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II. Executive Summary

Background

This report is the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of Egypt’s United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2007-2011. It captures the key features of the United Nations work in Egypt from January 2007 to May 2009. Thanks to the efficient Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in place, reporting on progress towards achieving UNDAF outcomes and Country Programme outcomes and outputs was already available. Hence, the MTR went beyond progress reporting and focused on lessons learned from the first two and a half years of implementation so that those lessons can feed into the remaining UNDAF cycle (mid 2009-2011) and into the next UNDAF (2012-2016). As such, this review is more a moment of pause in implementation – a moment of strategic reflection – than a detailed analysis of performance.

The MTR focuses on the relevance of the current UNDAF against government priorities, the main achievements, challenges and obstacles of the UNDAF process, and the effectiveness of the current M&E system and its coordination mechanism. There is also close attention to revising UNDAF outputs to better reflect actual cooperation and on incorporating emerging issues in the next UNDAF cycle.

The review links the implementation of the UNDAF and its future implementation to the guiding principles of UN reform and aid effectiveness. Since the UNDAF was prepared in 2005, four years ago, and signed in March 2006, a series of significant events and processes took place in the UN reform and aid effectiveness areas, which are explained in detail in the report.

The report assesses the Egyptian context (economic, political and social) and the key development issues faced by Egypt as a Middle Income Country, possessing elements of both developing and developed countries.

The report also recalls the key findings of the latest national Millennium Development Goal (MDG) report, which was published in December 2008 by the Government of Egypt, and relates each MDG to their respective UNDAF outcomes and outputs.

Limitations

The review team did not measure the achievements of the strategic results of the UNDAF. Noteworthy is the fact that the terms of reference of the review did not focus on this aspect because annual progress reports exist. De facto, the present UNDAF is a series of agency activities contributing to UNDAF Outcomes. There is no explicit strategic implementation scenarios revealing how the UNDAF Outcomes will be achieved. There is only a tally of activities contributing towards the achievement of the Country Programme and UNDAF outcomes. Therefore, the consultants could not assess whether all critical factors necessary for the achievement of the strategic outcomes were being addressed. In addition, the UNDAF MTR preceded the preparation of agency country programme MTRs or equivalent. The UNDAF MTR process did not have available the necessary information for reporting on the degree of achievement of strategic outcomes. In light of these circumstances, the review team deployed more efforts thinking through the process that will enable the Government, UN System and partners to better plan the next UNDAF and make it more strategic and country-led.

The efforts to monitor the UNDAF faced several difficulties not only at the Task Force and M&E Team levels but also at the individual agency level. It is not easy to monitor the contribution of different agency programmes to the UNDAF. In general, the agencies undertake some type of systematic review or reporting on their respective programmes or projects, mainly to their headquarters, but do not make systematic reporting of their contribution to UNDAF. When agencies report, they do not systematically classify their implemented activities against the expected outputs listed in the UNDAF. In addition, there is no annual projection of contributions to the UNDAF, which could facilitate UNDAF monitoring and evaluation. All of this creates serious limitations in monitoring and reporting on the strategic implementation of the UNDAF.
Main findings

The review found the UNDAF to be in line with the internationally agreed development goals, in particular those of the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs, commitments from other conferences, and the norms and standards governing the work of UN entities, among them the human rights treaties. The UNDAF is also clearly in line with national policies and strategies spelled out in Egypt’s long-term “Vision for Egypt’s Development by 2022”, and with the country’s medium-term strategy set out in the sixth Five-Year Plan (FYP) for Socio-Economic Development.

Although the UNDAF is perceived as relevant by most actors, ownership by the Government – and other partners – seems limited. The Government does not appear to be sufficiently involved in either implementation or monitoring of the UNDAF.

Civil society organizations (CSOs) do not seem strongly involved in UNDAF implementation either. This does not mean that CSOs or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are not committed to several country programme outputs but that, in general terms, their participation at the strategic level of the UNDAF remains limited.

Relevance, effectiveness and coherence

In terms of design and focus, at the time when the UNDAF was prepared, the UNCT seems to have interpreted, from the guidance material, that the UNDAF was a framework that was going to reflect most of the activities undertaken by the UN agencies. So while the UNDAF has been designed as a coherent, focused and results-based framework, it may come across as unfocused in its strategic intent. It is difficult, for example, to determine whether the planned UNDAF Country Programmes outcomes at the lower level in the hierarchy of results could effectively lead to the expected UNDAF outcomes at a higher level.

With respect to effectiveness, many activities have unquestionably been undertaken by agencies in the UNDAF framework, some jointly and others individually. Nevertheless, the two annual UNDAF progress reports made significant observations on the effectiveness of the UNDAF, including that virtually all achievements still focus on inputs and outputs, and that more work is necessary to facilitate the switch to outcome reporting. Furthermore, the report affirmed that the majority of achievements and indicators reported do not show significant progress from the original baseline status. It was also suggested to look at sustainability factors for the various UNDAF outcomes. The latest progress report concluded that it is safe to assume that the UNDAF has not delivered results at the level originally expected.

On a positive note, the review also reported that it is indisputable that interagency collaboration and cooperation have reached levels never attained before this second UNDAF. One distinctive feature of UNCT activities in Egypt is the number of joint programmes and joint programming activities. In this regard, it is worth noting that there are currently 17 joint programmes under implementation, which is a significant number, including the approval of three UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund proposals.

With respect to the need for greater efficiency of activities undertaken at field level, emphasized in the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR), the Delivering as One (DaO) approach, and the Accra Agenda for Action, the Common Country Assessment (CCA)/UNDAF process in Egypt has certainly played a key role in improving efficiency. It has helped to ensure better alignment with national strategies and plans, despite country ownership concerns. This has induced greater harmonization within the UN system, especially with the use of joint programme approaches. The UNDAF has also strengthened the RC system and improved inclusiveness of non-resident agencies.

That said, some partners lamented the lack of coherence and harmonization. In the donor community, there seems to be some confusion regarding the mandates of each UN agency and a lack of knowledge of whom does what and on behalf of whom. There was a plea for better flow of information and better communication between the bilateral donor community and the UN.
Several development partners also indicated that partners may shy away from UN bureaucratic procedures, which make collaboration unattractive and costly.

In Egypt, there is definitively a challenge in harmonization, with no less than 24 UN agencies involved and 30 donors. The UN Resident Coordinator assumed the Chairmanship of the Development Partners Group in November 2008, and his role has been particularly appreciated. As a result, the group has been revitalized and benefited from a new impetus. Within the DPG, there is definitively a key role the UN can play to bring partners together, enhance dialogue between the Government, donors and the UN, and increase aid effectiveness and efficiency.

The five key inter-related principles

The review also analyzed some of the five inter-related principles that must be applied at country level, according to the CCA/UNDAF guidelines: human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management and capacity development.

With respect to the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA), the review observed that both the CCA and the UNDAF are built on a solid human rights approach foundation. The CCA aims at exploring the responses of claim-holders and duty-bearers to different development challenges and identifying the main capacity gaps that impede the fulfilment of these obligations. The UNDAF is very much in line with this thinking. In addition, the outcomes in the Results Matrix do reflect, to some extent, an expected increased performance of rights-holders and duty-bearers. Some progress has been made in the implementation of the approach, by focusing on the gradual fulfilment of "rights", strengthening capacities of both right-holders and duty-bearers, and on interventions promoting social inclusion of those excluded from enjoying their human rights.

On gender equality and the elimination of discrimination on the basis of sex, the MTR analyzed how gender issues were reflected in UNDAF programming and whether special attention was given to girls and women’s rights and to expanding their means of action. Gender issues are indeed very much at the centre of the CCA/UNDAF and placed at a high level in the hierarchy of the Results Matrix. Likewise, there are several gender-focused projects. Nevertheless, the intended gender mainstreaming in all projects has not been fully implemented.

Efforts undertaken in Egypt to put in place a solid results-based management (RBM) system, use and update the Results Matrix regularly and monitor the UNDAF are commendable. RBM – another of the five inter-related principles – has been strengthened by the constant use of the Results Matrix and the M&E plan during UNDAF implementation. In order to continue to improve RBM and M&E features in the UNDAF, the MTR focused some effort on improving the M&E Framework (indicators, baselines, targets, risks and assumptions) and on reviewing the Results Matrix.

While progress has also been made in data gathering, problems remain, which affects the functioning and quality of the monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF. Baseline data is a problem, because it is often not available. DevInfo, which offers a greater level of disaggregation of information that can show disparities in gender, location, ethnicity, religion, etc., has not been significantly used so far in Egypt, and several systems continue to coexist.

The UNCT certainly deserves credit for having put in place a comprehensive M&E system and for having produced two informative annual reports, with a good level of analysis of results and challenges in UNDAF implementation, at the outcome and output levels. The system put in place in Egypt is very much in conformity with the recommendations contained in the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines. Further credit is due to the UNCT, the Government and all parties involved for having actually implemented the M&E system in a rather systematic way.

Role expected from the UN

The review team attempted to gain a better understanding of the value added of the UN in Egypt and to identify the key role that is expected from the UN. Most donors recognize the unique role of the UN in the country. Because it is not very significant in terms of financial flows, the UN is expected to provide robust technical advice and intellectual leadership. The UN analytical work
(including the CCA) is one of its comparative advantages, especially because the UN is considered more independent than the other development partners.

The review also highlighted that several development partners consider the UN as the best place for aid coordination in the country. The UN can definitively bring people together. This is already a niche of excellence of the UN and a much appreciated role among development partners. Since the Resident Coordinator is now chairing the Development Partners Group, the UN is even better placed to play this role fully. All development partners indicated their interest in continuing to collaborate with the UN. Some of them (EU and US, for instance) will soon engage in new programming cycles and would welcome the opportunity for the UN to lead a development coordination effort. Better coordination would also have many benefits for strengthening effectiveness, efficiency, advocacy and resource leveraging and ensure that greater attention is given to national capacity development.

How coordination is done is key for enhancing the comparative advantages of all partners. This would enable them to contribute and lead in their respective areas of expertise. In addition, more weight and influence would be gained if partners were given the opportunity to speak on issues where they have specific strengths. The idea of burden sharing is considered excellent and clearer coordination would alone be a worthy strategic outcome of the UNDAF. Furthermore, the UN can play an important facilitating role in South-South cooperation, exchange of know-how, etc.

Main conclusions and recommendations

At the moment, too much is expected of the UNDAF. Those consulted by the review team emphasized the need to simplify the approach – focusing on too many issues often leads to limited implementation. The overall strategic positioning of the UNDAF was often considered weak by most interlocutors.

The results of the revision of UNDAF outputs – referred to as "pruning" – conducted as part of the MTR process should generate clearer focus on its strategic results, both for the remaining part of the current UNDAF programming cycle and the next. At the same time, the MTR also offered the opportunity to formally include in the UNDAF some ongoing joint activities that were not initially planned and facilitated the consideration of emerging issues. Similarly, important work was undertaken by UN agencies, in conjunction with the M&E Task Forces, to review the M&E framework. All these efforts are key outcomes of the MTR and considered very valuable by the review team and more broadly by the whole UNCT.

While choices will obviously be determined by key problems identified and emerging issues, the UNCT should bear in mind that the five inter-related principles included in the UNDAF guidelines, which are closely related to those in the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness, can actually help to define more clearly the strategic intent. The Human Rights-Based Approach holds the potential to ensure a high quality review and analysis of development challenges by identifying the different causes of development problems (e.g., discrimination and exclusion patterns), together with the concrete claims of rights-holders, as well as the obligations and responsibilities of duty-bearers.

With the series of crises that are currently shaking the world – financial and economic, environmental and energetic, food and prices, health and pandemics, for example – development frameworks like the UNDAF are necessary for the benefit of the poorest and more marginalized in society. Considering that the UNDAF is one of the key instruments identified by the TCPR for increasing coherence, effectiveness and relevance of UN operations at country level, it is imperative that the UNDAF embodies a strategic vision of the UN’s contribution to national priorities and focuses the UNCT’s limited resources on those issues where the UN can make the biggest difference, based on its comparative advantage and capacities. At the same time, the lessons from the Delivering as One UN pilots point to the need for further operational planning, through a common operational document or UNDAF implementation plan.

The UNDAF can also support the aid effectiveness agenda in Egypt. The “Accra Agenda for Action” (AAA) has the potential to accelerate the implementation of the Paris Declaration
principles, which has been lagging behind. According to high-level officials and discussions that took place at the retreat of development partners in Cairo in March 2009, this provides a good opportunity for the UN system, the Government and other aid partners to reflect on how external aid and cooperation could become more effective in Egypt, and how the UNDAF can be more useful in that sense. The AAA priorities for Egypt should therefore inform the UNDAF – both the remaining programme cycle and the next UNDAF.

In a context where UN assistance is limited, all actors involved – the Government, the UN system, development partners, civil society, NGOs, and all other partners – would certainly benefit from stronger national ownership and enhanced coordination of external assistance. Coupled with stronger monitoring of the UN’s contribution to the country’s development, this would reinforce the accountability of different actors, as suggested in the UNDAF Guidelines, the TCPR, the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Clearly, CSOs and NGOs are not adequately involved in the UNDAF at the moment. It is now understood that true “national ownership” is a more powerful tool for achieving sustainable development results and impact than mere “government ownership”. This implies stronger involvement of CSOs and NGOs in UNDAF implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The meaningful participation of these actors at the strategic level of the UNDAF should be actively pursued, including in the M&E Task Forces.

The TCPR, the UNDAF Guidelines and the Accra Agenda for Action clearly suggest that there should be more coordination in development aid between all actors involved. All development partners seem to be very interested in continuing to collaborate with the UN, which is a key interlocutor in the development debate. Most of them would welcome the opportunity for the UN to lead a development coordination effort. The role of the UN as a Chair of the DPG is widely appreciated, and development partners are certainly very willing to support the UN’s readiness to assume a coordinating role. This is quite a unique opportunity for the UN system in Egypt.

Preparations of the next CCA/UNDAF will have to start soon if the UNCT wants to ensure that they provide a clear strategic direction for the UN, with the full support and participation of Government, development partners and all other actors.

Many interlocutors consider that, in the case of Egypt, the preparation of a CCA would be quite useful, given that there is no other comprehensive analytical process that can replace it. This would need to involve a multitude of actors from the UN, Government, CSOs and NGOs, development partners, private sector, etc. The end result of this multi-partner analytical process could be a “situation analysis” that articulates Egypt’s priority development outcomes, for which international cooperation would be welcome. The social impact of the international global financial crisis for Egypt could be significant and a comprehensive assessment of the situation in Egypt has not been yet finalized. Other studies may need to be conducted very soon to feed into the CCA. In the short run, the Government and the UNCT need to identify where evidence gathering and strategic planning are required.

Finally, it will be crucial to apply what the UN system can further learn from UNDAF implementation, and consider the assets of the “Delivering as One UN” approach for the next UNDAF.
III. Introduction

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2007-2011 represents the overall planning structure for the United Nations system, in its support to Egypt’s national development priorities for a period of five years. The UNDAF, representing both a process and a product, enables a holistic, nationally owned United Nations approach to country challenges, thus increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of United Nations operations by promoting greater synergy in action.¹

In Egypt, the UNDAF process was initiated with the preparation of the Common Country Assessment (CCA) in 2004.² In November 2004, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) retreat decided on the analytical framework for the CCA and the timeframe for the entire UNDAF process. The UNDAF itself was finalized and adopted between the Government of Egypt and the United Nations System in March 2006, in order for the agencies to submit to their Executive Boards, the Country Programme Documents (CPDs) or other similar documents, followed by the preparation of the Country Programme Action Plans (CPAPs) for some UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, WFP and UNFPA) and other similar tools for other agencies. The formal implementation of the UNDAF began in January 2007.

Although the Mid-Term Review (MTR) does not constitute a mandatory requirement, having reached the midpoint in the UNDAF implementation cycle, the UN Country Team decided, along with the Egyptian Government, to conduct a light mid-term review as a ‘stepping stone’ to a possible final evaluation which could take place in 2011, if the UNCT and the Government would deem it necessary and useful.

This report captures the key features of the United Nations’ work in Egypt from January 2007 to May 2009, when the Mid-Term Review took place and this report was drafted. More than analyzing the progress in the achievements of UNDAF outcomes, and Country Programme outcomes and outputs – which was already available thanks to the efficient Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in place – the review has focused its attention on what to learn from these first years of implementation, and how to plan for the rest of the cycle (mid 2009 – 2011) and for the next UNDAF (after 2012). As such, this review is more a moment of pause in the implementation – a moment of strategic reflection.

This report explains the rationale and background of the Mid Term Review (Section I), places the review in the evolving context of UN reform and aid environment (Section II), describes the current situation in Egypt and emerging issues (Section III), offers an analysis of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDAF (Section IV), proposes a vision statement for strategic governance and implementation of the UNDAF (Section V), and make some conclusions and recommendations, most of which are relevant to the implementation of the current UNDAF and the preparation process of the next one (Section VI). The report includes various annexes, including the updated Result Matrix and M&E framework.

IV. Background and Methodology

A. CCA and UNDAF – Background and Rationale

In the development area, the Common Country Assessment (CCA) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) are crucial elements of the United Nations Reform process, launched by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in 1997. The UN Reform introduced the CCA and UNDAF as new planning and programming tools. In Egypt and elsewhere, they are the principal mechanisms to strengthen analytical work, development cooperation strategies, coordination and harmonization between UN entities, in support of Government. These instruments are also closely linked to the changing aid environment and have a great potential to strengthen aid effectiveness. They play a very useful and supporting role for countries such as Egypt that have signed the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005, and are engaged in implementing the more recently agreed upon “Accra Agenda for Action”, in 2008.

The CCA is the common instrument of the UN agencies prepared in collaboration with the government for the analysis of the national development situation.

The UNDAF is the common strategic framework for the operational activities of the UN system at the country level. It provides a collective, coherent, and integrated response to national priorities and needs, including poverty reduction strategies, within the framework of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other national commitments. The UNDAF is developed in full cooperation between the government and the United Nations Country Team, with the contribution and participation of civil society, Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and other stakeholders.

In Egypt, the UNDAF was designed on the basis of the diagnostic analysis of Egypt that was done in 2005 with the Common Country Assessment (CCA). Based on priority areas highlighted in the CCA, the eight MDGs and the Government priorities, the UN Country Team and its partners agreed on the UNDAF as the common ‘business plan’, which identifies the following five strategic areas (“outcomes”) for focused development cooperation by the UN, the Government and development partners, over a five-year period (2007-2011). These five areas are the following: (1) State Performance; (2) Unemployment; (3) Regional and Human Disparities; (4) Women’s Participation and (5) Democratic Governance.

While each of the UN agencies operate under the framework of the Resident Coordinator system and, currently, under the second UN Development Assistance Framework in Egypt, covering the years 2007-2011, they also operate in Egypt pursuing their specific mandates, and report to their specific Executive Boards or Governing Bodies.

B. Monitoring and Evaluation system

During the 5 year period, the UNDAF is being systematically monitored to measure progress towards its five outcomes, and annual review reports are prepared and disseminated. It must be said, at the outset, that the Monitoring and Evaluation system put in place by the UNCT and the Government of Egypt was very comprehensive. Moreover, it is being implemented, which merits recognition to all parties involved.

Following the publication of the UNDAF, the UN Coordination Office, in partnership with the Centre for Project Evaluation and Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA) of the Ministry of International Cooperation, designed the current M&E system, and composed of 6 UNDAF Outcome M&E Task Forces, an M&E Coordination Team and a Steering Committee.

The UNDAF monitoring and evaluation process in Egypt is characterized by the collective work of the UN System and the Government of Egypt, and the first two UNDAF M&E Annual Reports for 2007 and 2008 constitute the fruit of this partnership.
This review of the UNDAF was planned in the UNDAF document itself for 2009, as part of the M&E activities.

C. MTR Objectives

Terms of reference (TORs) were prepared, which specified the objectives of the MTR, which are included in Annex 1. The main objective of conducting the MTR was to assess the current UNDAF after two and a half years of programme implementation, by looking mainly at three components:

1. Relevance of the current UNDAF towards Government priorities;
2. Main achievements, challenges and obstacles of the UNDAF process;
3. Effectiveness of the current M&E system and its coordination mechanism.

The main expected result was to determine how emerging issues, which are not reflected in the current UNDAF, might be incorporated in the next UNDAF cycle, to ensure a better alignment of UN assistance with national priorities and achieve a greater development impact. The role of the review team was also to support the ‘pruning’ of Country Programme outputs, and the revision of the M&E framework (indicators, sources of verification, risks and assumptions.

During the course of the revision, it also appeared that the MTR provided the opportunity to take stock of progress toward Egypt’s development priorities, the environment within which the UN is operating, the strategic focus of the current UNDAF with a high number of outcomes and outputs, and consequently its level of overall implementation. Specifically, the MTR aimed at determining some adjustments in strategy, focus and programme implementation that needed to be carried out to achieve the expected programme results for the remaining period of the UNDAF, providing a foundation for emerging areas for consideration in the next UNDAF. As such, the review is considered a stepping stone towards a possible final evaluation, which will serve as an analytical tool, in preparation for the next UNDAF cycle (2012-2016).

Expected results of the MTR were also to: strengthen the UN’s contribution to national priorities; enhance ownership, from both the Government and other national partners, define possible new partnership initiatives, particularly within the context of new aid modalities; and, for UN Agencies, to add the greatest possible value to the achievement of national development goals and, to the extent possible, harmonize and simplify their work processes.

D. Review Process and Preparation of the MTR

The MTR was conducted by two external consultants selected by the UN Coordination Office in Egypt. The review process was undertaken in close consultation with PEMA. The Review was carried out from May to June 2009.

The entity responsible for the day to day conduct of the MTR was the UN Coordination Office under the direct supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator and the leadership of the Director of

---

3 The two consultant-authors of this report are Jean Serge Quesnel and Christian Privat.
- Jean Serge QUESNEL is Associate Professor at Carleton University in Ottawa and at the École nationale d’administration publique (ENAP). He is Senior Facilitator at the United Nations System Staff College. He joined the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) when it was created and has held many programme directorships. He was twice Director of Evaluation at CIDA and was Chair of the Expert Group on Evaluation of the OECD Development Committee. He drafted the Principles of Evaluation adopted by OECD/DAC. At the Inter-American Development Bank, he was Alternate Executive Director and Director of Evaluation and Founding Chair of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the International Financial Institutions. He was Director of Evaluation at UNICEF and led the drafting of the Norms and Standards of Evaluation in the UN System. He is the founding coordinator of the Francophone Evaluation Network. He facilitated the preparation of the first business plan of the International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE), and is presently much involved worldwide in capacity development and the professionalization of evaluation.
- Christian Privat is an evaluation and development consultant working with several UN agencies, mainly UNICEF, UNDP and OHCHR, as well as the UN itself. He has conducted Mid-Term Reviews of the UNDAF in several countries. He is also involved in human-rights-based approach and climate change consultancy work. He collaborates regularly with the Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) and was a member of the UNDG/WGPP Task Team on Programme Support in 2007-2008, focusing on M&E issues. He has worked for UNICEF in the Evaluation Office, the Programme Division, and the Office of the Executive Director. He was also Senior Programme Officer with UNICEF Cuba.
PEMA. The review was undertaken in close cooperation with the Chair/Co-Chairs of the UNDAF M&E Task-Forces.

