | | | | |
| 3.1 | To what extent has UNDP leveraged the Global Programme to strengthen or add value to its corporate offer on rule of law, security and human rights? | X | | X | | |
| 3.2 | How does the Global Programme identify lessons and support scaling up from the field to develop policy and practice globally? | X | X | X | X | X |

| Questions & Sub-questions | | Data Source | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|------|---------|-------|
| | | Document | Field Visit | UNDP | Partner | Donor |
| | COUNTRY | | | | | |
| Q3 | How has ROLJSHR supported Country Offices, and what has been achieved with this support? | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Has the Global Programme’s technical, financial, operational and strategic support been relevant and responsive to the needs and priorities of UNDP Country Offices in the field to engage on rule of law, security and human rights programming? | X | X | X | X | |
| 1.2 | To what extent has the Global Programme contributed to improving the overall rule of law, security and human rights situation in priority countries? What examples can be shared? | X | X | X | X | |
| 1.3 | How consistent has Global Programme support been with UNDP corporate standards of practice (e.g., prioritizing Leave No One Behind, human rights-based, nationally-owned, based on analytical assessment, adapted to country context, gender sensitive and conflict-sensitive, supportive of innovation)? | X | X | X | | |
| Q2 | To what extent is ROLJSHR support acting as a catalyst for greater outcomes, and what could be done to improve that effect? | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Has the Global Programme modality added value to UNDP’s offer on rule of law, security and human rights in the field? | X | X | X | | |
| 2.2 | What elements of this support have the largest impact (flexible funding, expertise, comprehensive programming, coordination with the UN system)? | X | X | X | | |
| 2.3 | How sustainable are the results? | X | X | X | X | |
| Q3 | How is ROLJSHR contributing to the development and dissemination of lessons within a country and between countries? | | | | | |
| 3.1 | How do country programmes identify and develop lessons, and how does the Global Programme support this? | X | X | X | | |
| 3.2 | What is done to disseminate lessons identified? | X | X | X | X | X |

| Questions & Sub-questions | | Data Source | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|------|---------|-------|
| | | Document | Field Visit | UNDP | Partner | Donor |
| | PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT | | | | | |
| Q1 | How well does the current structure and resourcing of ROLISHR contribute to or inhibit effective outcomes? What options exist to improve this? | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Are the management, operational, financial and administrative structures, including SOPs and business processes of the Global Programme fit for purpose? | X | X | X | | |
| 1.2 | Where are the current challenges and what improvements could be made? | X | X | X | | |
| 1.3 | Does the Global Programme have the required resources (human and financial) to achieve its intended programme objectives? If not, where is more investment needed? | X | | X | | X |
| Q2 | Does the Global Programme management meet partners' expectations? If not, what can be done to facilitate this? | | | | | |
| 2.1 | How are partner expectations changing? | | | | X | X |
| 2.2 | What is the longer-term role of the Global Programme? | | | X | X | X |
| 2.3 | What can be done to improve the partnerships? | | | X | X | X |
| Q3 | Is the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning capacity in the Global Programme sufficient and how could it be improved? | | | | | |
| 3.1 | To what extent are MEL changes resulting in better knowledge and understanding of outcomes? | X | X | X | | |
| 3.2 | How does the Global Programme use results to manage and adapt its portfolio of efforts? | X | X | X | | |

Annex 2

Consultation list and mission reports

UNDP

Head ROLSHR

Human Right team ROLSHR

Justice team ROLSHR

Community Security team ROLSHR

Global Programme Team ROLSHR

Regional Service Centre for Africa

Sub-Regional Hub for Africa (Dakar)

Amman Regional Hub

Bangkok Regional Hub

Istanbul Regional Hub

Panama Regional Hub

Lesotho Country Office

Mali Country Office

Mozambique Country Office

South Sudan Country Office

Zimbabwe Country Office

UN System

UNOPS

UN Women

Department of Peace Operations

Justice and Corrections Standing Capacity

Donor

The Netherlands

Sweden

Kyrgyzstan Mission

UNDP Country Office Leadership

UNDP Rule of Law Team

UNDP Gender Team

UN Women

UNODC

Kyrgyzstan Ombuds Office

Prosecutor General's Office

Ministry of Justice

Bar Association

Association of Women Judges

Association of Legal Clinics in Kyrgyzstan

Free Legal Aid Coordination Council

Osh Free Legal Aid Coordination Centre

Human Rights Advocacy Centre

Strategic Directions NGO

Fond Razvitiya Prava I Biznesa

Soros Foundation

Other Interviews

Independent Evaluation Office Access to Justice Evaluation team

ROLSHR Mid Term Evaluation Team

Annex 3

Documents Reviewed

Project Document: The Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development Phase 3

Project Document: The Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development Phase 4

Methodological Note to Accompany Phase IV Results Framework

Mid-Term Project Evaluation for the Global Programme on Rule of Law and Human Rights (2016-2019)

Management Response: Mid-Term Project Evaluation for the Global Programme on Rule of Law and Human Rights (2016-2019)

ROLSHR Annual Report (2019, 2020, 2021)

UNDP Strategic Plan 2022 – 2025

Organisational Chart ROLJSR (2022)

Organisational Chart Global Policy Network (2021)

ROLSHR Project Pipeline (2022)

Outline of Pipeline Process

GP4 Funding Request Template for Djibouti, Libya, Moldova (2022)

The Justice Futures CoLab Brochure

E-Justice: Digital Transformation to Close the Justice Gap (report and Toolkit)

Beyond the Pandemic – The Justice Emergency (2022)

Organisational Chart Governance and Peacebuilding RSCA (2022)

Organisational Chart Dakar Sub-regional Hub (2022)

Global Focal Point for the Rule of Law Progress Report (2020, 2021)

IEO Evaluation Access to Justice Terms of Reference (2022)

Project Document: Women, Peace and Security Global Facility: From Resolutions to Accountability and Leadership Phase II

Women’s meaningful participation in transitional justice: Advancing gender equality and building sustainable peace (2022)

Local governance and rule of law contributions to prevent, address and solve forced displacement and statelessness situations: UNHCR-UNDP Programmatic Framework 2020-2023

Guiding Principle on Business and Human Rights (2011)

Heightened Human Rights Due Diligence for Business in Conflict-Affected Contexts: A Guide (2022)

Overview of the UN System support to the legal inventory process (Kyrgyzstan 2021)

Status of UN priority laws (Kyrgyzstan 2022)