The UNDAF mid-term review entailed both an internal and external participatory process, through a series of consultations led by the consultants. A list of the persons interviewed by the consultants is included in Annex 2. It was also agreed to keep the UNDAF midterm review “light”, informative and forward looking. In view of the fact that there were established outcome review and annual review processes, the UNCT decided not to gather primary data and instead to rely on existing Government-UNCT M&E processes. This approach reduced transaction costs for both the Government and the UNCT.

The review team was responsible for:

- Interviewing and consulting key informants, to identify emerging issues and links between different programmes impacting on the UNDAF objectives and to obtain information on performance, relevance and future strategies. Some of the key informants included: heads of agencies and programme officers in UN agencies; relevant Government officials; representatives of donor agencies; and a few civil society representatives.
- Supporting UN agencies in the review of agency outputs in order to review the Results Matrix.
- Supporting the UNDAF M&E task forces in the review and compilation of M&E indicators, baseline information and sources and means of verification.
- Producing a first draft of the UNDAF Mid Term Review, in close coordination with UNDAF M&E task forces, PEMA and the UN Coordination Office.
- Preparing, as part of the report, a short analysis of UN coordination challenges and lessons learned drawn from the UNDAF M&E Chairs and UNCT, which would be useful for the completion of this UNDAF cycle, and in preparation for the next.
- Supporting the UN Coordination Office and PEMA in organizing a joint mid-term review validation workshop to discuss the report, recommendations and implementation plan, to be organized with all partners, the Government and other stakeholders.

E. Methodology issues

Guidance used

The Egypt MTR is not a formal “Evaluation” of the UNDAF, but uses some evaluative techniques and evaluation criteria spelled out in the UNDG “UNDAF Evaluation Guidelines for Terms of Reference”\(^4\), which themselves are guided by the OECD/DAC criteria. To the possible extent, the three main purposes of the UNDAF evaluation that are indicated in the guidelines have been used as a general framework for this Mid-Term Review. These are the following:

a) To assess the relevance of the UNDAF outcomes, the effectiveness and efficiency by which UNDAF outcomes and Country Programme outcomes are being achieved, their sustainability and contribution to national priorities and goals.

b) To determine how the UNDAF helped UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to national development efforts and capacity building.

c) To learn from experiences of the current programming cycle, and identify issues and opportunities emerging from the implementation of the current UNDAF, to inform the design of the next UNDAF and country programmes and projects by individual agencies, as well as adjust the current programming as relevant.

Because this Review is not an Evaluation, the issues of impact of the UNDAF on the lives of the poor, and sustainability of results achieved and strategies used have not been studied. It would be too early at this stage of implementation to get an overview of these issues.

\(^4\) “UNDAF Evaluation Guidelines for Terms of Reference”, 1 July 2005, which are part of the “CCA and UNDAF Guidelines for UN Country Teams on preparing CCA and UNDAF”, issued by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) in February 2007. The CCA and UNDAF Guidelines for UN Country Teams themselves have also been used as generic guidance, especially since they were recently reviewed in February 2009.
The importance of reviewing and evaluating UNDAF and development results at country level has also been stressed by the General Assembly in the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR) Resolution 59/250 (paragraph 69), and Resolution 62/2008 (paragraphs 135 and 136), and in ECOSOC Resolution 2006/14 (paragraph 34), among others.

**Revision of the Country Programme Outputs**

The UNDAF Mid Term Review was a unique opportunity, for the UNCT, to think strategically in support of Government priorities and development challenges. With this in mind, the MTR consultants met with the Task Forces Co-Chairs and several agencies. They also met with the Task Forces Chairs (Government’s representatives) and other partners to discuss, among other things, the issue of the UNDAF Country Programme Outputs, and the M&E framework.

There was a consensus that the UNDAF Country Programme Outputs needed re-examination. It was agreed that special attention should be given to the outputs that had not yet been acted upon. If they were not essential, they could be withdrawn. This revision of the UNDAF outputs – also referred as “pruning” – would enable a clearer focus on the strategic results of the UNDAF. The MTR also offered the opportunity to include ongoing joint activities that were not initially planned. Also, the MTR allowed the consideration of emerging issues.

To move ahead in this exercise, the Resident Coordinator asked the agencies to indicate: (1) whether they were currently working on all the outputs, (2) if they intended to work on outputs where no results had been recorded yet, and (3) to identify any additional outputs that should be included in the UNDAF. To simplify the exercise, agencies were asked to fill out tables accordingly (divided by UNDAF Outcomes) and send them to the UN Coordination Office, which then shared the tables with the M&E Task Force Co-Chairs so that they could review and consolidate the information in their respective groups, and validate the final list of outputs. This Task Force consolidation exercise was then finalized by the end of May.

In order to facilitate this validation exercise, the UN Coordination Office organized half-day workshops in May 2009 with each of the UNDAF Outcomes Taskforces, as follows: Outcomes 4 (Gender), 5 (Democratic Governance) 3A (Regional Disparities) and 3B (Environment); Outcome 1 (Pro-poor Policies) and 2 (Employment).

The MTR Workshop (8-9 June 2009), which was organized to discuss the finding of the preliminary draft Mid-Term Review report offered an opportunity to endorse the updated UNDAF Results Matrix, which is included in Annex 3 of this report.

**Revision of the M&E framework**

As a follow-up to the discussions between the consultants, the UN Coordination Office, and the Co-Chairs of the UNDAF Task Forces, it was decided to update the M&E framework (indicators, baselines, targets, and risks and assumptions), in conjunction with the revision of the Results Matrix. The latest version of the framework, which had last been reviewed in July 2008 at a retreat where all the Task Forces participated, would be used as a basis. Agencies and Task Forces were asked to review the M&E framework. At the MTR Workshop (8-9 June 2009) it was agreed that the updated and revised M&E framework would be finalized by the end of June 2009 and included as an Annex 4.

The agenda of the 8-9 June MTR Workshop is included in Annex 5.

**Sources of information**

In addition to the interviews and consultations that took place with key informants, the MTR team identified the sources of information since the beginning of the UNDAF implementation (2006). The main sources that were used during the course of the revision include the following:

- Documents issued by the UNDAF M&E system (especially annual monitoring reports).
A number of studies were also undertaken on UNDAF issues at Headquarters level, by both UNDG (particularly the Working Group on Programming Policy), and UNEG, some of them in the framework of the 2007 TCPR preparation. See section below on TCPR issues.

In this revision, a lot of importance has been given to these studies that discussed the quality of UNDAFs, their “evaluability”, and the lessons learned from their implementation in different countries. The analysis in this report has been inspired in several instances from findings and recommendations from all these studies. Without a doubt, this link between the national and global levels has significantly enriched this revision. These studies include:

The first series of studies around UNDAF issues dealt with the guidance provided to UNCTs, the quality of the UNDAFs, and the evaluability of the results frameworks. The recommendations of these studies have been reflected in the revision of the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines (February 2009), particularly the M&E section. These studies included:

- A study, commissioned by the Working Group on Programming Policy at the end of 2006, to feed into the revision of the 2004 CCA-UNDAF Guidelines. This study included specific recommendations on Monitoring and Evaluation, including the M&E Plan and Framework, and their implementation, as well as Annual Reviews, UNDAF Evaluation, and Mid-Term Reviews.\(^5\)
- A landmark study on the “Evaluability” of UNDAF, commissioned by UNDESA, in the framework of the preparations for the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR 62/208, 2007). This study was undertaken by the Evaluation Offices of UNDP and UNICEF, and completed in December 2006.\(^6\)
- A review of the role and quality of the UNDAFs, in May 2006, by the Overseas Development Institute.\(^7\)
- Some recommendations and suggested actions to amend the M&E aspects of the 2007 CCA/UNDAF Guidelines, which were consolidated in November 2007 by UN- DGO and the UNICEF Evaluation Office.\(^8\)
- The result of regular monitoring by UNDG/DOCO through surveys about UNDAF undertaken with UNCTs on a regular basis.

The second series of studies around UNDAF issues focused specifically on Results Based Management (RBM) issues in UNDAF. The process which led to these studies, as well as their findings and recommendations has also been particularly useful during the Mid Term Review.

- A study on RBM issues in UNDAFs, with concrete examples, prepared by the Task Team 1 of the Working Group on Programming Policy, in October 2007.\(^9\)
- Another study on RBM at country level, commissioned by the same TT1/WGPP, in 2008. This study is particularly relevant for this revision because it analyses the general problems that often prevent or thwart UNDAF good implementation and results.\(^10\)

---


\(^9\) Results-Based Management in UNDAFs, Issues Note: October 2007, UNDG Working Group on Programming Policies – Task Team 1.
The third series of studies, which fed into this revision, was around the linkages between UNDAF and Delivering as One UN.

- A series of assessments of the evaluability of Delivering as One UN took place in the eight pilot countries in 2008, undertaken by UNEG. A synthesis report was prepared, which discusses many of the issues that this report addresses.\(^\text{11}\) See also the section below on DaO issues.

---


V. United Nations Reform and Aid Environment

In Egypt, the UNDAF was prepared in 2005, four years ago, signed by the Minister of International Cooperation on behalf of the Government and then the RC on behalf of the UNCT in March 2006, and formally began in January 2007. Since then, a series of significant events and processes took place in the UN reform and aid effectiveness areas. This includes: Delivering as One UN (November 2006), the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities for development (TCPR, December 2007), the United Nations Development Group Response to the Changing Aid Environment (January 2008), the Third High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, which adopted the Accra Programme of Action (September 2008), and the new management and accountability system of the UN Development and resident coordinator system (August 2008).

A. TCPR 2007: Improved functioning of the UN development system

The Mid Term Review took into account the efforts to achieve a stronger UN coherence at the country level. The last General Assembly “Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system” (TCPR) was finalized in December 2007, and adopted in its resolution 62/208. It provides guidance to make the role and contribution of the UN system more coherent, effective and relevant at country level. In the resolution, which followed a previous one with similar recommendations, the General Assembly emphasizes that planning and programming frameworks of the UN system, including the UNDAF, need to be fully aligned with national development planning cycles, whenever possible, and that they should make use of and strengthen national capacities and mechanisms. The ownership, leadership and full participation of national authorities are considered vital to guaranteeing that the UNDAF respond to the development plans and strategies.12

UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies are also called to continue to harmonize and simplify their rules and procedures wherever it can lead to a significant reduction in the administrative and procedural burden on the organizations and national partners. In particular, UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies are encouraged to lower their transactions costs. UNCTs are also encouraged to step up efforts to rationalize the country presence through common premises, co-location and, where appropriate, to implement the joint office model and expand common shared services and business units, in order to reduce UN overhead and transaction costs for national Governments.

B. High Level Panel on System-Wide Coherence and Delivering as One

The MTR thinking was also influenced by the Delivering as One approach, which was recommended by the Secretary General’s High Level Panel on System-Wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment on November 9th, 2006.13 This has been a major piloting exercise of a new way of doing business for the UN at country level, which happened during the UNDAF implementation in Egypt. The Panel was mandated by the Secretary-General as part of the follow-up to the 2005 World Summit. It recommended to the Secretary-General that, to bring about real progress towards the MDGs and other Internationally Agreed Development Goals, the UN system should establish UN country teams with One Leader, One Programme, One Budgetary Framework, and, where appropriate, One Office. UN country teams should also have an integrated capacity to provide a coherent approach to cross-cutting issues, including sustainable development, gender equality and human rights. To ensure that there was no potential for, or perception of, a conflict of interest, UNDP was asked to establish an institutional “firewall” between the management of its programmatic role, and the management of the resident coordinator system.

On November 22nd, 2006, the Secretary-General decided to move forward with a few of the recommendations, which focused in particular on the call to establish pilot countries where the

---

12 The “Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system” TCPR is a review that is led by the UN General Assembly every three years. The last two reviews are contained in General Assembly Resolutions 59/250 (2004) and 62/208 (2007).
13 Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on UN System-Wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment, Delivering as One, United Nations, New York November 2006.
One UN approach would be tested. The rationale being that this recommendation built on the reform agenda set forth by the General Assembly in the TCPR resolutions of 2001 and 2004, notably the Joint Office concept.

On April 3rd, 2007, the new Secretary-General presented the report of the High-Level Panel to the General Assembly. In his comments, he noted that the exercise would provide an essential test of the principles advocated by the Panel in different countries. He mentioned a number of issues that needed to be considered, including the central concept of national ownership, the authority and accountability of the UN resident coordinator, and the role of the UNDP as manager of the resident coordinator system on the one hand, and its programme role on the other. There was also a need for clarification with regard to what would constitute an effective unified budgetary framework.

At the request of the Committee of Executive Boards (CEB), the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) initiated an evaluation of the process and results related to the Delivering as One (DaO) UN Pilots. UNEG conducted evaluability assessments of all eight pilots, which described and analyzed the basic parameters needed to fully evaluate, at a later date, both the results of the DaO pilots and the processes that led to these results. The evaluability assessments report was discussed by the High Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) in September 2008.

In addition, during its retreat of October 24th and 25th, 2008, the CEB considered the evaluability study and indicated the results of the consultations with Delivering as One Member States (8 pilots). The UNDG Chair explained that it had been decided that a new series of pilots would not be initiated, but rather that the lessons learned from the 8 pilots would be generalized in the context of the new UNDAFs.

Given the level of attention that Delivering as One raised these last years and still does these days, this whole process and the UNDG decision to mainstream lessons learned of the Evaluability assessments has a particular relevance for Egypt, which is going to start preparing its new UNDAF.

C. Paris Declaration, UNDG Response and Accra Agenda for Action

This Mid Term Review is also taking place in the context of the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness for development (March 2005), the UNDG Response to the Paris declaration (2005), and the Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness (September 2008).

**Paris Declaration**

Egypt is a signatory of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (March 2nd, 2005). The Paris Declaration underlined that additional efforts were needed to ensure the achievement of all internationally agreed development goals and the commitments made, notably: the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2000; the Monterrey consensus on financing for development in 2002; and the World Summit in 2005.

With its key principles (ownership, harmonization, alignment & results and mutual accountability), and with its 12 indicators of aid effectiveness, the Paris Declaration is, without a doubt, an important instrument for Egypt and the UN system. The Declaration requests that the “donor community” – expression which includes the UN system – to increase the quantity and improve

---

14 General Assembly resolutions A/56/201 and A/59/250.
15 Letter of the Secretary-General to the Chair of the UNDG of 22 November 2006.
the quality of aid by strengthening predictability, untying aid, increasing its coherence and alignment with countries’ priorities and systems, and improving harmonization among donors. National development strategies and poverty reduction strategies, developed and implemented under programme country leadership, should serve as anchors for measures to meet these goals.

Egypt sent its reply to the first and second Monitoring Surveys of the Paris Declaration in 2006 and 2008, in which several agencies participated.  

**UNDG Response to the Changing Aid Environment**

Because a lot of the principles included in the Paris Declaration were very similar to, and congruent with, those reflected in the TCPRs, the UNDG signed the Declaration. In 2005, the UNDG prepared a Plan of action to implement the Paris Declaration. In January 2008, it issued a “Response to the Changing Aid Environment”, and indicated that the following actions should be undertaken at the country level:

(a) Enhance United Nations involvement in nationally led processes as part of the UNCT mandate, both as coordinator and as trusted partner;
(b) Decide on a division of labour to avoid overlap and duplication;
(c) Align United Nations programming with national development planning cycle;
(d) Deliver technical assistance in the changing aid environment;
(e) Participate systematically in public expenditure reviews (PERs) and public financial management (PFM) reviews;
(f) Define respective and complementary roles with the Bretton Woods Institutions;
(g) Strengthen partnerships with non-State actors: this process would include, as appropriate, the UNDAF preparation process, with a view to seeking new and innovative solutions to development problems in accordance with national policies and priorities;
(h) Support systematic reporting on United Nations performance against Paris declaration indicators.

**Accra Agenda for Action**

The MTR in Egypt was undertaken shortly after the Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness took place in Ghana in September 2008, to accelerate and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration. In Accra, ministers of both developing and donor countries responsible for promoting development and heads of multilateral and bilateral development institutions adopted the “Accra Agenda for Action” (AAA). This provides a good opportunity for the UN System, the Government, and other aid partners to reflect on how external aid and cooperation could become more effective in Egypt, and how the UNDAF can be more useful.

The key points highlighted in the AAA are the following:

a) **Predictability** – developing countries will strengthen the linkages between public expenditures and results, and donors will provide 3-to 5-year forward information on their planned aid to partner countries.

b) **Ownership** – developing country governments will engage more with parliaments and civil society organizations.

c) **Country systems** – partner country systems will be used to deliver aid as the first option, rather than donor systems, and donors will share their plans on increasing use of country systems.

---

21 See the 2008 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, Country Chapter, Egypt. Volume 2 of the 2008 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration includes a detailed analysis for each of the 55 countries that undertook the survey. Each survey was managed by the national co-ordinator, appointed by the government, in co-operation with the local donor community.
22 Implementing the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Action Plan of the UN Development Group.
23 Response to the Changing Aid Environment, UNDG, January 2008.
d) **Conditionality** – donors will switch from reliance on prescriptive conditions about how and when aid money is spent to conditions based on the developing country’s own development objectives.

e) **Untying** – donors will elaborate individual plans to further untie their aid.

f) **Aid fragmentation** – donors agree to avoid creating new aid channels, and donors and countries will work on country-led division of labour.

g) **Partnerships** – all actors are encouraged to use the Paris Declaration principles, and the value of South-South cooperation is welcomed.

h) **Transparency** – donors and countries will step up efforts to have mutual assessment reviews in place by 2010. These will involve stronger parliamentary and citizen engagement and will be complemented with credible independent evidence.\(^{25}\)

The Paris Declaration, the UNDG response and the Accra Agenda for Action are all very relevant to the UNDAF in Egypt, and have been considered in this Mid Term Review.

### D. Management and Accountability System

With the objective to strengthen further the UN reform, the UNDG adopted a new system of management and accountability of the resident coordinator system, in August 2008.\(^{26}\) The UNDG Chair sent letters to the UNCTs, on September 2\(^{nd}\) and November 6\(^{th}\), 2008. In the last letter, Kemal Dervis indicated that the agreements reached further clarified the issue of a “firewall” that provides distinctive internal arrangements to clarify the role of UNDP as a UN partner with its functions on behalf of, and in support of, the UN development system. With respect to the UNDAF, UNCT members were asked to support the RC as their team leader, guiding the overall UNDAF strategy development and implementation, and coordinating the work of all resident and non-resident agencies. Each UNCT member is also now accountable for UNCT results where they have agreed to lead the team.\(^{27}\)

All these recent changes in the UN reform context and the renewed attention to aid effectiveness context are very relevant to the UNDAF in Egypt. They have been paramount in the thinking around all the Mid Term Review process and report. They will also definitively influence the rest of the programme cycle, and the next UNDAF. Several of the issues pertaining to UN reform, the aid environment, and aid effectiveness, which have been highlighted above are also referred to, and discussed in successive sections of this report.


\(^{27}\) Letter sent by Kemal Dervis, UNDP Administrator, to the UNDG members, 6 November 2008.
VI. Current situation in Egypt and emerging issues

A. The Egyptian Context

When the UNDAF started to be implemented in January 2007, it was against the backdrop of increasingly positive figures for macroeconomic growth and continued political stability. Economic performance continued its upward trend in 2007, reflecting a favourable external environment, prudent macroeconomic policies and the continuation of fiscal reforms and trade liberalization. Real economic growth registered an impressive 7.1% while the trade deficit and the savings-investment gap as a percentage of the GDP narrowed. Foreign direct investment surged significantly in comparison to previous years to reach 5% of GDP. The economy registered 7.2% growth in the fiscal year 2007/2008 (as of June 2008) – the third year in a row with such high growth rates, demonstrating the positive impact of recent economic reforms.

The World Bank listed Egypt as the leader in introducing investor-friendly reforms in the 2007 “Doing Business” Report, although the country’s overall ranking remained only at 126 out of 178 countries. The same report ranked Egypt as the top reformer in the world for 2008 and UNCTAD’s International Investment Report 2008 ranked Egypt as the first in North Africa and second in Africa in attracting foreign direct investment (FDI).[

The MTR is taking place in a different economic conjuncture. It is estimated that the current global financial turmoil will slow down Egypt's economic growth rate from around 7% in late 2008 to an average rate of 4% for 2009. Early growth figures for the first semester of 2009 were around 5% but experts foresee this rate declining to 3% in the second semester. Reflecting the impact of price hikes Egypt faced in 2008, and the global financial crisis, urban inflation soared to 22% in the year to July 2008, the highest since January 1992. These figures settled at 14% year to year from January to December 2008. Following unrest and the bread crisis earlier in the year, the Government expanded its already large food subsidy scheme to include 63 million people (from approximately 45 million before the crisis) out of a population of 79 million.[

In addition, there are continued concerns that growth has not resulted in improved equity, with the World Bank reporting that poverty increased from 16% to 19% of the population between 2006 and 2007. Inflation, especially rising food prices that affect the poor disproportionately, continued to be a major cause of concern along with high unemployment rates, which is concentrated among educated youth, especially women. Towards the end of 2007, the Government was focusing increasing attention on social programmes to ensure that economic growth becomes increasingly inclusive. During the fifth annual conference of the Egyptian ruling National Democratic Party (NDP) in November 2008, President Mubarak said maintaining the economic growth rate and extending social justice are the two priorities of the party and the Government.

Chronic unemployment remains a national challenge. Official figures released by CAPMAS indicate an 8.4% unemployment rate in the second quarter of 2008, down from 8.9% exactly one year earlier, with 30.4% of the unemployed university graduates and 20% to 25% among young people overall. It is also worthy to note that about 30% of employed people are in seasonal, temporary or irregular jobs.

In addition, population growth has remained stubbornly high at around 2% for the last decade and the fertility rate, at about 3.1 children per woman, has also levelled and ceased to drop. At this rate, Egypt's population could double to 160 million by 2050 with serious consequences in terms of quality of life and food security.

The top development on the political front in 2007 was the passage of a series of constitutional amendments, which focused on: (a) the extent of executive authority; (b) the role of Parliament; (c) judicial supervision of the electoral process; (d) the state of emergency; and (e) women’s participation in public life. In 2008, the Government continued to make political stability a top priority while publicly expressing its intention to broaden political participation through such processes as decentralization and enhancement of laws regulating the political and social role of

28 2007 Resident Coordinator Annual Report, Egypt, UNDG.
29 2008 Resident Coordinator Annual Report, Egypt, UNDG.
civil society. Critics nevertheless remained sceptical, pointing to slow progress on political reform and low voter turnout in general elections. The scheduled 2011 presidential election promises to be a crucial indicator of future policy direction. Presidential succession remains at the heart of the country’s political debate, despite official assurances that the constitution sets out a procedure for choosing the new leader.

Commentators have acknowledged greater freedom of the press in recent years characterized by visible government willingness to accept criticism. In spite of this, alleged human rights violations and freedom of the press crackdowns were reported, including imprisonment of journalists, online censorship and curbing the right to non-violent protest. In May 2008, the People’s Assembly extended the state of emergency for another two years, until 2010.

In 2008, there was a surge in the movement of asylum-seekers and migrants trying to transit illegally through Egypt, which raised legitimate concerns for countries involved, as well as serious protection challenges. Hundreds of Eritrean and others were reportedly detained and forcibly returned from Egypt, despite UNHCR’s repeated appeals to grant access to detention centres to determine international protection needs, which have largely remained unsuccessful.

As a regional power, Egypt exerted great efforts in 2008 to advance the Palestinian-Israeli talks and inter-Palestinian dialogue. Egypt played a strong mediating role focusing on thorny issues such as resuming peace talks, a prisoner swap and a truce between Israel and Palestinian militant groups. Despite these efforts, little tangible progress was reached before the Israeli invasion of Gaza in late December. Egypt stepped up its efforts during the war to bring about an immediate truce, to provide humanitarian aid to Gaza (with the support of UN agencies) and afterwards to spearhead the organization of international efforts for Gaza reconstruction.

B. Key human development issues

Egypt is considered a Middle–Income Country by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This section attempts to understand more precisely to what extent is Egypt a Middle Income Country, what does this mean, and to what extent is Egypt a “developed country” or a “developing country”.

At a recent retreat of the Development Partners Group (DPG), a presentation was made on “Key Development Challenges and the Role of International Development Partners in Egypt” by Professor Heba Handoussa. The presentation argued that there are in Egypt both elements of a developing and a developed country. The table below presents these elements, based on this presentation.

Table: Egypt: elements of a developing and a developed country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt: A Developing country</th>
<th>Egypt: A Developed country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>FDI flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>High infrastructure coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Diversified manufacturing sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wages &amp; productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large and growing middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Democratic deficit</td>
<td>Developed Judiciary system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Business environment is improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Developed accounting and auditing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 Key Development Challenges and the Role of International Development Partners in Egypt, prepared for the Development Partners Group Retreat, 25 March 2009, Professor Heba Handoussa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education, R&amp;D, ICT</th>
<th>Illiteracy</th>
<th>Enrolment in higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>Internet use on the rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of public schools</td>
<td>Cellular &amp; Landline phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D disconnect with industry</td>
<td>Number of researchers and scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive media network, television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Hepatitis C</td>
<td>Physicians per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water-borne diseases</td>
<td>Immunization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor nutrition</td>
<td>Low HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air and water pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Youth</td>
<td>Low Labour participation</td>
<td>Women well-represented in civil service and professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Political participation</td>
<td>Extended family system provides social protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth in slum conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. UNDAF and MDGs

A MDG report was published in December 2008 by the Government of Egypt as an instrument for tracking Egypt’s international commitments in this respect. It was also considered a tool for emphasizing priorities and guiding future actions, and a policy instrument for articulating national aspirations and developmental goals. Finally, it was an opportunity to document current public policies and actions to achieve national developmental goals and to highlight challenges that need to be addressed. The 2007 reference date came at a midpoint between the adoption of the international goals set in 2000 and the 2015 date for achieving specific targets in Egypt. This midpoint timing therefore provided an opportunity to reflect on the potential for success. The 2007 reference date also allowed an update of the indicators in the 2005 similar report, which had 2004 as reference point. During the three years that had passed since this last MDG report (2004), new sets of data have been collected and were used in the report to provide revised measures.

This section recalls the key findings of the latest report (2008), and relates each MDG with the UNDAF respective outcomes and outputs. This shows that in general, the MDGs have been very much taken into account in the UNDAF.

UNDAF Outcome 1, Country Programme Outcome 1 addressed the issue of MDGs in generic terms “Government and nongovernmental organizations are better equipped to fulfil citizens’ rights and MDGs at the local level in a well planned and coordinated manner.”

Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

A number of UNDAF outcomes related to poverty indirectly, especially UNDAF Outcome 2 “By 2011, unemployment and underemployment are reduced and worst forms of child labour eliminated”.

- Egypt’s commitment to poverty alleviation has acquired clear momentum through the explicit adoption of the goal of reducing poverty to 15 percent by 2011/12 in its national Sixth Five Year Socioeconomic Plan (2007-2012). This goal is based on national poverty

---

32 In particular, these sets of data include the 2007 World Bank/Ministry of Education report, Egypt Poverty Assessment, 2007 Ministry of Health and Population reports, the 2007 World Bank World Development Indicators, the 2006 Census, the 2005 Egypt Demographic and Health Survey, the United Nation Development Program/Institute of National Planning Egypt Human Development 2005, and Egyptian Environmental Affair Agency reports, 2004-2007.
lines, recognizing that Egypt has already achieved its international commitment of reducing to half extreme poverty based on US $1 per day.

- The Government of Egypt has also explicitly articulated a package of actions and programs to empower the poor. These include short-term deliverables, two complementary programs: ‘Geographic Targeting’ and ‘Supporting Most Vulnerable Families,’ as well as an integrated package of social policy reforms.

- The small increase in the percentage of the poor during the period 2000-2005 as well as its geographic clustering – and despite a clear improvement in economic performance and growth — is receiving a great deal of attention. The government sees this as not reflecting the recent growth trend. Concern over the need to reflect shorter-term trends has resulted in a decision to monitor poverty every two years instead of the usual five years, as well as the adoption of special programmes to ensure equitable benefits of growth, particularly in relation to public spending.

- Unemployment rates have witnessed some decrease but remain a serious challenge, particularly with regard to women and young people.

- Large differences in underweight children among governorates are a cause of concern. An accelerated progress is needed in some governorates to achieve the national MDG target.

**Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education**

This MDG Goal was mainly addressed in the UNDAF Outcome 3, CP Outcome 1 “Improved and sustainable access to quality social services and basic needs (education, health, food, water and sanitation, social protection) achieved in a participatory manner in Upper Egypt and frontier governorates with a special focus on the underprivileged communities in rural areas”.

- Education enrolment saw substantial improvements for both men and women during the period 2000-2006. Non-enrolment and school drop-out rates remain relatively high and clustered in certain areas and in vulnerable groups, with an additional effort directed to specific social groups. It is expected that by 2015 almost all children of primary school age will be in school.

- The literacy rate for the young has improved and Egypt is approaching one hundred percent literacy among the 15-24 year old age group. Such an improvement is mainly a reflection of the progress in school enrolment. However, the universal eradication of illiteracy remains a challenge and demands the efficient implementation of new strategic directions.

- Within the framework of the Presidential Election Program of 2006, Egypt’s education strategy aims not just at increasing enrolment rates but increasing number of schools and reducing class density, as well as supporting early childhood development (4-5 years).

**Goal 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women**

The issues of gender were placed at a high level in the hierarchy of the Results Matrix. First, the UNDAF Outcome 4 focused on women’s participation and human rights: “By 2011, women’s participation in the workforce, political sphere and in public life is increased, and their human rights are increasingly fulfilled”. Second, the UNDAF Outcome 2 focused on reducing the gender gap: “By 2011, regional human development disparities are reduced, including reducing the gender gap, and environment sustainability improved”. Third, UNDAF Outcome 1, CP Outcome 4 is also gender focused: “National policies are made gender sensitive”.

---

33 As detailed in the papers published by the Policy Secretariat of the National Democratic Party.
Egypt is addressing women’s empowerment and has demonstrated its commitment through institutional arrangements, major legislative changes and a large number of initiatives and actions.

However, despite the expectations of a positive impact of the many national efforts on a large number of social groups, particularly those suffering from injustice and hardship, there are clearly major challenges remaining. The three fronts emphasized in the MDGs — of education and of economic and political participation — still call for concentrated actions.

On the educational front, Egypt has already achieved the MDGs in girls’ enrolment in general secondary education and is on its way to achieving this goal in primary education. Girls’ technical education in Egypt remains a real challenge. Technical education currently absorbs around 70 percent of students, with a women population representing 85% equivalent of the male students. Women are mainly concentrated in the commercial and agricultural branches, which are less competitive for the labour market.

The low quality of technical education is well recognized in Egypt and current reforms effort that are under discussion need to explicitly recognize the specificity of women enrolment in that sector.

The other two key fronts of female economic and political participation are not showing any signs of progress. These fronts need to be further prioritized and to receive a more articulated strategy supported by a detailed action plan and implementations steps.

**Goal 4: Reduce Child Mortality**

This goal was not specifically reflected in the UNDAF as an outcome, most likely because it would not lead to some form of joint programming or activities, however several agencies undertook some activities to meet this goal (UNICEF, UNFPA and WHO).

- Egypt’s efforts to reduce child mortality are paying off. Good progress is documented and the country is on track towards achieving the MDG targets.

- Inequities in survival between geographic and social groups remain a serious challenge. Gendered differentials are also manifested in certain vulnerable groups. Other health challenges include reduction of the relatively high neonatal mortality rate, achieving a universal full programme of vaccinations, and combating childhood morbidity, particularly diarrhoea and acute respiratory infections.

**Goal 5: Improve Maternal Health**

Similarly to goal 4, this goal does not lend itself in an UNDAF outcome.

- Egypt’s commitment to improve maternal health and its many national programmes have already translated into a significant and impressive reduction in maternal mortality ratios, and in births attended by skilled personnel.

- The impressive speed of decline in maternal mortality calls for further confirmation of the accuracy of recent measures.

- Regional variations in all available measures of maternal and reproductive health, particularly in rural Upper Egypt, demand more effective targeting.

- Additional significant gains in women’s health could materialize through the comprehensive adoption of the ‘reproductive health paradigm’. Such a paradigm incorporates a strong gender and social determinants component as well as a broader definition of reproductive health challenges.
**Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Major Diseases**

HIV/AIDS is not reflected at the level of Outcome in the UNDAF, but merely as a Country Programme Output (in UNDAF Outcome 1, CP Outcome 3): “Quality HIV/AIDS information, prevention and treatment provided with a focus on most-at-risk populations, including youth”.

- Egypt is making significant strides towards achieving this goal. The battle against HIV/AIDS was started when the first case appeared in the country. Egypt has succeeded in controlling malaria, while tuberculosis and schistosomiasis are regressing. Despite these achievements, Egypt should adopt steps to avoid the danger of experiencing a turning point from a low to a concentrated HIV epidemic. The HIV infection in Egypt is not only confined to the high risk groups; it is clustered in the most productive age span and the country is experiencing a relatively high share of women in the epidemic.

- Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C constitute major health threats in Egypt.

- The Ministry of Health and Population has created specific preventive and curative programs for all major illnesses and Egypt is currently reforming the health insurance system. The challenge that needs to be resolved is the overburden born by the Ministry of Health and Population in caring for those in need of medical attention, as well as for a health policy with multisectoral integration, to address health in a social context.

**Goal 7: Ensuring Environmental Sustainability**

Environment sustainability pertains to UNDAF Outcome 3, CP Outcome 4 “Institutional capacity building for environmental sustainability improved”, and CP Outcome 5: “Pollution levels reduced”.

- Ensuring environmental sustainability in Egypt is still a challenge despite government policies, and increasing investments in protection measures. Key challenges are the need to curb population growth with its negative impact on the environment as well as better control and/or manage the increasing demand on natural resources.

**Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development**

This goal is not specifically reflected in the UNDAF.

- Progress on global commitments for improved aid, fairer trade and debt relief is at the core of MDG 8, and, in consequence, will determine to a large extent the successful achievement of the first seven MDGs by 2015. In the past few years Egypt has witnessed a rising trend in its ODA disbursements from a variety of rich countries and international organizations, and these have been allocated to meet the development needs of different sectors. Further, Egypt has also benefited from a number of bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. Recently the share of exports of goods and services in Egypt's GDP has been increasing. Egypt's external debt has witnessed stable movement in the last few years, with a decline in the ratio of debt interests to exports of goods and services.

- The Egyptian ICT sector has been growing fast in the last years especially with the increase in investments, resulting in more access to landlines and cell phones, along with the extensive use of personal computers and access to the internet.

**D. Identification of some emerging issues**

The informants that the review team interviewed indicated some emerging issues, which were not included in the UNDAF (drafted in 2005) but may be considered for insertion in the remaining part of the programming cycle (2009-2011) or alternatively, in the next UNDAF. A UN agency (WFP) observed that the UNDAF is not sufficiently flexible to reflect the changes of the programming environment of the UN agencies.
Climate change

Climate change was mentioned by a number of interlocutors. WFP, for instance, said that the warming by one degree could mean for Egypt a reduction of 10% to 15% in agricultural production. The issue of the stability of the Nile river basin is of serious concern. All of this affects extreme poverty, which is on the rise and compounded if food subsidies are lowered. The 2007 RC Annual Report was already recognizing this emerging issue by explaining that climate change posed a daunting challenge to Egypt. Given its implications for human development and security – such as the loss of jobs, food insecurity, and relocation of populations – adapting to climate change is already becoming a critical development issue, and one that will remain so for the coming decades.

The preservation of Egypt’s environment and natural resources is imperative for reaching the MDGs and ensuring economic growth, poverty reduction and social protection, added the 2008 RC Annual Report. Despite Egypt’s proactive approach, however, global warming risks aggravating the country’s current environmental and development challenges. International reports, including UNDP’s Global Human Development Report 2007/2008, subtitled “Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World”, indicate that Egypt is vulnerable to climate change, particularly in terms of its impact on coastal zones, water resources and agriculture.

Recognizing these challenges, and the importance of a coherent, long-term strategy and plan, six UN agencies – UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, FAO, IFAD and UNESCO – have joined forces with the Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Ministry of Agriculture, and Supreme Energy Council to address both mitigation and adaptation to climate change. Thanks to the Government of Spain, $4 million have been approved through the Spanish MDG Fund to kick off an integrated climate change programme.

Food crisis

Another issue which came out through interviews was the food crisis. The current UNDAF does not contain the concern for food prices, now compounded by the world financial and economic crisis. In addition, the present UNDAF was designed before the new strategic plan of WFP. The new plan has changed significantly the emphasis from food aid to food security. As mentioned above, following unrest and the bread crisis in 2008, the Government expanded its already large food subsidy scheme to include 63 million people (from approximately 45 million before the crisis) out of a population of 79 million. Price hikes had also a significant impact on inflation.

Financial and economic crises

Some interviewees suggested that the MTR should put at the front line the financial and economic crises. Outcome 2 on unemployment and underemployment becomes more pertinent with the financial crisis, and its related displacement issue, and with refugees returning home. The Government has issued a declaration on social justice. WB and ILO have been asked to do a study on the labour market in the two most intensive employment sectors (tourism and textile). The Egyptian Centre for Economic Studies has also issued a report on employment in March 2009. ILO expects to have a new Decent Work Programme approved in May 2009 at the International Labour Conference. An interviewee indicated that the economic crisis would affect income levels, employment, remittances, poverty, and growth is expected to fall from 7 to 4 %, and maybe more. In addition, the food crisis is heavily subsidized, but the economic cost of this public intervention in years to come remains unclear. The impact of the energy crisis is also a serious issue.

Avian and Human Influenza (H5N1) and Influenza A (H1N1)

The current UNDAF does not contain consideration for the Avian Flu. Despite progress in the fight against Avian and Human Influenza (AHI) both in Egypt and worldwide, the threats of HPAI persist, and the risk of a pandemic remains unchanged, and thus much work remains to be done to minimize the risk of a human influenza pandemic. The Government continues to respond on many fronts to the outbreaks in poultry and in humans despite limited resources and logistical
difficulties on the ground. In October 2008, it hosted the 6th International Ministerial Conference on Avian and Pandemic Influenza in Sharm El Sheikh, in cooperation with the International Partnership for Avian and Human Influenza, the United States, European Commission, and various UN agencies. The conference, which was attended by 126 countries and 26 regional and international organizations, allowed stakeholders to reflect, learn and re-commit to coordinated actions against AHI. The donor community continued its support to AHI and pandemic preparedness. The United States, Japan and Norway between them pledged more than $350 million. The cumulative total of international assistance pledged since January 2006 has now reached $3.060 billion.

The UN recognizes the threat that AHI poses to Egypt, and its potential to spread to neighbouring countries and the world, if not contained properly and urgently. UN agencies have been proactive in collaborating with the Government to reduce the risks to humans and to mitigate the anticipated impact on people’s livelihoods through effective prevention and control interventions. FAO and WHO continue to support the Government in addressing AHI’s human and animal health aspects. UNICEF is working with national authorities to control AI through community education and improving public knowledge and practices, while colleagues in WFP and OCHA are working to address non-health pandemic preparedness and developing humanitarian contingency planning. IOM and UNHCR are providing support to enhance the resilience of vulnerable populations such as migrant and refugee communities and advocate for their inclusion in national response plans. Moreover, UNDP and the Office of the UN System Influenza Coordinator are supporting the UN Coordination Office to build synergies and foster effective links between national and international stakeholders and partners in Egypt.

Epidemics and pandemics can place sudden and intense demands on health systems. They expose existing weaknesses in these systems and, in addition to their morbidity and mortality can disrupt economic activity and development. More recently, Influenza A (H1N1) has put the world on high alert. In these early days of the outbreaks, some scientists speculate that the full clinical spectrum of disease caused by H1N1 will not become apparent until the virus is more widespread. This, too, could alter the current disease picture, which is overwhelmingly mild outside Mexico.

Apart from the intrinsic mutability of influenza viruses, other factors could alter the severity of current disease patterns, though in completely unknowable ways, if the virus continues to spread. Scientists are concerned about possible changes that could take place as the virus spreads to the southern hemisphere and encounters currently circulating human viruses as the normal influenza season in that hemisphere begins.34

**Other emerging issues**

The attention of the review team also focused on other emerging issues.

Recent information indicates that the development of Egypt from 2005 to 2008 was characterized by a decline of income poverty and an increase of extreme income poverty. Children are vulnerable to crisis. Income poverty reduced by 1.8 million persons from 23.4% to 18.9%, with poverty reducing across all regions of Egypt. Upper Egypt has been slower than the national average. Extreme income poverty increased in rural Egypt from 6.6% to 9.1%. In light of current trends, it is very likely that the economic and food price crisis will have a significantly negative impact. Ration cards for food has increased from 45 million to 63 million. Wages increased in the public sector (up 18% in total budget). 2009-10 budget is reduced in subsidies from LE93 billion to LE76 billion. The main budget stimulus focuses on infrastructure and production sector. There are significant poverty reduction initiatives: the 1,000 villages’ project (social services, safety nets and micro finance) and increase of 16% and 18% for Education and Health. The UNDAF may therefore increase its focus on poverty issues, as they are cross cutting.

On the **HIV/AIDS** front, recent evidence has pointed to a HIV concentrated epidemic in Egypt, particularly among men having sex with men (6.2% prevalence). This was not widely known in

---

2005 and was not reflected in the UNDAF. National priorities only become relevant when there is a crisis, observed a UNAIDS staff. Being strategic means looking at the future, she added. There has been low political commitment, and HIV/AIDS is still being perceived as a stigmatizing problem to address. Even within the UN, UNAIDS has to repeatedly insist on these issues. The line Ministries do not pay particular attention to this issue. Having the issue of HIV/AIDS in a UN document like the UNDAF is considered very important by UNAIDS, which also noted that if an emerging issue is not in the UNDAF, it is very difficult to work on it with other agencies. UNAIDS also brought up an interesting point: if the UNDAF is supposed to be linked to national priorities in a strict way, HIV/AIDS should not be in the UNDAF because it is not a national priority. Therefore it may be necessary to establish a second level of priorities in the UNDAF. Similarly, Hepatitis C has a very significant prevalence in Egypt, yet it is not reflected in the UNDAF.

That said, as the 2008 RC Annual Report noted, whether included or not in the UNDAF, the response to HIV has developed in several areas through UN support to match the response to the new emerging epidemic situation. Main achievements in 2008 included: (a) developing one national HIV monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan and establishing a national M&E reference group; (b) expanding research and outreach programmes related to vulnerable groups and most-at-risk groups; (c) improving access to antiretroviral medication for people living with HIV and establishing an NGO led by people living with HIV; and (d) supporting the Government to mobilize resources through the Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria ($11 million) to enhance the national response in areas where gaps exist.

The political situation in the Middle East remains an uncertainty that Egypt has to face, in terms of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, refugees, and assistance to Palestinians. More contingency planning may be needed, and emergency preparedness probably needs some reinforcement. The role of the High Commissioner on Refugees may need to be strengthened and these issues better reflected in the UNDAF.

Migration issues were not part of the UNDAF. However, Egypt has been one of the few countries that have instituted a separate Ministry of Manpower and Migration along with the Philippines and Brazil. The link between migration and development is now more clearly established, with a Technical Committee put in place for a global project, and an European Commission - UN Joint Initiative (with HCR, ILO, UNFPA, UNDP, IOM and HCR). According to official government statistics, approximately 3.9 million Egyptians lived abroad in 2006. Regular migration carries significant development potential, through this is yet to be effectively harnessed. In contrast, irregular migration, both from and via Egypt, remains a considerable cross-border challenge, inextricably linked with security risks and human rights concerns. With consideration of national priorities, emerging issues include harnessing the developmental potential of migration, facilitating migration, regulating it, addressing forced migration and displacement, and finally responding to environmentally-induced migration.\(^\text{35}\) Demographic issues were also raised and a report was published by UNFPA and other partners in 2006.

Similarly, human trafficking was not recognized as a problem in the previous UNDAF, but now the First Lady has raised this issue. The Government outlined the four areas on trafficking they plan on working on and would require both technical and financial support from the UN. The four areas are namely: (i) conducting a comprehensive study at the national level on the extent and scope of the problem of trafficking; (ii) preparing a comprehensive anti-trafficking legislation; (iii) conducting a public awareness campaigns; and (iv) undertaking capacity building, particularly training. UN agencies have pooled together resources to support the Government in conducting the study. Based on the findings of the study, there are plans to formulate a joint programme of support to help the government implement the areas (ii), (iii), and (iv). The UN main partner on this issue is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Finally, South-South cooperation is a growing trend in Egypt in the development area, to the point that some of the countries from the Southern hemisphere have been integrated in the Development Partners Group. This includes partners such as Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Turkey, and South Africa. A strategic project is being implemented between UNDP and

\(^\text{35}\) IOM Informal Paper for MTR of UNDAF, International Organization for Migration. See also Note on IOM Programmes in Egypt, International Organization for Migration.
the Ministry of Foreign Affairs entitled "Supporting Egyptian South-South Cooperation", in the framework of UNDAF Outcome 5, Country Programme Outcome 1, on pro-poor policies and geographic disparities. The project is expected to: (i) conduct a comprehensive stocktaking of SSC flows and group them sectorally; (ii) establish six partnerships with counterpart Southern institutions/companies; (iii) support the formulation of an Egyptian National SSC Strategy; and (iv) convene a High Level Conference to present the SSC Strategy and promote and establish new South-South solutions.

As pointed out by the TCPR, the new dynamism in South-South cooperation is increasing the flow of development assistance among developing countries, including through investments, grants, concessional loans and debt cancellation. The United Nations system can play a unique role in helping developing countries, at their request, to establish a strong link between the operational activities that these new contributions support, and the pursuit of internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals. There is therefore a call made by the General Assembly to all Member States in a position to do so to strengthen their support to South-South cooperation, including triangular cooperation, especially by mobilizing financial resources on a sustainable basis. The TCPR also invites the United Nations development system to intensify its information-sharing and reporting on support provided by all funds, programmes, specialized agencies and other entities of the United Nations system to South-South and triangular cooperation, and to mainstream the support to South-South and triangular cooperation in their regular activities.
VII. Analysis of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDAF

A. Relevance of the UNDAF with Government priorities and Internationally Agreed Goals

The review attempted to determine if the current UNDAF is still relevant to national priorities and Internationally Agreed Goals, and how it has contributed or is able to contribute to national priorities, including poverty reduction or MDGs’ achievement. It tried to assess if the UNDAF is adequate and relevant, and if it is necessary and useful in Egypt. It also attempted to determine if the UNDAF outcomes respond to crucial needs, in light of the current situation in Egypt.

As pointed out by the UNDAF Guidelines, the UNCT is required to pursue national priorities and to help shape those priorities. The UNDAF is to reflect commitments to the Millennium Declaration, MDGs and obligations under international human rights and other instruments. UNCTs can provide significant inputs into the design of national plans addressing issues of social justice and equality. UNCT supported analysis and programming are ways to bring these concerns to the centre of national development debate.

According to interviewees and the review process, the UNDAF seems in line with Internationally Agreed Goals, in particular those of the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs. A previous section of this report illustrates the links with the MDGs. The UNDAF is also in line with internationally agreed commitments from other conferences, and with norms and standards governing the work of UN entities, among them the human rights treaties. What is missing is a clearer link between UNDAF’s operational activities and the human rights approach to development, which is one of the five principles of the CCA/UNDAF guidelines. This link is also a key component of the UN reform, which bridges, conceptually and in practice, human rights norms and standards with the UN operational activities for development. A subsequent section of this report includes a detailed analysis of the integration of the rights-based approach to programming in the UNDAF.

The UNDAF seems to be well in line with national policies and strategies. Many UN agency activities have contributed to the national policies, plans and strategies, and to actions planned in the framework of such plans and strategies.

The Egypt country chapter of the 2008 Survey on the implementation of the Paris Declaration explains that Egypt’s medium- and long-term operational development strategies are largely developed. The UNDAF seems to fit quite well into this framework. Egypt’s long-term vision is called “Vision for Egypt’s Development by 2022”. Its two main goals are to achieve high and sustainable growth, and to reduce poverty and income disparity. The country’s medium-term strategy is set out in the sixth Five-Year Plan (FYP) for Socio-Economic Development, which covers the period 2008-12. The FYP sets the framework for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), stressing a comprehensive approach to development, and addressing human and social development challenges, including environment, gender, youth unemployment and local development. Sector strategies and initiatives describe how goals set out in the FYP will be met in the areas of health, environmental issues and education.

A series of National Democratic Party policy papers provides a more detailed framework for the reform agenda, and the priorities of the Prime Minister’s administration are reflected in his announced 10-point program. The annual budget aims at reaching the goals of the FYP, ensuring alignment between its goals and budget allocations. Major efforts are being made to improve budget preparation and implementation for greater effectiveness. There is also currently a multi-year expenditure review to deal with issues of efficiency and equity in public spending.

The FYP’s development programmes are the result of a comprehensive planning process driven largely by central and local authorities. A National Council of Planning was established with members from several ministries to define priorities and set up operational plans. Consultative mechanisms have been built into the planning process, with regular consultations with private sector representatives. The government has also announced that greater decentralization will

allow more opportunities for involving other civil society entities, including NGOs, in the consultative process. However, according to the survey, challenges remain. More efforts are being made to strengthen budget preparation and implementation to avoid past delays in submitting budget documents to Parliament.

The UNDAF was designed in 2005 and includes most of the issues the UN system was dealing with at that time. The UNDAF Results Matrix has three outcomes levels: “UNDAF Outcomes”, “Country Programme Outcomes” and “Country Programmes Outputs”. It is quite encompassing, with five UNDAF Outcomes, 23 Country Programme Outcomes, and 103 Country Programme Outputs.

According to interviewees, not everyone has the same understanding of UNDAF accountabilities and attributions. More efforts were put into the preparation of this second UNDAF. As a result, it became so complex and comprehensive that it now needs to be refocused. Several government and agencies interlocutors suggested that it is necessary to distinguish between outputs that are not acted upon and those that are no longer a Government priority. The UNCT should not lose the focus of national priorities as its driving force, and consider the emerging issues as well. With the National Development Plan, Ministries have clear ideas of what needs to be done, but the issue is the extent to which national priorities and the emerging issues are acted upon.

While the UNDAF contains more than 100 Country Programme Outputs, it does not indicate which are the most relevant and priority actions and programmes that must be implemented, jointly or individually, in order to achieve its goals and outcomes. If done, this would indicate a clear strategic intent. Such question is left to the agencies’ own appraisal – and to some extent the UNCT’s – given the fact that there is no existing official mechanism aligning agencies programmes and projects with the UNDAF, except the annual review processes.

With regards to the UN agencies, the UNDAF started to be implemented in 2007, but arguably, some programmes and projects were already being executed. In the course on this review, it was not possible to determine if the UNDAF in Egypt has been adapted to existing programmes or if the programmes were aligned to the UNDAF’s expected outcomes. In brief, it was not possible to analyze UNDAF’s impact on current Country Programmes and activities. Nor was it possible to assess how the UNDAF was integrated into UN agencies programming cycles, including Country Programme Documents (CPDs) and Country Programme Action Plans (CPAPs) for UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP, and other programming documents of other agencies. Most likely, there were synchronization issues among some agencies’ cycles and the UNDAF’s programming cycle. It is worth noting that an attempt was made to map-out how the UNDAF Country Programme Outcomes and Outputs were translated in the CPAPs of UNFPA, UNDP, UNCEF and WFP.37

In order to assess the role and relevance of the UNDAF in relation to the issues and their underlying causes, and the challenges identified in the CCA, a thorough and detailed analysis should be conducted. This was not possible during the timeframe of the present review. Nevertheless, one would need to understand if there is a close, obvious and demonstrated relationship between the development problems identified in the CCA, and those addressed in the UNDAF. This raises the issue of a logic model that is perhaps not explicit enough, and increases the risk that instead of addressing root causes of development problems, the UN in Egypt may be addressing their manifestations. This may explain, to some extent, the lesser impact that the UN can have as a result of its interventions. This highlights the need for a closer and more articulated relationship between a future “situation analysis”, and the next UNDAF.

B. Government Ownership of the UNDAF

Despite the fact that the UNDAF is perceived as relevant by most actors, the ownership of the UNDAF by the Government – and other actors – seems to be very limited. A number of interviewees stressed this issue as a key problem.

---

37 See “UNDAF Results and Resources Framework, Egypt 2007-2011” (the title of this matrix is not very explicit).
The Government and national entities were involved in the UNDAF preparation process. The UNDAF Results Matrix has set forth the mobilization of a number of ministries towards specific outputs, as well as CSOs and NGOs. It should be noted, however, that the Government does not seem to be sufficiently involved in the implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF.

The review team encountered a certain level of frustration expressed about the Government not being in the driver’s seat, and not delivering its contribution at the level it should. This impression was shared by some high level Government officials, UN entities, and development partners. Possible hypotheses explaining this situation range from lack of time of senior officials overburdened with many assignments. There is insufficient involvement of appropriate staff, language problems, and a level of expertise that is sometimes problematic. UNDAF is not being prioritized, and there is a lack of understanding of the importance of UNDAF. The Ministry of Cooperation had suggested that the Outcome Task Forces be chaired by the UN during year one, and by the Government as of year two. This would serve as a tangible transition of ownership of the UNDAF. The review shows a situation where the participation of the Government falls short from showing a strong Government ownership in the UNDAF process.

Ownership depends to a great extent on how the Government is willing to seek and use UN support. The evaluation of the Paris Declaration points to the need for country-led developmental approaches. The leadership role belongs to the Government. In Egypt Government leadership is uneven between the economic areas on one hand – where it is stronger – and the social areas on the other – where it is weaker. Therefore the UN is called to play different roles depending on areas of intervention.

Several ministries collaborate on an individual basis with agencies on specific topics, rather than with the UN system as a whole on cross-cutting or more strategic issues. This is the reason why the UNDAF may sometimes be less visible to the Government than the agencies’ respective programmes. In a context in which the UN assistance is limited and decreasing against the country’s annual budget, the Egyptian Government and other partners should benefit from a stronger national ownership and enhanced coordination of external assistance. By trying to have a unique interlocutor (the UN system), rather than all UN agencies, the Government would probably benefit from a clearer UN contribution to the country’s development strategies. This also applies with development partners, issue that is discussed further in a successive section of this report. Coupled with a stronger monitoring of the UN’s contribution to the country’s development, this would reinforce the accountability of different actors, as suggested in the UNDAF Guidelines, the TCPR, the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action.

Some interviewees also linked the lack of Government ownership to the design of the UNDAF, which is considered by many as too diffuse and not focused enough. According to these views, the UNDAF should be streamlined to strengthen Government’s ownership, enabling a more focused capacity building approach and improved buy-in. Also, some UN staff recognizes that limited advocacy has been done with ministries other than the Ministry of Cooperation. This has resulted in limited buy-in and ownership from the Government in general.

C. Civil Society Participation

To be really effective, “Government” ownership must mean “National” ownership. As just mentioned and pointed out by some interviewees, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) do not seem strongly involved in the UNDAF implementation. This does not mean that CSOs or NGOs are not committed to several country programme outputs but that, in general terms, their participation at the strategic level of the UNDAF remains limited. Nevertheless, CSOs are represented in the M&E Task Forces (in some more than in others), and therefore are involved formally in the UNDAF monitoring process.

One area – just to give an example – where CSOs and NGOs are not adequately involved in the UNDAF is HIV/AIDS. It is now understood that some groups are more at risk than in 2003 when a national assessment was undertaken on HIV/AIDS. Since then, the situation has completely changed. Addressing this issue would require the involvement of a multitude of actors beyond the Ministry of Health (which has only the health perspective) to include not only other Ministries, but also some CSOs and NGOs, which know the situation on the ground. In terms of national
ownership, it is a missed opportunity not to involve such organizations at a more strategic level of UNDAF planning and implementation, as well as in monitoring.

The 2008 Survey on the implementation of the Paris Declaration indicated that the Government also intends to further facilitate the participation of civil society in plan implementation, recognizing the need for adopting a partnership approach to mobilize available resources to achieve development goals.

As stressed by the UNDAF Guidelines, the focus on country ownership and national priorities must be seen in the context of partnership. Inclusive national ownership is key, and the UNDAF must encourage partnership with civil society, including minorities, and other forms of citizen engagement such as volunteerism, which can expand impact and development effectiveness through fostering greater social inclusion.\(^{38}\)

The Paris Declaration also invited partner countries to encourage the participation of civil society and the private sector, linking it to country ownership. More recently, the Accra Agenda for Action included in its recommendations the need to build more effective and inclusive partnerships for development. Such partnerships are now seen as more effective when they fully harness the capacity and experience of all development actors (bilateral and multilateral donors, global funds, CSOs and private sector).\(^{39}\) The participation of all these actors is also crucial in the rights based approach to programming, to ensure that all partners can fulfil their responsibilities and obligations in the development process.

The *Egypt Human Development Report 2008* focused precisely on the role of civil society in the Egypt’s social contract. This landmark publication, from last year, can be a crucial source of inspiration for future work undertaken with civil society and for involving it more systematically and more strategically in the UNDAF.\(^{40}\)

### D. Design and Focus of the UNDAF

**Current design and focus**

The UNDAF is a very general reference framework. Two tools facilitate its concrete implementation and help assess the *design* and *focus* of the UNDAF: the Results Matrix and the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. The Results Matrix defines the "UNDAF Outcomes", the “Country Programme Outcomes” and the “Country Programme Products”, hence thoroughly identifying each individual agency’s responsibilities. From this point of view, the UNDAF in Egypt is well designed and complete.

At the time when the UNDAF was prepared, the UNCT interpreted, from the guidance material, that the UNDAF was a framework that was going to reflect most of the activities undertaken by the agencies. On the basis of this consideration, the UNDAF has been designed as a coherent, focused and results based framework. For instance, the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners (UN agencies and national counterparts) are clearly defined, and facilitated the analysis of the achievement of results during the annual reviews.

It is difficult, however, to determine whether the planned UNDAF Country Programmes Outcomes at the lower level in the hierarchy of results, could effectively lead to the expected UNDAF Outcomes at a higher level. For answering this, one would need to study the formulation of the outcomes and outputs at different levels. The quality of the results chain would also need to be carefully analyzed. In addition, many Country Programme Outcomes and Country Programme Outputs have been formulated in a generic way, and are hardly measurable. In the same way and

---

\(^{38}\) CCA and UNDAF, Guidelines for UN Country Teams on preparing CCA and UNDAF, issued United Nations, February 2009, paragraph 5.

\(^{39}\) It is worth noting that a whole section (paragraphs 16-17) is included in the Accra Agenda for Action on the role of partnerships for development, which was not the case in the Paris Declaration itself. This indicates a growing recognition that CSOs and other actors have a key role to play in increasing aid effectiveness and impact. See also a document submitted in Accra: Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations, Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, August 2008, 3rd High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, 2-4 September 2008, Accra, Ghana.

in some instances, the UNDAF Outcomes defining other outcomes and outputs are put at a very high level and the UN agencies contribution is not always easy to determine. Moreover the expected outcomes are not always realistic given the UNDAF timeframes and resources.

These difficulties were mentioned by several interlocutors, together with the issue of the attribution of results – to the UN agencies, to the Government, to other entities. A reflection on these issues is included in the annual progress reports, prepared by the M&E Coordination Team.

The M&E Framework is the tool defining the indicators, baselines, targets and verification sources, as well as risks and assumptions. The M&E Framework appears to be well defined and generally in line with the “SMART” criteria. Risks and assumptions are also identified for several Country Programme outcomes and mainly at the outcome level. That said the Task Forces spent time in 2007-2008 to refine the M&E Framework. Despite all these efforts, the annual progress reports indicate remaining problems in this area, which will be addressed in more details in the section of this report that deals with M&E aspects.

According to many interviewees, the UNDAF is not very focused in terms of strategic intent. The MTR was a strategic exercise that informs management decisions concerning the current cycle and the forthcoming UNDAF. The MTR clearly showed that the current UNDAF could not be achieved in its totality. It’s encompassing nature, with five UNDAF Outcomes, 23 Country Programme Outcomes, and 103 Country Programme Output, made it, de facto, hard to focus and manage. Moreover, there were emerging issues that warranted greater attention in the current UNDAF. Other sections of this report discuss this issue from different angles.

**Improved design and focus with the MTR**

The UNDAF Mid-Term Review was a unique opportunity for the UNCT to think strategically in support of Government priorities and development challenges. As mentioned earlier in the first section of this report, the MTR undertook a complete revision of the UNDAF Country Programme Outputs to ensure that they remain relevant, and of the M&E Framework to update and strengthen it. This was done by the Task Forces and agencies, under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator’s Office, with the support of the consultants, during half days workshops for each of the Task Forces. As a result of this “pruning” process, the Chairs and Co-Chairs of the Task Forces proposed a reviewed list of Country Programme Outputs, and a revised M&E Framework.

The MTR Workshop (8-9 June 2009), which was organized to discuss the finding of the preliminary draft Mid-Term Review report offered an opportunity to endorse the updated UNDAF Results Matrix, which is included in Annex 3 of this report. Similarly, at the MTR Workshop (8-9 June 2009), it was agreed that the updated and revised M&E framework would be finalized by the end of June 2009, and is included in Annex 4.

The end result of such efforts is an improved Results Matrix for the rest of the remaining cycle – even though they will not be as strategic as one would hope, in order to manage the UNDAF properly and orient it towards a clear strategic intent. In any case, the design and focus of the UNDAF and its Results Matrix have been improved by the Mid-Term Review process, which should help to make a more manageable framework. More importantly, this exercise will be useful for improving the design of the future UNDAF for the next cycle (2012-2016), as it has clearly shown the importance of having a more strategic UNDAF, with a reduced number of Country Programme Outcomes and Outputs.

**E. Effectiveness of the UNDAF**

**Aid effectiveness in Egypt – A Panoramic View**

Egypt has endorsed the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Seventeen donors in Egypt have responded to the 2008 survey on the implementation of the Declaration – the United Nations being one of them. Together, these donors provided 85% of the country’s ODA. Net official development assistance (ODA) to Egypt in 2006, according to the survey, was USD 873 million,
40% lower than 2004, which accounted for less than 1% of GNI.\textsuperscript{41} Government ODA figures are higher than those reported in the survey, reflecting a broader range of donors, and include technical assistance.

According to the figures drawn from the Egypt Chapter of the 2008 OECD Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey (PDMS), the official development assistance (ODA) to Egypt in 2007 was calculated $ 873 million, thus accounting for less than 1 percent of Egypt’s Gross National Income (GNI). However, the PDMS includes figures collected from a limited number of partners, namely: the African Development Bank, Canada, Denmark, EC Delegation, Finland, Germany, the Global Fund, Greece, Italy, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, the UN system in Egypt, USAID, and the World Bank.

On the other hand, the 2009 Development Cooperation Report (DECODE), published by the Ministry of International Cooperation, indicates an overall ODA figure of $ 2.6 billion for the year 2007.

The explanation for the discrepancy between these two figures owes to the DECODE report’s use of data drawn from a wider set of partners (The Arab Fund, OPEC Fund, Adou Dhabi Fund, Kuwait Fund and Montreal Protocol in addition to the PDMS respondents) and to the reporting on the following areas: (1) budgetary aid including direct budget support; (2) Investment Project Assistance; (3) technical cooperation; (4) food aid, and (5) emergency relief and assistance, whereas the PDMS reports on a different set of criteria which do not include investment project assistance, food aid and emergency relief.

The table below gives an overview of the progress achieved in the five principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, together with the challenges and the priority actions that have been identified to strengthen its implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Priority Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak budget preparation and implementation process</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity of line ministries in budget process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Limited use of country systems</td>
<td>Fully implement public financial management and procurement reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low proportion of donor missions are coordinated</td>
<td>Donors improve coordination of donor missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing for results</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low quality of poverty-related data</td>
<td>Improve national information systems and plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual accountability</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No mutual assessments have taken place</td>
<td>Formalize assessments between ministries and donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results of 2008 OECD/DAC Survey on Aid Effectiveness

\textsuperscript{41} These figures are drawn from the Egypt chapter of the 2008 OECD Monitoring Survey, which was completed by the following donors: African Development Bank, Canada, Denmark, European Commission, Finland, Germany, Global Fund, Greece, Italy, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, United Nations, United States, and World Bank.
These issues are discussed in more details in other sections of this report, both above and below.

**Alignment with national strategies and plans**

For aid to be effective, it must be aligned with national development strategies and plans. The Paris Declaration envisions that donors should base their support fully on partner countries’ development strategies, institutions and procedures. Egypt’s ratings from the 2008 Survey of the Paris Declaration revealed mixed progress with respect to the degree of alignment attained, with continued effort needed particularly for aligning aid flows with national priorities, and increasing use of country systems, if the 2010 targets for alignment are to be met.

According to the Survey, rationalizing public expenditure has been a priority in the government’s reform agenda, and Egypt has made significant advances in improving Public Financial Management (PFM) in recent years. Egypt has a strong and autonomous Central Audit Agency, reporting to the President. It undertakes a thorough review and critique of government expenditures and compliance with the national development plan. The Agency submits its report to Parliament annually, and this report receives detailed discussion in Parliament and public media. Donors have also formed a financial management group to harmonize efforts in the PFM and Corporate Financial Reporting agendas.

In 2009, a Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) study was carried out by a team of consultants on behalf of the European Commission and the World Bank. The study found that public financial management (PFM) in Egypt, when analyzed from the perspective of the six dimensions of the PEFA, functions fairly well in general.42 There are areas of weakness, which have been identified, and in most cases the necessary corrective measures are either being or in the process of being implemented in line with international best practices. The continuity of these measures and reforms will make it possible to subsequently strengthen the country’s PFM system and better support the three budgetary outcomes. This will also play a decisive role in supporting poverty reduction in the country. In this context, the quality of national government leadership and the continuation of the Ministry of Finance leadership will be of the utmost importance in ensuring the success of these outstanding reforms.43

The fact that the United Nations system in Egypt participated in the processes of formulating some National Development Strategies (NDSs) has led to greater coherence and increased alignment of the United Nations system’s planning instruments with national priorities, mainly through the UNDAF. The UN has also aligned itself with national procedures and the use of national systems wherever possible. Also, the coordination and coherence within the UNCT as the UNDAF was developed, implemented and monitored supported a certain level of alignment, both within the UN system and with the Government.

In addition, the UN has played, and can continue to play an increasing role to ensure a more comprehensive and transparent reporting on aid disbursement and use, as a means of ensuring that donors align aid flows with national development priorities. The degree to which development assistance to the government sector is fully and accurately reflected in the budget provides a useful indication of the degree to which serious effort is made to connect aid programmes with country policies and processes. It also allows partner country authorities to present accurate and comprehensive budget reports to their parliaments and citizens. The 2008 Survey results report a significant decline, with only 31% of total aid disbursed recorded in the national budget.

---

42 The six dimensions of the PEFA are: (1) Credibility of the budget - The budget is realistic and is implemented as intended; (2) Comprehensive and transparency - The budget and the fiscal risk oversight are comprehensive, and fiscal and budget information is accessible to the public; (3) Policy-based budgeting - The budget is prepared with due regard to government policy; (4) Predictability and control in budget execution - The budget is implemented in an orderly and predictable manner and there are arrangements for the exercise of control and stewardship in the use of public funds; (5) Accounting, recording and reporting - Adequate records and information are produced, maintained and disseminated to meet decision-making control, management and reporting purposes; and (6) External scrutiny and audit - Arrangements for scrutiny of public finances and follow up by executives are operating.

Effectiveness of the UNDAF with respect to expected outcomes

In mid-2009, the UNDAF completed two and a half year of implementation. The current Review focuses on this period, while two and half year remains in the implementation process. Unquestionably, many activities have been achieved by agencies in the UNDAF framework, some jointly and others individually. Achievements are more visible in some cooperation areas than in others.

As mentioned above, the scope of the MTR is a moment of strategic reflection, aiming at learning from implementation in order to improve the performance of the current UNDAF and prepare the next one. Substantively, the MTR is more a strategic planning exercise than a progress assessment. Indeed, UNDAF progress reports are already available for the latter purpose, produced by the UNDAF M&E Coordination Team (United Nations and PEMA/MIC).

The first progress report includes a summary of the key achievements for all the UNDAF Outcomes and the Country Programme Outcomes. This effort merits recognition for the UNCT, the UNDAF Task Forces, and its M&E system, since annual reports of this kind are not available in all countries with a good disaggregation of information and analysis of results. In the first report, the Monitoring & Evaluation Coordination Team noted that it was clear, from the achievements reported, that these have been predominantly “outputs” and “work-in-progress”. This was considered understandable at this early stage of implementation (2007) where very few projects/initiatives could claim to have achieved outcomes. This situation was considered likely to continue for at least the successive few months or years; but as the UNDAF approached mid-point (mid-2009), focus had to shift to outcomes. This called for more discussion of the appropriate indicators to assess outcome achievements.144

The second progress report includes a much more detailed analysis of the key achievements for all the UNDAF Outcomes and the Country Programme Outcomes. In two years, more experience have been gained in monitoring and assessing progress in implementing UNDAF activities, this report highlighted the results achieved, as reported by the six Outcome Groups, and presented observations and recommendations for consideration by the Steering Committee.45

This second progress report, which has just been finalized before this Mid Term Review took place, made very significant observations in terms of the effectiveness of the UNDAF, as well as other issues. These general observations are the following:

- First, virtually all achievements still focus on inputs and outputs. There is little doubt that much activity has been taking place along the broad spectrum of development issues contained in the UNDAF. Typical examples are training seminars and workshops for different target groups, signing of agreements/protocols with line ministries to initiate new projects, preparing draft strategies and amendments to existing decrees, and so on. These are mainly activities, although a few outputs have also been reported. It will be recalled, however, that the Steering Committee directed that more attention be given to outcomes as we approach mid-term review, which is due this June-July. More work is necessary to facilitate the switching to outcome reporting.

- Second, the majority of achievements and indicators reported do not show significant progress from the baseline status. It is recognised that in some areas visible progress will take longer than two or three years to manifest itself. But the question must be raised at this stage, whether it is too early to expect more tangible results or should a review be undertaken to examine how a faster pace of progress might be realised?

44 First Consolidated UNDAF Annual Progress Report - 2007, United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2007-2011), Monitoring & Evaluation Coordination Team, Submitted to the UNDAF M&E Steering Committee, by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, Chair, UNDAF M&E Coordination Team, 18th February 2008.
Third, since the UNDAF was approved three years ago, some important developments have taken place domestically and internationally that would warrant a strategic review of the objectives and targets stated in the UNDAF document. Such a review might well lead to adding objectives, dropping others or assigning them lesser priorities and provide a new sense of direction for future activities to align UNDAF more closely with current national development priorities.

Fourth, PEMA’s evaluation work over the past six years clearly indicates that a major challenge, even in the case of successfully implemented projects, is that of sustainability of outcomes at an acceptable quality level. It is, therefore, suggested that future progress reports for each Outcome Group look into sustainability factors in their respective areas and point out measures that are being taken to enhance continuity after project completion.

Based on these recent observations from the M&E Coordination Team, it is safe to assume that the UNDAF has not delivered results at the level it was expected to. The Chair of the UNDAF M&E Coordination Team, Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, pointed out that there has been very little progress on the performance of UNDAF in terms of achieving development results. At the end of year two, we should not be reporting only on activities he said, but, at minimum, on outputs.

Enhanced coordination within the UN system

Even if the UNDAF results in terms of achievement of development outcomes and outputs have been below expectations, UNDAF appears to be a useful tool to enhance effectiveness within the UN System context.

Coordinating 24 UN entities, some of which non resident agencies, is certainly not an easy task. It is indisputable that interagency collaboration and cooperation have reached levels never attained before this second UNDAF. Thus, the work of the UN system with national actors has been more coordinated than ever before. Even when activities have not been jointly executed (which does not mean that there was no collaboration) serious efforts have been made to keep other partners abreast of activities undertaken individually.

The UNDAF in Egypt also mirrors the findings of the Evaluability assessment of the Delivering as One pilot countries. It offers three main options that countries have in deciding how to benefit from the UN System (with the corresponding three options that the UN System has in responding):

1. Countries may prefer a highly centralized cooperation with the UN. In this case, the UN can respond with the Delivering as One UN.
2. Countries may favour some key areas of concentration for the UN. In this case, the UN can respond with joint programming and joint programmes.
3. Countries may prefer a “laissez-faire” attitude. In this case, the UN is very much influenced by agency driven activities.

Of course, in any country, there may be a combination of these country preferences and UN responses. The cooperation between the UN and the Government is probably more a mix between some key areas of concentration (joint programmes) and the “laisser faire” (the rest of the UNDAF and the activities undertaken individually by UN agencies.

Most UN entities interviewed said that they contribute towards the achievement of the UNDAF goals and outcomes. In turn, the UNDAF supports the achievement of the mandate of their organizations.

In the donor community, there seems to be some confusion with respect to the mandates of each UN agency, and a lack of knowledge of who does what, and on behalf of whom. Agencies seem to be involved in multiple areas, often the same. It is also unclear who speaks for the UN. There is poor visibility of the UN in many instances. Several interlocutors wished a better flow of information, and a better communication between the bilateral donors’ community and the UN.

Enhanced joint programme approach
The TCPR encouraged the expanded use of the joint programme approach, i.e., the joint implementation by two or more United Nations organizations and national partners of specific activities with a common thematic focus and a joint work plan and budget, whenever this is the most appropriate and effective way to implement programmes and projects in support of national development priorities. The TCPR further invited the United Nations development system and the Bretton Woods institutions to intensify cooperation, collaboration and coordination, including through greater harmonization and consistency of strategic frameworks, instruments, modalities and partnership arrangements, in full accordance with the priorities of the recipient Governments, and with respect for the institutional integrity and organizational mandates of each organization. The TCPR call is reflected in the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines, and of course in the Delivering as One UN approach.

One distinctive feature of the UNCT activities in Egypt is the number of joint programmes, and joint programming activities. In this regard, it is worth noting that there are currently 17 joint programmes under implementation, which is a significant number. The UNCT has also been selected for three joint programmes funded by the Spanish Fund for the achievement of the MDGs. With its 17 joint programmes, the UNCT has made significant progress in this area. By May 2009, the joint programmes covered nine thematic areas, with a budget of approximately 43 million USD.

The UNCT even undertook an Assessment of Joint Programmes in 2007, and another one is planned. This is certainly a welcome initiative that merits recognition. A strategy was also drafted in 2007, which indicated that most joint programmes suffer from weak coordination mechanisms, limited information sharing between stakeholders, and no joint decision-making bodies. This has and may jeopardize any apparent added value of joint programming. The main issue seems to be the general lack of reporting on progress made in a coordinated and timely manner, under an established accountability framework. The limited knowledge about joint programming at the country level and lack of training have likewise contributed to some of the challenges faced by the managers of joint programmes, particularly in terms of coordination, reporting and monitoring and evaluation.

The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) with its 13 agencies involved in Egypt is a good example of joint programming. The pilot concept of one budgetary framework is also significant and provides the basis for a management tool at the country level, linking performance to funding.

That said, some interviewees, especially in the development partners still lamented the lack of joint programming in some areas. For instance, CIDA, among other donors, talked about Female Genital Mutilation / Cutting (FGM/C) related work. There is a pool funding from 9 donors that UNDP manages, and has been most successful thanks to a good coordinator, good and timely reporting, and transparent financial reporting. CIDA was also a member of the Steering Committee, was invited to participate in field trips, and was felt as a partner, but the interviewee asked why UNDP and UNICEF had parallel projects on FGM, while in addition, the same organization, the National Council for Child and Motherhood (NCCM) coordinates well these two projects from a national perspective. Further research revealed that four UN agencies (UNICEF, UNDP, UNIFEM and UNFPA) are currently putting together a joint programme with NCCM for the next phase of the fight against FGM/C.

The fact that no less than three UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund proposals have been approved (Climate change, Heritage, culture and development and Private sector) shows, however, that the UNCT can collaborate very well around joint programmes, when there are strong financial incentives. Other donors (EU, US) are also inviting the UNCT to collaborate better. The opinion of some interviewees from UN agencies is that joint programming, associated with funding, is one of the best ways to enhance collaboration between agencies in the UNCT framework.

---

46 Egypt Joint Programmes, UN Coordination Office, July 2008 (status update).
Enhanced donor coordination and Accra Agenda for Action

In Egypt, with no less than 24 UN agencies involved and 30 donors, it is definitively a challenge to enhance coordination with this multitude of actors. An interviewee referred to the relative light weight of ODA toward the support to Egypt development. As a MIC, Egypt is not a country of concentration for the ODA community. There are three large contributors (USA, EU, and the Multilateral Development Banks). Other contributors include Germany, France, CIDA, Spain and Italy. She explained that the large contributors are not present for development per se, but more for political reasons. The USA is honouring a commitment taken as part of Camp David, the EU is involved for reasons of good neighbourhood, trade and immigration, and the MDBs for infrastructure loans. There is a lack of governmental coordination of ODA, and the weak level of peer coordination amongst donors. If the UN were to be serious about coordination via the UNDAF, the donors would welcome it. This may provide a framework for greater relevance of the contribution of donors.

As a matter of fact, the Resident Coordinator assumed the Chairmanship of the Development Partners Group in January 2009. Several interlocutors indicated that his role has been particularly appreciated, and that as a result, the group has been revitalized and benefited from a new impetus.

In 2002, the DAC Task Force on Donor Practices had chosen Egypt as a case study for a Workshop on Donor Practices. There was total unanimity amongst respondents from partner institutions that donor procedures, requirements and rules constituted a major burden. The fact that donor procedures and requirements differ between donors was regarded as a problem. Adhering to donor procedures represented an excessive claim on government partners, and some procedures were beyond their institution’s capacity. Donor procedures also led to disbursement delays. In particular, differing rules regarding procurement and financial reporting were regarded as being the most burdensome, and this was even worse in the case of co-financing of projects, where each donor insisted on their own rules and procedures.

Parallel to the United Nations harmonization efforts is the development and implementation of joint assistance strategies (JASs), in which UNCTs in some countries have been entrusted to lead coordination efforts among development partners, including the Bretton Woods institutions (BWIs). The United Nations system has played a role in supporting national capacities to coordinate what is often a contentious and tedious process. The result has been a division of labour among donors in some of these countries, but this does not yet exist in Egypt.

More recently in 2008, a mapping of current donors’ interventions has been prepared by the UN Coordination Office, and a retreat of the group was organized in March 2009. The objective of the DPG Retreat was to provide participants (i.e. DPG members and Chairs/Co-chairs of the DPG thematic sub-groups) with an opportunity to engage in an in-depth discussion on selected key topics, central to the role and modus operandi of the international community vis-à-vis the development priorities of Egypt. It was also expected that the retreat would serve to revisit and perhaps adjust the work of the DPG on Egypt’s development priorities and in following-up in on the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness.

The retreat discussed the fact that unfortunately, the Government of Egypt does not implement national development plans in an integrated fashion and following aid effectiveness principles, but sectorally. The EHDR of 2005 constitutes the best integrated strategy for Egypt, and a lot of it was adopted in the 2006 election campaign. Within such framework of sub-optimal governance which characterizes Egypt, the role of the international community is to speak with one voice when lobbying at both central and local levels for the application of better governance and transparent coordination throughout all development sectors, and by consistently involving Government counterparts throughout all phases of the ongoing dialogue.

---

48 Matrix on Donors’ Interventions, UN Coordination Office, 2008.
After presenting the framework of objectives present in the Accra Agenda for Action at this retreat, the Executive Director & Economic Advisor to the Minister, from the Centre for Project Evaluation and Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA), Ministry of International Cooperation, Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, also Chair of the UNDAF M&E Team, proposed an action-oriented strategy to implement the main recommendations of the AAA in the Egyptian context, which could be implemented at the level of the already existing DPG sub-groups. The strategy would consist of:

1. Reaching an agreement between the Government of Egypt and all development actors on the top priorities for assistance in the country;
2. Collecting evidence on the above mentioned priority areas through a situation analysis and needs assessment;
3. Drafting sectoral assistance work plans, in coherence with a wider programme-based approach, characterized by a strong M&E system;
4. Engaging Government counterparts, including decision-makers, and partners in development in a ‘structured governance framework’ to follow-up on the process.

The DAG, recently re-named Development Partners Group (DPG), has been active in Egypt since the late 1990s and is currently composed of 21 bilateral partners and 13 multilateral agencies, including the UN family and World Bank. Recently, G-20 countries not previously represented in the DAG (i.e., Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Russia, South Africa and Turkey) were invited to formally join the DPG. The DPG operates at two levels: plenary meetings and thematic sub-groups.

DPG plenary meetings are held once a month with senior representatives from DPG member organizations, and provide participants with updates on such matters as recent or upcoming missions, project developments, etc. Representatives from the Government attend these meetings from time to time, depending on the agenda. DPG also operates through the following eight (8) thematic sub-groups: Health and Population, Gender and Development, Natural Renewable Resources, Human Resource Development, Participatory Development and Good Governance, Environment and Energy, Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, and Information and Communications Technology (ICT).

**Coordinating support to strengthen capacity**

Capacity constraints significantly undermine the ability of partner countries to capture, coordinate and utilize aid flows more effectively. Under the Paris Declaration, donors committed to providing technical co-operation in a manner that is coordinated with partner countries’ strategies and programmes. The UNCT seems to have played a role in the improvement registered in donors’ joint efforts to coordinate technical assistance more effectively and more in line with government priorities. The 2008 Survey suggested, however, that the government should identify more specifically its capacity-building priorities and preferences in order to establish greater ownership over technical assistance activities. Donors are called to re-examine their technical assistance strategies, refine the monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building activities, and discuss these with Egyptian counterparts to enhance sustainability. This can be achieved through a national capacity-building programme, based on a study of priority needs.

**Resident coordinator system**

The TCPR reaffirmed that the resident coordinator system, within the framework of national ownership and government leadership of national development processes, has a key role to play in the effective and efficient functioning of the United Nations system at the country level and that this role needs to be strengthened. The adoption by UNDG of a new system of management and accountability of the resident coordinator system, in August 2008 has further strengthened the UN system.\(^\text{50}\)

---

\(^\text{50}\) The Management and Accountability System of the UN Development and RC System, including the “functional firewall” for the RC System, 27 August 2008.
In Egypt, there is a clear firewall between UNDP and the Resident Coordinator, and as an interlocutor explained, there is a real potential to help the Government as a Team. The UN Coordination Office is also well structured and well staffed.

The UNDAF Guidelines describe the UNDAF as a collective and strategic response of the UNCT to contribute to the development and implementation of these priorities, developed through an inclusive approach, covering the entire range of analytical, normative, technical and operational expertise of the UN system, and including resident and non resident agencies and funds and programmes.

The TCPR also underscored that the resident coordinator system is owned by the United Nations system as a whole, including Non-Resident Agencies (NRAs), and that participation, inclusiveness, collegiality, transparency and accountability are key principles that underline the functioning of the resident coordination system. Even if the participation of NRAs remains a challenge, they are involved in the UNDAF implementation and play a role as UN partners.

F. Efficiency of the UNDAF

Besides the need to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, accountability and credibility of the UN development system activities at country level, the TCPR, among other resolutions, emphasized the need for a greater efficiency of activities undertaken at field level, including in the framework of the UNDAF implementation. The drive for increased coherence and efficiency of the UN system received fresh impetus with the piloting of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach in eight countries starting in 2007.

The piloting of a team approach for “Delivering as One” in eight “programme country pilots” has brought about a major change in the way of doing business within the United Nations: from an individual agency focus to one of team support which, in and of itself, would result in reduced administrative and transaction costs. The UNCT through the “Delivering as One” model – one leader, one programme, one budgetary framework, and one office – carries forward the United Nations goal of harmonization. Although the United Nations launched only eight pilots to adopt this working model, many other UNCTs in non-pilot countries have followed suit.

Within “Delivering as One”, the relatively new way of delivering assistance, through joint programming and joint programmes which are increasingly being aligned to NDSs, helps reduce administrative costs, and also has the advantage of combining complementarities of expertise.

The UN system in Egypt has taken a number of measures to improve efficiency, and the CCA/UNDAF process has certainly played a key role in this respect. It has helped to ensure a better alignment with national strategies and plans, despite country ownership issues raised above in this report. It has also ensured a greater harmonization within the UN system, which has used quite intensively the joint programme approach where it was possible. Finally, the UNDAF has also strengthened the RC system and inclusiveness of non resident agencies.

Several development partners, however, indicated that they tend to shy away from bureaucratic procedures from the UN, which makes collaboration not really attractive. There are often different interests, procedures, budgetary rules, etc. The cost of doing business through UNDP, for instance, is 7%. There needs to be a real value added to make it worth it.

Finally, in Egypt as elsewhere, there is a continual drive towards the development of common arrangements and simplified procedures, with the goal of gradually using national systems and processes, particularly budgetary ones, and strengthening national execution. A specific example of this is the agreement by UNDG to harmonize the way cash is transferred to implementing partners at the national level. Pursuant to the TCPR, the implementation on the new Harmonized Approach for Cash Transfer (HACT) to counterparts is expected to significantly reduce transaction costs and lessen the burden that the multiplicity of UN procedures and rules creates for its partners. UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP (UNDG ExCom Agencies) adopted

TCPR, UN General Assembly Resolution 56/201.
this common operational framework for transferring cash to both government and non-government implementing partners.

Until date, this agreement has not been implemented in a coordinated fashion by agencies in Egypt, although agencies have used HACT principles, which may have reduced some transaction costs. However, some progress has been noted by the review team on this front, especially in 2009. One of the risk management activities (also a prerequisite) for HACT is conducting a micro-assessment of the adequacy of the implementing partner’s financial management systems and internal controls. This assessment is usually done once every programme cycle, or whenever a significant change in the Implementing partner’s organizational management is noticed. This assessment is done for partners that receive or are expected to receive cash transfers above an annual amount (usually $100,000 combined from all agencies). UNICEF, on behalf of the ExCom agencies in Egypt, has contracted an audit firm to conduct the micro-assessment for the identified 60 NGO implementing partners in Egypt, which will allow, consequently, the implementation of HACT in Egypt.

It is important to mention also that significant efforts have been undertaken to lower transaction and operational costs by creating a UN Common House where an important number of agencies would regroup in the same building or same area of Cairo. Given the distance and time involved in local transportation, having agencies together would certainly help interagency cooperation, and facilitate working relationships with national and donor partners. This would in turn facilitate the UNDAF implementation, support the use of common services, help communication and facilitate exchange of information.

G. Human Rights-based Approach

Inter-related principles and cross-cutting issues

The UNDAF guidelines explain that five inter-related principles which must be applied at country level:

1. Human Rights-based Approach (HRBA) based on the nine core international human rights treaties;
2. Gender Equality and the elimination of discrimination on the basis of sex;
3. Environmental sustainability;
4. Results-based Management (RBM); and
5. Capacity development.

At the headquarters level, a workshop held in September 2008 in Tarrytown has analyzed the implementation of the five principles in the UNDAF and the published documents could be used as a basis for reflection by the UNCT in Egypt.52

In September 2008, the Accra Agenda for Action has also recommended the following: “Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability” (paragraph 13 c).

The present section of the report will analyze more carefully the first two principles (Human Rights-Based Approach and Gender Equality). Results-Based Management has been analyzed in the successive section of this report. The cross-cutting and holistic implementation of the environmental sustainability principle has not been highlighted during this review but there is a joint Climate Change joint programme financed through the UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund, as well as initiative to mainstream these issues, and work with the private sector in a much

52 The main documents of the Tarrytown Workshops are the following:
- Lessons learned on 5 principles in 2007 UNDAF Guidelines,
- Excerpts of guidance on 5 key principles,
more systematic fashion, with a planned visit of Nobel Prize winner Al Gore in October. The review could not observe that capacity development has been systematically and explicitly referred to as a cross-cutting principle, however many of the UNDAF actions were deliberately aiming at strengthening counterparts capacities.

**HRBA: A key component of the UNDAF**

The Human Rights-Based Approach is one of the inter-related principles which must be applied at country level, according to the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines.53

The Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming became part of UNICEF and UNDP programming guidelines in 1998-1999, and later on for other agencies.54 In 2003, UN agencies agreed on a Common Understanding, and since then, the following components are considered necessary, specific and exclusive to a Human Rights-based Approach to Programming.

1. All programmes of development co-operation, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments.
2. Human rights standards contained in, and principles derived from, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.
3. Development cooperation contributes to the development of the capacities of ‘duty-bearers’ to meet their obligations and/or of ‘rights-holders’ to claim their rights.55

**Human Rights Based Approach in the CCA and UNDAF in Egypt**

Given the importance of the rights approach in development thinking in the last ten years, the review team has attempted to understand to what extent human rights principles and standards have been reflected in the CCA and the UNDAF in Egypt, and how the “rights approach” has been promoted during the UNDAF implementation.

At the core of the 2005 CCA is an analysis of “Human” capacities and “State” capacities, the later being seen through the lens of the legal obligation that the government of Egypt has towards its citizens in fulfilling social, economic and political entitlements. In this vein, the report concludes that Egypt continues to suffer from the three principal human development deficits identified by the 2002 Arab Human Development Report (AHDR), namely in knowledge, freedom and the empowerment of women. The main message which emerges is that the state needs to strengthen its capacities to build the human capabilities of all citizens in an equitable way, so as to ensure that all Egyptians can realize their full potential and benefit from the expansion of choices in their lives.

The CCA report intends to identify the causal relationships between different developmental impediments and pinpoint the root causes of the challenges the government and society face in meeting the major human rights norms embraced by Egypt and the international community, as well as the obstacles to fully reaching the MDGs. The CCA analysis rests on two structural concepts: the human capabilities of citizens to fulfil their potential in society and the institutional capabilities of the State and its organs to create the right kind of environment for human development. The CCA refers to the 1997 Human Development Report, the 1993 Vienna Declaration on human rights, the 2005 Secretary-General’s report, In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All. The CCA also indicates that the “progressive realization” of certain rights is an accepted norm since progress in areas such as health, education, an adequate standard of living and the environment does depend on long-term economic growth, long-term institutional development, planning and the strengthening of human

capacities. The CCA also includes a table that compares the MDGs with the corresponding human rights standards and conferences.

Finally, the CCA explains that since the Secretary-General’s reform agenda, launched in 1997, the quest to place human rights at the centre of the United Nations System’s activities has continuously gained momentum, including through the adoption of a human rights based approach to development. This approach implies that the UN system has a responsibility to help countries meet their obligations towards the realization of their citizen’s human rights. Obligations emanate from the fact that, wherever there is a right, there is someone who has a claim to that right – claim-holders – and someone else with a corresponding duty or obligation to fulfil that claim – duty bearers. Development work aims to help build the capacities of claim-holders to assert their rights and of duty-bearers to meet their obligations. The CCA aims at exploring the responses of claim-holders and duty-bearers to different development challenges, and identify the main capacity gaps which impede the fulfilment of these obligations. Each chapter includes a description of the claim- or rights-holders and the required responses and capacities from duty-bearers. As one can appreciate from the above, the conceptual basis about the rights approach included in the CCA is therefore very robust.

The UNDAF is very much in line with this thinking. Similarly to the CCA, the UNDAF cover design is inspired by the shape and form of the human DNA. As for the DNA structure, the CCA/UNDAF analysis reflects a complex relationship between two axes that are critical to the functioning of the Egyptian society: Human capabilities and State capabilities. It is the interplay of these features with the essential elements of participation, social contract and rule of law, which determines, according to the UNDAF, the quality and pace of development in the country. The ‘State’ is considered broadly and holistically to encompass government, civil society, the media and the private sector, all as key players and stakeholders in the human-state development paradigm.

The report indicates that the entire UNDAF process pursues the quest to place human rights at the centre of United Nations system activities, and resolves to continue to apply a human rights-based approach to development, from the analysis to the programming and implementation stage. The UNDAF also refers to the relationship between claim-holders and duty-bearers, and to the need to strengthen both human and State capacities, using a human rights-based approach to programming. While the UNDAF Outcome 1 specifically refers to state capacities (performance and accountability), the UNDAF Outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5 are mainly aiming at building and supporting human capacities. In addition, there is a strong focus, in both the CCA and the UNDAF towards the most marginalized, excluded and poor people.

Therefore, both the CCA and UNDAF show a very systematic thinking in terms of the overall framework of the rights approach, and the UNCT deserves credit for preparing documents that are very articulated in that respect.

**HRBAP and the Results Matrix**

As pointed out by a RBM Issue Note from UNDG/WGPP, according to the Stamford Consensus, while the introduction of a human rights based approach (HRBA) has led to increased “human rights language” in UNDAFs, the outcomes in the results matrices often do not reflect an increased performance of rights-holders and duty-bearers. The issue note recalls that all UNDAF outcomes and agency outcomes should reflect the institutional and behavioural changes required for right-holders to claim their rights and for duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations. Agency outputs should close the capacity gaps which prevent rights holders and duty bearers from fulfilling or performing these roles. In addition, a HRBA approach ensures a high quality analysis of development challenges by identifying patterns of discrimination and exclusion, and together with the concrete claims of rights-holders and obligations of duty bearers which need to be fulfilled in order to address these development problems. Despite the fact that many UNCTs have undertaken a good rights-based analysis in their CCA, frequently, result chains do not build necessarily on these analyses.\(^{56}\)
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\(^{56}\) Results based management in UNDAFs, Issues Note: October 2007, UNDG Working Group on Programming Policies – Task Team 1.
To some extent these pitfalls have been avoided in the UNDAF in Egypt, however the implementation of the rights approach has not been monitored in light of these recommendations, as will be discussed in the sub-section below.

Optimally, a HRBA also requires that human rights standards and principles be systematically applied in all phases of the programming processes including in the formulation of result chains. A HRBA is not just an add-on, and therefore, singling out human rights issues in a separate UNDAF or agency outcome would not be sufficient to integrate human rights systematically in RBM. The UNDAF in Egypt has pretty much mainstreamed most of the human rights principles of indivisibility and interdependence of rights by addressing civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights. By identifying the duty-bearers responsibilities and obligations, the CCA has also affirmed the principle of accountability of different actors – Government, UN system, civil society, communities, parents, etc. When it comes to participation of the different actors, the UNDAF has included a number of actors from civil society in the implementation of the UNDAF. Nevertheless, participation has been limited and as mentioned earlier in this report, ownership has not transcended UN agencies.

There are various examples of integration of the Human Rights Approach in UNDAF, which can be used as reference points by the UNCT in the future to further improve on the good basis it already has at its disposal, with solid CCA and UNDAF documents. These include the UNDAFs in Nicaragua 2007-2011, Suriname 2007-2011, and for those from the UNDAFs elaborated in 2005, Guyana 2006-2010, Ukraine 2006-2010, Viet Nam 2006-2010. Similarly, a recent paper produced in preparation of a recent Interagency Meeting on implementing a HRBA, looked at other UNDAFs (Ecuador 2004-2008, Kenya 2009-2013, Niger 2009-2013, Nigeria 2006-2010, Guyana 2006-2010).

Two studies have also been conducted recently in Senegal, one on the integration of the rights approach in the Poverty Reduction Strategy, the other on the integration and strengthening of the approach in the UNDAF.

**Progress in the implementation of the rights approach**

There is no doubt that some progress has been made in the implementation of a Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming (HRBAP) in order to define more accurately the intended results (the "what") and strategies (the "how"). The design and content of the CCA/UNDAF, together with the implementation of the UNDAF, reveal a transition process from the previous perspective - aiming at improving access to, and the quality of services to respond to development "needs" - to a focus which is gradually oriented towards fulfilling "rights" and the strengthening capacities of both right-holders, with a focus on the more vulnerable, and duty-bearers. The current UNDAF advocates for the development of interventions promoting in practice social inclusion of all those excluded from the enjoyment of their human rights, and for the promotion and advocacy for such rights. A great part of the UNDAF intervention targets the most excluded portion of the population. Due to the fact that the excluded do not always receive enough attention from other cooperation partners, the UNDAF plays a very significant role at the national level. It is, in a way, a niche of excellence for the UN in Egypt.

That said, according to interviewees, the link between the rights approach and the government is mainly through the National Council on Human Rights, which is a national human rights institution, with some degree of independence. The HRBA does not seem to be fully integrated in the UNDAF implementation, and is seen by some as too philosophical. That said, many UNDAF related work do reflect discrimination, regional disparities and gender issues, and do attempt to
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57 Good Practices from the 2005 reports, Three Examples of UNDAF that Reflect a Human Rights Approach (UNDG).
address capacity gaps of rights-holders and duty-bearers. However, other interviewees indicated that the issue of human rights remains controversial in Egypt. There is juxtaposition between culture, universal versus local rights, and religious rights. Religion and traditional practices influence personal status on issues such as marriage, divorce, family law. Because these are sensitive issues, UNFPA uses the term “reproductive rights” rather than “sexual rights”. Female Genital Mutilation is also an example of some basic human rights violations, which dramatically affects women and girls that is being addressed by several UN agencies.

Unlike in other countries, there does not seem to be an interagency human rights working group, and Egypt did not benefit from the set of activities undertaken in several other countries in the framework of the support brought via “Action 2”, by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. In addition, there seems to have been no training on the Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming for UN staff, government officials and other partners from civil society.

**HRBAP and Human Rights Conventions**

Finally, as pointed out in the CCA and UNDAF, a country has a series of obligations once it has ratified international legal instruments. The UN agencies have also responsibilities in that respect. The main international instruments defining the reference framework of many agencies have been signed and ratified by Egypt, including the Convention on the rights of the child (CRC), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against women (CEDAW), the ILO Covenant no.182 on child labour, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, etc. The CCA/UNDAF Guidelines also specifically refer to Conventions of the UN System, international human rights mechanisms, and other useful references.

Moreover, a number of human rights treaty bodies, including some committees monitor these human rights instruments in a systematic way, and engage in a regular dialogue with governments at the international level. Egypt provides periodic reports on its implementation efforts regarding these Treaty provisions. Treaty bodies also prepare reports reviewing the implementation of the conventions provisions, and make recommendations to the country and others stakeholders, including the UN System. These reports have implications for the UN agencies work in Egypt. A key element of the UN reform is precisely to fill the gap between the human rights work of the UN, and its programming and operational activities in the development area. Interviewees, however, did not have much to say about these issues.

In this context, it is also worth mentioning that several UNCTs, especially those which have benefited from the OHCHR “Action 2” Programme, conducted studies to analyze the reports provided by Egypt to the human rights treaty bodies and committees, as well as the concluding observations and recommendations made to Egypt by such bodies, and finally, the role of the UN, civil society and NGOs in the report preparations. Such studies, conducted for instance in Peru and Senegal, have the potential of being quite useful to enhance the understanding of all parties involved, and the implementation of the human rights based approach in the UNDAF.

The documentation consulted in the course of this review did not show the evidence of some common and joint monitoring actions of the human rights mechanisms processes and treaty bodies’ recommendations. Advocacy activities have integrated human rights issues, but the review did not analyze if issues deemed sensitive may have benefited from a concerted action of the UNCT, through the UNDAF mechanisms, like the Task Forces or the UNDAF Coordination Team or the UNDAF Committee.

**Gender equality**

Gender Equality is one of the 5 key principles of the UNDAF Guidelines. Gender Equality is also “at the heart of the Human Rights-based Approach to Programming” and human development. As
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61 CCA/UNDAF Guidelines, Annex 7, Hyperlinks to Conventions of the UN System, international human rights mechanisms, and other useful references.


63 États des lieux en matière de droits humains au Sénégal, Consultation pour le Programme « Action 2 », Ismaila Madior Fall, Professeur agrégé de droits et de science politique, Université Cheikh Anta Diop, (Octobre 2008).
the Guidelines stipulate, "The UN should help ensure that priorities in the national development framework reflect the country's commitments to achieving gender equality within the internationally agreed development goals". A study commissioned by the UNDG Task Team on Gender Equality, which analyzed how gender was reflected in CCAs and UNDAFs, showed that the principle of gender mainstreaming is well accepted across the UN. Nevertheless, despite good gender analysis in the CCA, such analysis rarely gets translated into strategic UNDAF results chains and consequently into holistic programming for gender equality.

The Mid Term Review also attempted to analyze to what extent and how gender equity and equality concepts were reflected in the UNDAF programming, if efforts were made to produce gender disaggregated data and indicators while assessing progress and, if concrete goals and objectives were set in terms of gender equity and equality. It also appraised to what extent, and in what ways, special attention was given to girls and women's rights and to expanding their means of action.

Gender issues are also very much at the centre of the CCA and the UNDAF, and placed at a high level in the hierarchy of the Results Matrix. First, the UNDAF Outcome 4 focuses on women's participation and human rights: "By 2011, women's participation in the workforce, political sphere and in public life is increased, and their human rights and increasingly fulfilled". Second, the UNDAF Outcome 2 focuses on reducing the gender gap: "By 2011, regional human development disparities are reduced, including reducing the gender gap, and environment sustainability improved". Third, UNDAF Outcome 1, CP Outcome 4 is also gender focused: "National policies are made gender sensitive". The UNCT in Egypt deserves credit for addressing this issue by having specific UNDAF and Country Programme outcomes on women's participation, gender gap, and national policies. These efforts are also further complemented by the use of indicators that reflect narrowing of gender gaps.

Gender has also been taken into consideration as part of UNDAF programming in Egypt, and some efforts have been made by the UN agencies to address gender issues, with varying levels of success. There are several gender focused projects, but the intended gender mainstreaming into all projects has not been fully implemented. In addition, in the documentation consulted during the present review, no specific data or report were identified on gender equality as cross-cutting theme in the UNDAF. In the future, a key question could be: To what extent women's capacities were strengthened with the UNDAF support, and what were the contribution and added value of inter-agency cooperation?

H. Results Based Management

RBM and Results Matrix

Efforts undertaken in Egypt to put in place a solid RBM system, use and update the Results Matrix regularly, and monitor the UNDAF are commendable. Results Based Management is one of the five interconnected principles of the CCA/UNDAF guidelines, which also give a lot of importance to the UNDAF M&E Plan. Both are considered mutually reinforcing. In many countries, there is a lack of a robust application of RBM. Despite the harmonized UNDG terminology and a solid training package offered to UNCTs, a 2007 UNDG/WGPP desk review of recent UNDAF results matrices still found many persistent shortfalls in RBM application, which hamper effective monitoring and evaluation of results. In addition, a 2008 UNDG/WGPP study on systemic issues affecting the lack of consistent and robust RBM application points to the fact that there still is no common understanding and application on RBM.

The importance of the constant use of the Results Matrix and the M&E Plan during the UNDAF implementation phase has also been reiterated in the Evaluability assessments of the Delivering
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64 Results based management in UNDAFs, Issues Note: October 2007, UNDG Working Group on Programming Policies – Task Team 1.
65 Issues Note: Results Based Management in UNDAFs, Task Team 1 of Working Group of Programming Policies, October 2007.
as One Pilot countries at the end of 2008.\textsuperscript{67} The Evaluability assessments found major shortcomings in this regard in most programming and M&E documents. Objectives were formulated as activities.\textsuperscript{68} In addition, in some cases, indicators were not ambitious enough and lacked credibility.\textsuperscript{69} The existence of adequate results frameworks and M&E systems is a necessary prerequisite for a future evaluation addressing relevance and effectiveness. A process evaluation will have to assess the extent to which results frameworks and M&E systems have been put in place.

In Egypt these systems do exist. In order to continue to improve the Results Based Management and M&E features of the UNDAF, the MTR dedicated some efforts to review the Results Matrix and improve the M&E Framework (indicators, baselines, targets, and risks and assumptions). As a follow-up to the discussions between the consultants, the UN Coordination Office, and the Co-Chairs of the UNDAF Task Forces, it was decided to update the latest version of the framework, which had last been reviewed in July 2008 at a retreat where all the Task Forces participated.

As mentioned in more detail in the previous section on ‘Design and Focus’ of the UNDAF, the MTR Workshop (8-9 June 2009), which was organized to discuss the finding of the preliminary draft Mid-Term Review report, offered an opportunity to endorse the updated UNDAF Results Matrix, which is included in Annex 3 of this report. Similarly, the M&E Framework (indicators, baselines, targets, and risks and assumptions) was also revised immediately after the Workshop in conjunction with the revision of the Results Matrix and is included in Annex 4.

Finally, the workshops and training sessions conducted earlier in 2007 on RBM and M&E issues were definitely helpful in explaining what was involved in monitoring UNDAF outcomes and clarifying many concepts. However, some confusion seems to persist regarding the definition of outcomes, choice of relevant indicators and roles of group members. The UNCT also organized a two days training on planning and management of Joint Programmes, which was attended by programme staff from 6 UN agencies.

\textit{Indicators and data issues}

RBM guidance usually requires objectives and indicators to be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). Progress has been made during the 2007-mid 2009 period in connection with the selection and use of indicators. More consultations continue to pursue further refinement of indicators, particularly those that capture progress toward “outcomes” rather than outputs. A number of challenges identified in the progress reports are worth noting. A first problem has been caused by the adoption of over-ambitious lists of indicators. In the 2007 progress report, it is noted that no “outcome” indicators were used in reporting results. Each Group did designate a number of indicators, but a review of the draft reports submitted showed lack of empirical data to which these indicators could be applied. A second problem with indicators is also their definition: for instance a yes or no answer may be insufficient at times, or it may be hard to have any control over issues such as the issuance of a Decree. A third problem is with the M&E agency systems: UNICEF and UNFPA, for instance, both have their own indicators, and there is no mechanism to coordinate work around these issues. However some efforts have been made by some agencies, UNICEF being one of them, to review the CPAP results matrix in order to ensure the smartness of results and the appropriateness of indicators.

Interviewees stressed the significant issue of data, which affects the functioning and quality of the monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF. Baseline data is a problem, and often not available. While progress has also been made in data gathering, problems remain. Data availability and access are problematic in a few instances, as reported by outcome groups and in the progress reports. Group members have encountered problems in obtaining information. Some information simply does not exist (for example, gender breakdown of national and governorate statistics in many areas). Other information is hard to access for reported security reasons or insufficient

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Evaluability Assessments of the Programme Country Pilots Delivering as One UN, Synthesis Report, Final version, UNEG 2008, paragraph 112.
  \item \textsuperscript{68} Objectives are often phrased in terms of activities (for example contribute to …, enhance …, promote … etc.) rather than as descriptions of outcomes (e.g. enhanced capacity of … in …).
  \item \textsuperscript{69} For example, the production of reports as an indicator for a programmatic result.
\end{itemize}
cooperation by sources. As pointed out by some interviewees, on issues such as street children or HIV/AIDS (especially MSM), data is difficult to access, culturally sensitive, and not released. On infant mortality, there is no consensus on data. On FGM, the Government does not make the data available.

DevInfo, which is the instrument adopted by UNDG for offering, among other things, a great level of disaggregation of information that can show disparities in gender, location, etc., has not been significantly used so far in Egypt. Some interviewees pointed out that DevInfo is still perceived as a UNICEF tool. In addition, several systems coexist in UN agencies and bilateral donors (i.e. MICS, regional surveys, DHS, etc.), and all these systems are twisted to different mandates and compete with the national system. There are also some competing interests at play to generate data.

The first comprehensive national database with socio-economic indicators in DevInfo was launched in 2008, and is currently being updated. A total of 139 people were trained on the use of DevInfo, of which 110 people on both the administration and management of DevInfo. The IDSC, which is progressively taking leadership in training, and has planned to become a national training hub for DevInfo, will roll out the institutionalization of DevInfo in Governorates, line Ministries and local agencies in 2009.

Risks and assumptions

The UNDAF M&E Framework specifies some risks and assumptions; however not all the country programme outcomes include a description of these. Only a few country programme outputs include them. It also does not seem that these risks and assumptions have been the object of a regular analysis during the annual reviews, as no particular mention seems to be made in the progress reports.

The monitoring of the UNDAF could possibly be enhanced with a more detailed inventory and a regular analysis of the critical conditions and factors that could jeopardize or undermine the achievement and quality of the expected results, not only for the Country Programme Outcomes, but also at a higher level of the hierarchy (UNDAF Outcomes) and at a lower level (Country Programme Outputs). This could minimize the effects of the risks and reinforce the capacity of the UNCT and agencies to anticipate and to take corrective action on time.

I. M&E system: challenges and opportunities

Excellent M&E system in place

The issues just discussed on RBM are intimately linked to the M&E system to monitor the UNDAF. As mentioned in the previous section of the effectiveness of the UNDAF, the UNCT certainly deserves credit for having put in place a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation system, and for having produced two informative annual reports, with a good level of information and analysis of results and challenges in UNDAF implementation, at the outcome and output levels.

Following approval of UNDAF (2007-2011) in March 2006, a series of meetings took place that brought together representatives of UN agencies, government and civil society to consider how best to monitor the progress of implementing UNDAF activities, with special focus on outcomes. The Monitoring and Evaluation system that was put in place by the UNCT and the Government of Egypt (especially the Centre for Project Evaluation and Macroeconomic Analysis, PEMA, of the Ministry of International Cooperation) is very comprehensive. It aims at enhancing the effectiveness of the development assistance as laid out in the UNDAF, strengthening national capacities and ownership, and reducing the reporting burden on Egypt. With a view to effectively monitor and evaluate the implementation of the UNDAF, three entities were established:

- An UNDAF Steering Committee, chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and co-chaired by the Minister of International Cooperation (MoIC), and comprising Co-Chairs of UNDAF Area Task Forces at the Ministerial level, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and UNCT Heads of Agencies.
- An UNDAF Coordination Team, chaired by the Director of the Centre for Project Evaluation and Micro-economic Analysis (PEMA) in the Ministry of International Cooperation, and comprising IDSC staff and PEMA staff, UN M&E and Coordination officers.
- Six UNDAF outcome area task forces (one per UNDAF outcome), chaired by UN Agency, co-chaired by a senior official of a key Ministry/National Council, and comprising UN project staff, UN M&E officers, key government and civil society partners at the practitioner’s level.

In addition, a UN agency was appointed as a lead Agency for each of the 103 outputs in the UNDAF to:

- Foster dialogue and joint programming among UN Agencies and partners contributing to the respective output;
- Monitor progress towards the respective output;
- Liaise with and provide inputs to relevant UNDAF M&E task forces for reporting purposes with a view to inform the semi annual and annual progress reports.

Monitoring was described as a continual management function that tracks programme activities and strategies to identify progress towards the achievement of programme results. It was described as a joint responsibility of the UN and its implementing partners. Therefore, all entities reflected in the M&E system were responsible for monitoring the different levels of progress towards the results, as reflected in the UNDAF – or UN business plan.

Evaluation was broken down in three types of evaluation/review exercises that were going to take place:

- Internal (by UN and partners) UNDAF Semi-Annual and Annual Reviews;
- External UNDAF final evaluation;
- External evaluation of selected outcomes and/or cross cutting issues.

The M&E system is described in a scheme, which gives an overview of this system, and in the TORs of the system, which provides the description of all the functions performed by the above mentioned entities.

It is important to stress that the system put in place in Egypt is very much conform to the recommendations contained in the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines. The compliance of the UNCT to prepare annual reviews and annual reports on the implementation of UNDAF is particularly worth highlighting. At the beginning of 2009, with the issuance of revised guidelines, there has been a renewed interest in annual reviews and annual progress reports, which were highlighted as minimum requirements for UNCTs (see framed text included in paragraph 107). Egypt will definitively benefit from its significant experience in this respect.

The system is also very much in line with the TCPR recommendations. The 2004 TCPR insisted on the need to optimize the linking of evaluation to performance in the achievement of development goals, and encouraged the United Nations development system to strengthen its evaluation activities, with particular focus on development results, including through the effective use of the results matrix of the UNDAF (paragraph 69). The 2007 TCPR stressed the importance of the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of United Nations development assistance frameworks, with a view to assessing their contribution to national development and the achievement of internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (paragraph 59, d).

It also highlighted the significance of national ownership and leadership in the evaluation of all forms of external assistance, and invited the United Nations development system to pursue and intensify its efforts to strengthen evaluation capacities in recipient countries of Governments, individual professionals, professional associations and other institutions; (paragraph 59, a).

In Egypt, this was attempted in part with the planned transfer of the Chairs of the Task Forces to the Government in 2008. In addition, in 2008, UNICEF facilitated the establishment of the first
National Monitoring and Evaluation network in Egypt that aims at increasing national capacity for research and evaluation, and to link M&E issues with evidence based policy-making, through sharing knowledge and experience amongst international and national partners. In order to further strengthen the network, a training course was organized in the spring 2009.

A well implemented system

Further credit is due to the UNCT, the Government and all parties involved for having actually implemented the M&E system in a rather systematic way.

This Mid Term Review of the UNDAF was planned in the UNDAF document itself for 2009, as part of the M&E activities. For the time being the UNCT has decided to conduct a MTR and will decide if it is really opportune to conduct a formal evaluation. The MTR is a bit of a diversion with respect to what was set up in the M&E system – an external final evaluation – since it is conducted at mid term. It is however used at a very good time to promote strategic thinking about the UNDAF in the remaining part of the cycle (2009-2011), and in the next cycle. This is an approach used by some UNCTs, is likely to be very useful for the Egypt UNCT and agencies, and will provide useful inputs to Headquarters (individual agencies and UNDG/DOCO). The other countries that conducted a MTR exercise include Zimbabwe (2003), Jordan and Niger (2006), Senegal and Angola (2007), Ghana (2008), Peru, Ecuador, Azerbaijan, and Zambia (2009).

With respect to the implementation of the M&E system in Egypt, a number of workshops and training sessions were conducted with the assistance of the UN Coordination Office and UN agencies in 2007 and 2008. These meetings aimed at developing both a better understanding of the monitoring process, and a consensus on how to gather and analyse relevant data, what indicators to use, and how to support the preparation of M&E reports for each of the five outcomes. An M&E Calendar was also prepared, and target dates were set for submitting the annual reports. The UNDAF Coordination Team and the UNDAF Steering Committee have both met at regular intervals. In addition, all the Task Forces have been involved in the regular work of monitoring the UNDAF, as the next sub-section explains further.

Lack of ownership of the M&E system

When the system was set up, it had been agreed that Egyptian co-chairs of Outcome Groups would assume responsibility for the chairs from 2008 on. This was designed to place more emphasis on their roles in guiding the monitoring process and facilitating access to information, working closely with their counterparts and other group members. According to the Chair of the UNDAF Coordination Team, this would have served as tangible transition of ownership of the UNDAF, but this did not happen. Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier in the section of this report which discussed ownership issues, it appears that the participation of the Government falls short from what was required and anticipated. Other interviewees indicated that the Government engagement in the M&E system was considered as a necessary burden by some officials. The sustainability of the Government involvement is therefore very much at stake.

Also, although the reporting mechanism is considered very useful by the Task Forces members and several interviewees, and fostering collaboration and regular reflection on progress and challenges in UNDAF implementation, it is also considered a burden and a time consuming activity.

Crucial role of Annual Reviews

Since it started to be implemented, the UNDAF has been systematically monitored to measure progress towards its five outcomes, and two annual progress reports have been prepared and disseminated.\(^70\) They are part of an annual review process, which involves the whole UNCT and

all the Task Forces. The UNDAF annual reviews and progress reports is certainly a significant effort on the part of both the UN system, including the M&E officers and the UN Coordination Office who give support to the various Outcome Groups and to the Coordination Team.

The importance given by the UNCT to annual reviews has been echoed by the latest revision of the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines (Part 4) which highlight the importance of the UNDAF Annual Review, the UNDAF evaluation and the clear and critical links between the UNDAF M&E and the Agencies’ M&E systems. According to the updated version, the UNDAF Annual Reviews are necessary for efficient Results Based Management and the planning for the successive year.71

An expressed the opinion that the M&E system has been more useful for reporting purposes, than as a management tool for programme managers, and as a coordination tool for the UNCT as a whole. It has been considered very useful by Task Forces and agencies, and allowed a regular exchange of information at the UNCT level on upcoming activities, challenges, and revised strategies. The system also asserts a cultural change and shift in UN organization and Government entities, by promoting regular learning from experience, acceptation of criticism, enhanced dialogue and exchange, and last but not least, strengthened accountability.

**Methodology issues**

As pointed out in the first progress report, there was some initial confusion about what was being monitored and evaluated. Frequent statements were that “we are not supposed to monitor specific projects but should look for outcomes in a more holistic fashion”. This may have led to less than adequate input in some cases about actual project implementation results. It was suggested that UN and counterparts personnel involved in given projects tap the implementation experience gained through these projects, and provide more specific inputs in future M&E rounds. These specifics were considered necessary as a basis for a more holistic assessment of outcomes. Otherwise, the report added, UNDAF M&E reports could end up with general statements that are not particularly helpful for gauging actual progress and supporting the policy making process. This problem was dealt with successfully in the second progress report, which provides much more details and analysis of the achievements for each Country Programme Outcomes, together with key challenges and recommendations.

An additional problem was the capacity to assess the 17 joint programmes, which have their own M&E mechanisms at times, and may fit – or not – in the UNDAF Country Programme Outcomes or outputs. It is very positive and commendable that a specific assessment of these programmes was undertaken in 2007, and that a similar one is planned for 2009.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the reporting has mainly focused on “outputs”, a lot of which were considered as “work-in-progress”. Both the first and the second progress report, in their general observations, indicate that the focus has not shifted to outcomes yet. This calls for more discussion of the appropriate indicators to assess outcome achievements. The main advantage of the way Outcome Groups are constituted lies in their diverse membership, where members contribute on the basis of their own project(s) experience, while also helping synthesize the combined outputs/results to assess outcomes.

In addition, some country programme outcomes have been considered too general to monitor, and the 2007 Progress report suggested that they should be defined more specifically. The concept of assessing outcomes widely accepted and acknowledged in principle as the core of the M&E exercise, is still somewhat “elusive” in the minds of many. The report suggested that it needs further discussion and a more explicit illustration, through concrete examples drawn from other countries with more experience in this regard.

The preparation of these progress reports has not been done without difficulties. It took more time than expected and target dates had to be extended to allow groups more time to cope with data gathering issues and clarify certain concepts. Once these reports were received by the M&E Coordination Team, contents were reviewed and in 2007 – considering differences in styles and

71 This information on the updating of the CCA/UNDAF guidelines is highlighted in Coordination Connection #24, December 22 &29, 2008.
substance – the Team decided to summarise the contents of each report under three headings: achievements, challenges and recommendations. The Team considered that the report reflected accurately the status of UNDAF implementation progress during 2007 as stated in group reports, and similarly in 2008.

Finally, the choice of template for reporting was a matter of concern in 2007. Many members commented that the template chosen was demanding and complicated. Because the process of monitoring outcomes was fairly new, search continued for a more user-friendly template, which was then used in 2008.

**Attribution of results**

There were some discussions among Task Forces members were also not clear whether the UNDAF monitoring should assess national (or governorate) overall performance or focus only on results obtained under the UNDAF. Several interviewees explained that it has often not been easy to distinguish between the results based on UNDAF implementation, and those attributed to many of the non-UNDAF actions and actors. The question of attribution is obviously a key problem in the M&E area, and a core problem in a framework like the UNDAF. Similarly, measuring the value added of the UNDAF is also very difficult.

**Link with agency systems**

An interviewee explained that generic M&E weaknesses in UN agencies include the absence, or very limited number, of full M&E officers, a non-existent mechanism for knowledge sharing, and limited joint initiatives in research and evaluation projects.

The UNDAF monitoring has faced several difficulties not only at the Task Forces and M&E Team level, but also at the individual agencies level. It is not easy to monitor the contribution of different agency programmes to the UNDAF. In general the Agencies provide some form of regular review or report on their respective programmes or projects, and mainly to their headquarters, but do not make a methodical review of their contribution to UNDAF. They do not systematically classify their implemented activities against the expected outputs listed in the UNDAF. In addition, there is no annual projection of the UNDAF, detailing future annual UNCT or agencies actions, which could then facilitate the UNDAF monitoring and evaluation. All of this results in serious limitations in monitoring the UNDAF, and reporting on its implementation.

**Suggestions from latest CCA/UNDAF Guidelines**

The 2009 updated version of the CCA/UNDAF (paragraph 124) suggest that in developing the M&E Plan, UNCTs should consider the following key factors:

1. Most of the information on results must be drawn from other systems. As each UN agency is responsible and accountable for monitoring and evaluating its own programme outputs and outcomes, information should be drawn from the M&E systems put in place by the agencies for their respective contributions to the UNDAF Outcomes. Wherever possible, information on results should be drawn from national monitoring and evaluation systems, in line with the principles of national ownership.

2. When preparing the M&E Plan, UNCTs should therefore determine whether the UN agencies’ and national M&E systems will provide the results information required for the annual progress reviews and UNDAF Evaluation. Major gaps in terms of required data should be highlighted.

3. The M&E Plan should then spell out how these gaps will be filled, e.g. through strengthening M&E in key projects or building government’s capacity to operationalize its own M&E systems, wherever feasible.

4. The focus of the UNDAF M&E Plan and its components should be on the additional value and effectiveness of joint policy dialogue, joint UN programming, coordination and collaboration to support the government achieve national MD / MDG goals.
These suggestions were very much inspired by the UNDAF Evaluability study conducted by UNDG in the framework of the preparation of the 2007 TCPR, study which has also raised a number of issues discussed in these sections of the MTR report on RBM and M&E.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72} "UNEG Study on the Evaluability of the UN Development Assistance Framework", Paul Balogun, Consultant, December 2006, Final version.
VIII. A vision statement for strategic governance and implementation of the UNDAF

A. Strategic positioning and leveraging of the UN System

*Strategic planning in the UNDAF Guidelines*

The latest version of the CCA/UNDAF Guidelines (February 2009) have given more importance to strategic planning. The UNDAF is defined as the strategic programme framework for the UNCT, which describes the collective response of the UNCT to the priorities in the national development framework - priorities that may have been influenced by the UNCT’s analytical contribution (paragraph 65).

The collective results expected from UNCT cooperation – the UNDAF outcomes, and the outcomes and outputs of agencies working singly or together – must make a substantive and measurable contribution to the achievement of the selected priorities of the national development framework. They must:

- Reflect what the UNCT strives to achieve based on a participatory analysis of country needs involving all relevant stakeholders
- Embody the basic elements of UNCT cooperation;
- Reflect the five inter-related UN principles (See Part 1.3);
- Reflect the five Managing for Development Results (MfDR) Principles\(^{73}\), and
- Demonstrate the comparative advantages of the UNCT (paragraph 66).

Finally, the Guidelines specify that the UNDAF should be focused, country specific and respond to national priorities, in other words “demand driven”. It should be open to adaptation to reflect changes in the country situation. It should reflect the comparative advantage of the UN by emphasizing the thematic competence and leadership of the agencies involved, without necessarily highlighting their specific mandates. Further, the collective results in the results matrix should govern programming in individual agency programme/project documents (paragraph 67).

To facilitate the understanding of strategic planning, the revised Guidelines include a diagram that “promotes improved strategic planning by supporting a determination of the UN’s comparative advantage and priorities. The overlapping circles demonstrate the intersection of the contextual factors which will help establish how the UNCT can take into account national priorities and the UNCT’s own strengths”. See figure below.

---

\(^{73}\) The five principles are: at all phases—from strategic planning through implementation to completion and beyond—focus the dialogue on results for partner countries, development agencies, and other stakeholders; align actual programming, monitoring, and evaluation activities with the agreed expected results; keep the results reporting system as simple, cost-effective, and user-friendly as possible; manage for, not by results; and use results information for management learning and decision-making, as well as for reporting and accountability.
As mentioned earlier in the section dealing with the design and focus of the UNDAF, and according to many interviewees, the UNDAF appears not very focused in terms of strategic intent. The MTR is a strategic exercise that informs management decisions concerning the current cycle and the forthcoming UNDAF. The MTR clearly showed that the current UNDAF could not be achieved in its totality. Its encompassing nature, with five UNDAF Outcomes, 23 Country Programme Outcomes, and 103 Country Programme Output, made it, de facto, hard to focus and manage. Moreover, there were emerging issues that warranted greater attention in the current UNDAF. Other sections of this report discussed these issues.

The UNDAF Mid-Term Review was a unique opportunity for the UNCT, to think strategically in support of Government priorities and development challenges. As mentioned earlier in the first section of this report, the MTR allowed a light revision of both the UNDAF Country Programme Outputs, also referred to as "pruning", in order to ensure that they remain relevant, as well as a review of the M&E Framework, in order to update and strengthen it.

The lack of focus in the UNDAF in Egypt is not a problem only faced in this country. Findings of many other studies mentioned in this report are consistent with the observations and findings from the MTR process.

Prioritization, strategic positioning and leveraging

To address the lack of focus of the UNDAF in Egypt, interviewees mentioned that in order to be able to focus more clearly on results, it was necessary to do some pruning of activities, trim the UNDAF structure, and reorient efforts. This would clarify the vision and help to focus resources. "Do less, but do it well." A high level official affirmed that UN agencies need to rethink about the things they routinely do, and to reconsider what they do. There was a clear willingness among
interlocutors to make the UNDAF more focused as a management tool, some Government officials considering this was even "essential". A donor representative added that it was timely for the UN to use and focus the UNDAF as a management tool.

Some Government officials acknowledged that there a good deal of confusion within the governmental system about strategic planning. Strategic management is not included in the eight week training program for newly appointed officials. Because senior staff appointments are based on political decisions, it is not surprising that decision making is ad hoc and not based on systemic thinking. A UN agency representative suggested that there ought to be core strategies aiming at generating evidence to inform decision making.

It is also necessary to have a better understanding of the value added of the UN in Egypt. The review team attempted to identify the key role that is expected from the UN mainly through interviews.

In terms of financial flows the UN is not significant. Therefore, it should provide robust technical advice. There is much potential in Egypt. The problem is not a shortage of resources, but more the need to have a coalition of the willing to achieve developmental results. It was suggested that the UN and the Government should look at other countries’ experiences in terms of national ownership of the UNDAF and its overall performance.

Most donors recognize the unique role of the UN in the country. A representative of a development partner from the South said that his country was very interested in collaborating with the UN, especially on activities related to South-South cooperation, exchange of know-how, etc.

A development partner from the North said that the UN was the best place for the coordination of aid in the country. The UN can definitively bring people together. This is already a niche of excellence of the UN, and a role that is very appreciated among development partners. The Resident Coordinator is Chairing the Development Partners Group since the end of 2008. Therefore, the UN is even better placed than in the past to play this role fully. However, the role of the UN has to go beyond mere coordination, and there is also a need for greater follow-up with all those involved on aid issues.

All development partners said they were very interested in continuing to collaborate with the UN. Some of them (EU and US for instance) will soon engage in a new programming cycle and would welcome the opportunity for the UN to lead a development coordination effort. If the UN were to be serious about coordination via the UNDAF, the donors would welcome it. This may provide a framework for greater relevance of the contribution of donors. The Accra Agenda for Action clearly suggests that there should be more coordination in development aid between all actors involved. Furthermore, it was stressed that coordination needs to happen not only at the highest levels, but also at the technical level.

If development partners coordinate their work better, there will also be a stronger incentive for Government to coordinate itself better. A better coordination would also have many benefits to strengthen advocacy for effective policies and programmes, and for resource leveraging. Enhanced coordination could also ensure that a greater attention is given to national capacity development.

How coordination is done is key for enhancing the comparative advantages of all partners. This would enable partners to contribute and lead in their respective areas of expertise. In addition, more weight and influence would be gained if an opportunity was given to partners to speak on issues of their competence, and if there was to be a clear and unified voice on these issues. The idea of burden sharing is considered excellent, but there is a risk that the Government would not necessarily line up behind this, because it is not itself that coordinated. This could be due to the fact that there is a difference between the immediate interests of the Government, and the goals sought by the development community. The Government focuses on productive investments and attends to the wishes of the richer segments. The donor community targets its activities in favour of the poorer segments, the marginalized groups, in particular women, children and youth. There is therefore a mutual commitment between the UN and development partners to promote human capabilities and human dignity throughout the development process. It is widely recognized that
only a holistic approach to development can improve developmental results and improve the lives of targeted individuals and groups.

In any case, choosing 3 to 5 key strategic focus would place everyone in a better position to collaborate effectively. Clearer coordination would itself be a worthy strategic outcome.

Several interviewees stressed the role of the UN in the intellectual domain. The most visible contribution of the UN is the Egypt Human Development Annual Report. This is a useful contribution both in terms of substance and process. The report enables Egyptian thinkers to reflect share and openly address issues that would otherwise not be openly discussed in the Egyptian context. This is an excellent intellectual contribution to development thinking in Egypt. From that point of view, the UN has clearly an advisory role. Recently, the concept of Human Development was also discussed at the international level in a meeting in Bratislava. When they are available, the findings could be useful in the Egyptian context.

Other interlocutors stressed that the UN can also be a reference point with respect to the Common Country Assessment, a document appreciated by other partners. The EU is going to prepare a diagnostic of the situation in Egypt, which could fit into the CCA. The UN analytical work is one of its comparative advantages, especially because it is more independent than the other development partners. The CCA can talk easily about democratic reform, human rights, governance, etc. In addition for issues of global reach, the UN can draw on lessons from all continents and countries. This is the case, for instance, for issues such as climate change, economic and financial crisis, energy crisis, food crisis and food security, health pandemic risks, health, disaster reduction, equity, disparities, poverty, decentralization, civil society participation, human rights, gender, etc.

In the economic area, the UN’s role is also to facilitate knowledge and inform policies, by conducting studies, poverty assessments, etc., and could gain in working more systematically in the economic arena. Egypt is a Middle Income Country, yet there are still many disparities, and the benefits of development are not equally shared.

In conclusion, in light of the lack of Governmental coordination of ODA, and the weak level of peer coordination amongst donors, the UN could play a significant role, using the UNDAF to bring forth greater strategic alignment and effectiveness. Development partners would welcome such a framework, which could make their own contributions more relevant.

B. Preparing for the next UNDAF cycle (2012-2017)

This section reports the central outcome of the MTR emerged from a discussion on the last day of the UNDAF Workshop (8-9 June 2009) in Cairo. The plenary was asked to break out into working groups, each of which was asked to reach a decision of the strategic direction of the UN for the next UNDAF cycle using as a guide a “Decision Tree”. The groups were asked to base their decisions on what they believe would ‘work’ within the Egypt context, drawing lessons from the current UNDAF cycle.

Decisions to five specific questions were sought from participants that focused on the next CCA/UNDAF cycle and how the UN agencies and M&E Task Forces would like to move forward with the UNDAF. The questions and their possible answers were offered as options from which the working groups would decide.

The decisions that needed to be taken to help the UNCT prepare for the next UNDAF were the following.

Decision No 1
What is the scope of the UNDAF?

1. UN alone?
2. Government supported by the UN?
3. Government with UN and Development Partners?

---
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4. Government with Civil Society together with UN and Development Partners

**Decision No 2**

How to do the Situation Analysis?
1. CCA for a UN perspective?
2. Situation Analysis for the Development Partners?
3. Diagnosis for the Government?
4. Baseline for the Government, Civil Society, UN and Development Partners

**Decision No 3**

What is the role of the UN?
1. UN as provider of services?
2. UN as coordinator?
3. UN as Catalyst of Development?
4. UN as support to Government on strategic Drivers of the “Top Ten Priorities”?
5. UN working with Civil Society in collaboration with Government and Development Partners?

**Decision No 4**

What should be the strategic scenario for the UNDAF?
1. To do it - UN led?
2. To have it done – via Government, Civil Society and Partners?
3. To support Government to enable national execution with Development Partners?

**Decision No 5**

How the UN does deliver the strategic results contained in the UNDAF?
1. UN does it?
2. UN commissions other partners to do it?
3. Government with Civil Society together with UN and Development Partners?

A very clear consensus emerged from the Working Groups, which can be summarized as follows. The next UNDAF exercise should be done in very close partnership with the Government, civil society, and other development partners. It was clear from the answers to these questions that the participants believe that the UNDAF should be designed in an inclusive manner, without losing focus, and ensure that all the partners are fully on board. The role of the UN should mainly be to support the Government in achieving its national priorities and sharing experience, lessons learned and ‘know-how’ with all partners. This means that the UN’s contribution to development in Egypt should focus heavily on technical expertise and experience, with some financial support where possible and when affordable. The feedback from the Working Groups to each question of the Decision Tree was the following.

1. The scope of the UNDAF would need to include all partners – the Government, civil society, UN, and other development partners.

2. Similarly, more than a CCA from a UN perspective only, the “Situation Analysis” should serve as a baseline for the Government, civil society, UN and development partners.

3. With respect to the role of the UN, most Working Groups indicated that the UN should be a catalyst for development and play a support role to the Government on the strategic drivers of “Top Ten Priorities”, for instance. The UN should also be working with civil society in collaboration with the Government and development partners.
4. The best strategic scenario for the UNDAF is certainly not for the UN to do it alone, but rather to support Government to enable national execution with development partners.

5. Finally, the Government with civil society together with UN and development partners should deliver the strategic results contained in the UNDAF, rather than having the UN do it alone or commission other partners to do it.
IX. Conclusions and recommendations

This last section of the Mid Term Review presents some conclusions and recommendations. This is not, however, an exhaustive list of conclusions and recommendations, but a highlight of the most important ones. Other sections of this report include findings, observations and suggestions that may be very relevant for the remaining part of the UNDAF cycle and for the next one.

A. Drawing from the experience of the first and second UNDAF

The MTR was conceived as a strategic exercise that would inform management decisions concerning the current cycle and the forthcoming UNDAF. One of the key findings of the MTR process clearly showed that the current UNDAF could not be achieved in its totality. Its encompassing nature, with its five UNDAF Outcomes, 23 Country Programme Outcomes, and 103 Country Programme Outputs, makes it, de facto, hard to focus and manage. Moreover, there are emerging issues that warrant greater attention in the current UNDAF.

There was therefore a consensus that the UNDAF, especially the Country Programme Outputs, needed re-examination. Special attention was therefore given to the outputs that have not yet been acted upon with the idea of withdrawing them if they were not considered essential. This revision of the UNDAF outputs – referred to as “pruning” – was undertaken by the Task Forces, under the leadership and guidance of the RC and the UNCT, and the support of the UN Coordination Office. The results of this important exercise, conducted as part of the MTR process, should enable a clearer focus on strategic results of the UNDAF, both for the remaining part of the current programming cycle and for the next. At the same time, the MTR also offered the opportunity to include formally in the UNDAF some ongoing joint activities that were not initially planned, and facilitated the consideration of emerging issues. Similarly, an important work was undertaken by the UN agencies, in conjunction with the Task Forces, to review the M&E framework. All these efforts are key outcomes of the MTR, and considered very valuable by the review team, and more broadly by the whole UNCT. This important work was further validated by the June 2009 Workshop.

For Egypt, this UNDAF was a “second generation” one, and the UNCT, the Government, and the other actors involved are still on a learning curve. However, there was to be some strategic thinking on where UNCT effort is to be given greatest emphasis. At the moment there is too much being expected on the UNDAF. Those consulted by the review team emphasized the need for simplification in approach, but there was less consensus on how this could be achieved. Having too many issues to deal with often led to a limited implementation. Overall strategic positioning of the UNDAF was often considered weak by most interlocutors.

At the time of the pruning of the current UNDAF and the start of a reflection on the next one, the diversity of UN operations will remain a challenge, especially because of: its project orientation, to a large extent (although joint programming efforts are note worthy); its skills-base (especially insufficient strategic expertise); and the likely reluctance of UN agencies to ‘let go’ of some operations as part of the positioning and prioritization process, at a time when all agencies, even the NRAs are invited to provide their relevant expertise to address the selected national development issues.

Although there is a strong consensus at Headquarters level on the need to keep the UNDAF with 3 to 5 outcomes maximum, most likely, setting priorities will still remain the biggest problem that the UNCT may face in Egypt. Country Programme Outcomes and Outputs may still cover all bases, and there still may be some reluctance to say one thing precede another or that the activities of one agency are more pressing than others, or that one agency with a similar mandate should give way to another. If other development partners are involved in the UNDAF process, there may even be longer ‘lists’ of priorities. Designing the UNDAF with a clearer strategic intent will therefore be a key challenge, but if this succeeds, this would allow a clearer role for the UN and other Government and development partners, strengthening thus mutual accountability.
While the choices will obviously be determined by the key problems identified and the emerging issues, the UNCT could bear in mind that the five inter-related principles included in the UNDAF guidelines, which are closely related to those in the Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness, can actually help to define more clearly the strategic intent.

B. Five inter-related principles

The five inter-related principles that UNCTs must use in their CCA and UNDAF processes (Human Rights-based Approach, Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Results-Based Management, and Capacity development) are stronger if used together in the support and in the programming. For example, a reflection could be conducted on how environmental sustainability and human rights complement each other, and could be integrated together in the UNDAF implementation. An integrated orientation of such principles may provide the opportunity for a more strategic advocacy focus in Egypt.

The Human Rights-Based Approach holds the potential to ensure a high quality review and analysis of development challenges, by identifying the different causes of development problems (e.g., discrimination and exclusion patterns), together with the concrete claims of rights-holders and obligations and responsibilities of duty-bearers. Making the UNDAF more strategic in order to achieve better impact may be supported by a Results Matrix that reflects even more than now the institutional changes and the behaviours required in order for rights-holders to claim their rights and for duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations. UN staff, Government officials and other partners may also need to be trained and capacities built.

Strengthening the approach could also be done through its mainstreaming in the Monitoring and Evaluation activities of the UNDAF. A more systematic and interagency set of actions could also be defined with respect to the treaty bodies reporting systems and human rights mechanisms, and ensuring a wider national ownership of such processes by a variety of stakeholders (Government, UN, CSOs and NGOs, development partners, private sector, etc.). Sensitive issues can also be addressed through a coordinated approach. A study on the relationship between cultural values, social attitudes, behaviours, and taboos on one hand, and human rights on the other could be undertaken to prepare the ground of the next UNDAF.

C. Supporting the UN Reform in Egypt – Increased coherence, relevance and effectiveness

In the past decade, numerous resolutions of the General Assembly (most importantly the TCPRs of 2001, 2004, and 2007) emphasized the need to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and credibility of the UN development system activities at country level. The 2007 TCPR\textsuperscript{75} reinforces the centrality of the UNDAF and its results matrix as the collective, coherent and integrated programming and monitoring framework. It also calls for ownership, leadership and full participation of national authorities in the UNDAF process. This is echoed in Egypt by an important document that was prepared as a contribution to the debate on System-Wide Coherence for UN Operational Activities, in 2006.\textsuperscript{76}

This is because the UN is in need to show results, all around the world. And the same pressure exists for Governments – whether they are recipients of aid or providers, or both. Providers of aid are increasingly under the vigilance and scrutiny of their people and constituencies. With the series of crises that are shaking the world these days – financial and economic, environmental and energetic, food and prices, health and pandemics, etc. – development frameworks like the UNDAF cannot fail or deliver below expectations for the poorest and more marginalized in society. The UN and other partners need to continue building capacities to address the remaining national development agenda, as well as to improve capacities for Egypt to become a development provider to other countries, for example through South-South cooperation agreements.

Considering that the UNDAF is one of the key instruments identified by the TCPR for increasing

\textsuperscript{75} UN, TCPR, A/RES/62/208

\textsuperscript{76} Egyptian Non-Paper, Prepared as a contribution to the debate on System-Wide Coherence for UN Operational Activities, May 24, 2006.
coherence, effectiveness and relevance of the UN operations at country level it is imperative that UNDAFs are high quality documents. An UNDAF must embody a strategic vision of the UN’s contribution to national priorities, and must focus the UNCT’s limited resources on those issues where the UN can make the biggest difference, based on its comparative advantage and capacities. It should also include a robust set of results which are measurable and for which agencies can be held accountable. It should show how the UN has internalized in its programme the principles of aid effectiveness, capacity development and national ownership. And finally it should reflect the normative standards that the UN is mandated to promote, such as a human rights based approach, gender equality and environmental sustainability.

According to a recent report from UNDG, discussed by the Working Group on Programming Issues (ex Working Group on Programme Policy) 77, the drive for increased coherence, effectiveness and relevance received fresh impetus with the piloting of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach in eight countries starting in 2007. Several other countries with strong national ownership and determined UNCTs have also advanced the UN coherence agenda in line with the TCPR resolutions. The stocktaking exercises of the pilots 78 as well as the General Assembly discussions on DaO in 2008 have yielded agreement that the valuable lessons learned in the pilots should be integrated in UNDG policies in order to capitalize on the existing innovative approaches within the parameters of the 2007 TCPR 79. The experience from the DaO countries and ‘self-starters’ showed that the best timing for introducing measures for enhancing UNCTs' coherence, effectiveness and relevance is at the beginning of the UNDAF formulation process. In this regard, it is expected that countries where UNDAFs will be rolled out in 2009, 2010 and 2011 will continue the move towards more coherent, effective and relevant UN at the country level through the development of more strategic and results based UNDAFs. This will correspond to the time when Egypt will prepare its new CCA and UNDAF.

It is also recognized that UNDAFs do not yet fully reflect the relevant expertise among all agencies to address the selected national development issues. In order to ensure truly effective UN interventions, more efforts are needed to ensure that programme countries have access to the knowledge, expertise and support of all UN agencies, including Non Resident Agencies.

At the same time, the lessons from the pilots point to the need for further operational planning, through a common operational document or UNDAF implementation plan. Guidance for such an UNDAF implementation plan is currently being developed by the Working Group on Programme Issues and is expected to be ready by mid 2009. Moreover, a new UNDG Toolkit “For Improved Functioning of the UN Development System at the Country Level”, was recently launched to assist UNCTs to integrate the lessons of the DaO pilots. 80 The Toolkit adopts an integrated programme and operations approach for UNCTs, which aims at improving coherence and coordination across business operations in addition to programming, as exemplified by the DaO pilots.

This toolkit includes a Guidance Note that has been developed based on the experiences of non-pilot countries. For this reason and others, this tool is very relevant for Egypt. The Guidance Note focuses on enhanced UN Coherence, Effectiveness, and Relevance (CER). It presents a rationale for change from that point of view, describing the drivers for change, both internal and external.

The Guidance Note explains that before engaging in a change process like aligning the UN system at the country level to better support national priorities, it is useful to take some time to think about why it is that the UNCT’s need to change and what is the added value that is expected from the change process. This also helps to ensure that all stakeholders have the same understanding of what enhanced CER entails, and what the scope of activities is that the UNCT plans to engage in. As such, it resembles a statement of intent by the UN system to make an

77 Strengthening UNCT capacity for quality UNDAFs, draft 6 April 2009.
78 Delivering as One, 2008 Stocktaking Synthesis Report, Joint Reports by governments and UN Country teams, UNDG, 3 June 2009.
79 With the agreement that the final conclusions of the overall effectiveness of the new concepts will be drawn after the planned independent evaluation.
80 http://www.undg.org/toolkit/toolkit.cfm?sub_section_id=255&topid1=on&topid=1
effort to enhance coherence, effectiveness and relevance aimed at further enhancing development impact in the host country.\textsuperscript{81}

In the same vein, Helen Clark, the new UNDG Chair, recently addressed the Informal Session of the Inter-governmental Consultations on System-wide Coherence. She underlined the importance of delivering better results, more efficiently and effectively, in support of nationally led and demand-driven development programmes. She also added that this is especially important at this time, given the many significant challenges developing countries are facing. The impact of the global economic crisis on the world’s poor, the climate change challenge, and recent experiences of high food and fuel prices make it more important than ever for all actors to work together. \textsuperscript{82}

D. Supporting the aid effectiveness agenda in Egypt

The “Accra Agenda for Action” has the potential to accelerate the implementation of the Paris Declaration principles, which has been lagging behind. According to high officials and the discussion that took place at the Retreat of development partners in Cairo, in March 2009, this provides a good opportunity for the UN System, the Government, and other aid partners to reflect on how external aid and cooperation could become more effective in Egypt, and how the UNDAF can be more useful in that sense.

The key actions of the AAA highlighted at the retreat were the following:

- Country ownership is Key
- Build more inclusive partnership
- Achieve development results and openly account for them
- Strengthen capacity to manage development: developing countries to lead, and partners to support capacity development
- Reduce aid fragmentation
- Strengthen country systems to maximize their use
- Further untie aid
- Focus on delivering Results
- Increase medium-term aid predictability
- Adapt aid policies for fragile situations
- Strengthen mutual accountability

The main implications of the AAA that were discussed at the retreat were the following:

- Egypt is committed to the full AAA
- The Government priorities are:
  - To strengthen ownership at various levels
  - To adopt capacity development as a cross cutting issue in all international assistance
  - To strengthen M&E units in line ministries
  - To improve statistical database in terms of reliability and adequacy
  - To ensure that DPG thematic groups are more effective in aid harmonization and alignment
  - To enhance our benefit from and to contribute to south-south cooperation
  - To jointly establish a mutual accountability mechanism by end of 2009
  - and to deliver better development results, as this is what it is all about

These AAA priorities for Egypt should therefore inform the UNDAF – both the remaining of the programme cycle and the next UNDAF.

\textsuperscript{81} Concept Paper on Enhanced UN Coherence, Effectiveness, and Relevance – A Guidance Note, UNDG.
\textsuperscript{82} Helen Clark: Inter-governmental Consultations on System-wide Coherence, Statement by Helen Clark, Chair of the United Nations Development Group, on the occasion of the Informal Session of the Inter-governmental Consultations on System-wide Coherence, 8 June 2009.
E. Stronger Government ownership

As shown very clearly in this review, the ownership of the UNDAF by the Government is very limited. According to many interviewees the Government is not sufficiently involved in the implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF, despite its formal involvement in a very robust M&E system.

Both the UN and development partners would really like to see the Government in the driver’s seat of development cooperation, and some high level Government officials, especially in the Ministry of International Cooperation share this wish. This would enable the realization of what was initially planned, that is that the Outcome Task Forces be chaired by the Government, thus ensuring a tangible transition of ownership of the UNDAF. As mentioned earlier in this report, ownership depends to a great extent on how the Government is willing to seek and use UN support. The evaluation of the Paris Declaration points to the need for country-led developmental approaches.

In a context in which the UN assistance is limited and decreasing all actors involved, the Government, but also the UN system, development partners, civil society, NGOs, and all other partners would certainly benefit from a stronger national ownership and enhanced coordination of external assistance. Coupled with a stronger monitoring of the UN’s contribution to the country’s development, this would reinforce the accountability of different actors, as suggested in the UNDAF Guidelines, the TCPR, the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

F. Enhanced partnerships

Enhanced role for civil society, NGOs, and other actors

Clearly, CSOs and NGOs are not adequately involved in the UNDAF at the moment. It is now understood that "National ownership" is more powerful to achieve sustainable development results and impact that a mere "Government ownership". This implies a stronger involvement of Civil Society Organizations and Non Governmental Organizations in the UNDAF implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This review itself did not engage CSOs and NGOs as it should have.

For the UNDAF to be really effective, the meaningful participation of these actors at the strategic level of the UNDAF should be actively pursued, including in the Task Forces. The 2008 Survey on the implementation of the Paris Declaration indicated that the Government also intends to further facilitate the participation of civil society in the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action, recognizing the need for adopting a partnership approach to mobilize all available resources to achieve development goals. The AAA indicated that such partnerships are now seen as more effective when they fully harness the capacity and experience of all development actors (bilateral and multilateral donors, global funds, CSOs and private sector).

The participation of all these actors is also crucial in the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming, to ensure that all partners can fulfill their responsibilities and obligations in the development process. As stressed in the UNDAF Guidelines, the focus on country ownership and national priorities must be seen in the context of partnership. Inclusive national ownership is key, and the UNDAF must encourage partnership with civil society, including minorities, and other forms of citizen engagement such as volunteerism, which can expand impact and development effectiveness by fostering greater social inclusion.

Role of development partners

The TCPR, the UNDAF Guidelines, and the Accra Agenda for Action clearly suggests that there should be more coordination in development aid between all actors involved. All development partners that the reviewers had the opportunity to meet said they were very interested in continuing to collaborate with the UN, and further acknowledged that despite the fact that the UN is not as coordinated, effective and efficient as they would wish, it is also a key interlocutor in the development debate.
Some of the development partners will soon engage in a new programming cycle and would welcome the opportunity for the UN to lead a development coordination effort. The role of the UN as a Chair of the DPG is widely appreciated, and development partners are certainly very much willing to support the UN’s readiness to assume a coordination role. This is quite a unique opportunity for the UN system in Egypt to assume this role, while it continues to implement the current UNDAF, prepares itself to engage in a new CCA and UNDAF processes, and starts defining its renewed and strengthened strategic intent. These are all great opportunities, which can facilitate the engagement and involvement of a much broader and effective partnership, and common thinking on development issues, thus reinforcing mutual accountability of all actors involved.

G. Road map for the next UNDAF

Preparations of the next CCA and UNDAF will have to start pretty soon if the UNCT wants to ensure that they provide a clear strategic direction to the UN, with the full support and participation of Government, development partners and all other actors. See Annex 6: Roadmap for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle (2012-2016).

Many interlocutors consider that, in the case of Egypt, the preparation of a Common Country Assessment would be quite useful, given that there is no other comprehensive analytical process that can replace the CCA. In addition, a CCA would help assess the situation and help the Government and all the development partners to determine what can be done in the context of UNDAF – and what is better placed outside of it. Having an updated situation analysis would be the best way to prepare the UNDAF. This would need to involve a multitude of actors from the UN, Government, CSOs and NGOs, development partners, private sector, etc.

The social impact of the international global financial crisis for Egypt could be significant. Although World Bank experts are envisaging possible scenarios across several sectors, a comprehensive assessment of the situation in Egypt has not been finalized yet. Similarly, other studies may need to be conducted very soon to feed into the CCA.

Once the UNCT and other partners have taken stock of the UNDAF overall relevance to, and performance with respect to, national priorities and other Internationally Agreed Goals and other conferences – with the MTR as part of this process – it will have to finalize and implement the adjustments made to the rest of the programme cycle, including the pruning of activities. This will enable a clearer sense of focus.

The UNCT will also have to examine national priorities and emerging issues, and identify what can be achieved by 2011, and beyond, together with expanded partnerships. It will need to also discuss the governance of the UNDAF process, and identify “champions” for leading the achievement of each key strategic outcome.

Finally, it will be necessary to identify what can the UN System learn from the UNDAF, consider how to “Deliver as One UN” for the next UNDAF, and identify where evidence gathering and strategic planning are required.
X. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the UNDAF Mid-Term Review

UN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (UNDAF) EGYPT
MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)
Terms of Reference

Background

The UN Reform introduced new planning and programming tools, one of which is the Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

While each of the UN agencies operating in Egypt is pursuing its specific mandate, they all operate under the framework of the Resident Coordinator system and, currently, under the second UN Development Assistance Framework in Egypt, covering the years 2007-2011, and designed on the basis of the diagnostic analysis of Egypt as provided by the 2005 Common Country Assessment (CCA).

Based on priority areas highlighted in the CCA, the eight MDGs and the Government priorities, the UN Country Team and its partners agreed on a common ‘business plan’-the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which identifies the following five strategic areas (“outcomes”) for focused development cooperation by the UN, the Government and development partners over the five-year period 2007-2011: (1) State Performance; (2) Unemployment; (3) Regional and Human Disparities; (4) Women’s Participation and (5) Democratic Governance.

During the 5 year period the UNDAF will be systematically monitored to measure progress towards its five outcomes and annual evaluation reports will be prepared and disseminated.

Following the publication of the UNDAF, the UN Coordination Office, in partnership with the Centre for Project Evaluation and Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA) of the Ministry of International Cooperation, designed the current monitoring and evaluation system (ANNEX 1), composed of 6 UNDAF Outcome M&E Task Forces, an M&E Coordination Team and a Steering Committee (ANNEX 2 provides the description of all functions performed by the above mentioned entities).

The UNDAF monitoring and evaluation process in Egypt is characterized by the collective work of the UN System and the Government of Egypt, and the first two UNDAF Annual Reports for 2007 and 2008 constitute the fruit of this partnership.

Although the Mid-Term Review (MTR) does not constitute a mandatory requirement, having reached the midpoint in the UNDAF implementation cycle, the UN Country Team has agreed, along with the Egyptian Government, to conduct a light midterm review as a ‘stepping stone’ to the final evaluation which is due to take place in 2011.

Expected Results and objectives of the MTR

The main expected result of the MTR is to determine how emerging issues which are not reflected in the current UNDAF might be incorporated in the next UNDAF cycle, to ensure a better alignment of UN assistance with national priorities and achieve a greater development impact.

As such, the review will be a stepping stone towards the final evaluation, which will in its turn serve as an analytical tool in preparation for the next UNDAF cycle (2012-2016).

The main objective of conducting the MTR is to assess the current UNDAF after two and a half years of programme implementation, by looking mainly at three components:

(1) Relevance of the current UNDAF towards Government priorities:
(2) Main achievements, challenges and obstacles of the UNDAF process;  
(3) Effectiveness of the current M&E system and its coordination mechanism.

(1) The first component (i.e. relevance of the current UNDAF towards Government priorities) will be determined by assessing the following questions:

- Is the current UN assistance (UNDAF 2007-2011) still relevant to the national priorities?
- Has the UN recognized and effectively responded to urgent and emerging priorities which were not originally in the UNDAF?
- How can we ensure complementarily of the Ex-Com CPAPs with the UNDAF and GoE programmes?
- Has the UNDAF followed both a human rights-based approach and a results-based approach?

(2) The second component (i.e. main achievements, challenges and obstacles of the UNDAF process) will be best determined through the following:

- How to advocate for enhanced GoE commitment?
- What are the concrete, action-oriented steps the UN should take to improve active participation and partnership from GoE, i.e. incentive schemes and translation of documents for example?
- Is there the need of an UNDAF process budget?

(3) The third component will be determined by assessing the following points:

- Is the current UNDAF M&E system fit to capture progress on the existing UN programming framework?
- Is the current UNDAF M&E system fit to identify issues and challenges in UN coordination in Egypt?
- How can the quality/timeliness of UNDAF Outcome task-forces reporting be improved? Who is doing the actual reporting?
- How can the UNDAF Steering Committee be made more effective, especially in communicating results and challenges to the GoE senior decision –makers?
- How can UN staff/agencies be made more accountable throughout the review process in terms of attribution?
- Can UN agencies ensure longer-term sustainability of the UNDAF M&E process by mandating permanent M&E focal points to participate in the process?
- An analysis of the effectiveness, alignment and correspondence of the indicators to lines of action described in the UNDAF results matrix (i.e. against both UNDAF outcomes and UNDAF outputs) and their alignment with the government priorities;

Based on the above, the MTR report should include the following deliverables:

I. A vision statement for strategic governance and strategic implementation of the UNDAF, in order to maximize results and the impact of available resources, as a result of the following process:

- Identification of long- and medium term Government development and emerging
priorities, vis-à-vis progress on the MDGs, also in preparation for the next 2012-2017 UNDAF cycle.

- Analysis of UN agencies’ alignment towards GoE priorities and emerging issues;
- Analysis of UN agencies’ effectiveness towards progress on the MDGs;
- Proposal of refocused UN expected interventions for the next two and half years of the current UNDAF cycle implementation;
- Proposal of refocused UN expected interventions in preparation for the next 2012-2017 UNDAF cycle.

II. An updated and revised M&E framework, inclusive of duly revised indicators, baseline/targets and risks/assumptions that are feasible and relevant in monitoring UNDAF progress over the established development objectives;

III. A revised UNDAF Results Matrix with a focus on integrating capacity development and South-South cooperation (To be further discussed)

IV. A revised M&E reporting calendar;

V. A brief analysis of coordination lessons learnt, good practices and challenges, useful for guiding the UNCT towards the UNDAF completion and in preparation for the new UNDAF cycle 2012 – 2016;

VI. Roadmap in preparation for the next final evaluation and next CCA/UNDAF cycle.

Throughout the process, and in specific reference to point VI, the consultants will support UN agencies in strategically repositioning their CPAPs and multi-year plans towards the UNDAF and national priorities, also taking into account ongoing partnerships with the donor community including the private sector, and in respect of the limited financial resources available to the UN agencies.

Management of the Mid-Term Review

The MTR will be conducted by external consultant(s) selected by mutual agreement by the UNCT Egypt in close consultation with PEMA.

The focal point for the UNDAF Mid-term Review will be based at the Resident Coordinator’s Office, working under the direct supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator, the Director of PEMA and in close cooperation with the Chair/Co-Chairs of the UNDAF M&E Task-Forces and UN Coordination Office.

Methodology and Processes

The UNDAF mid-term review will entail both an internal and external participatory process lead by the consultant(s), to ensure that the MTR exercise does not place additional burden on UN Country Teams or strain national capacities. It has been agreed to keep the UNDAF midterm review “light”, informative and forward looking.

The consultants will be responsible for:

- Drafting a detailed plan for the process developed in close collaboration with the UNDAF M&E Coordination Team and approved by the UNCT. Inputs and roles of stakeholders will be determined once the work plan has been formulated;
- Interview and consultations with key informants, to identify emerging issues and links between different programmes impacting on the UNDAF objectives and to obtain
information on performance, relevance and future strategies. Some of the key informants include:
  o Heads of Agencies and programme officers in all UN agencies;
  o Relevant Government officials;
  o Civil society representatives;
  o Representatives of donor agencies.

• Supporting UNDAF M&E task forces in the review and compilation of M&E indicators, baseline information and sources and means of verification;
• In close coordination with UNDAF M&E task forces, PEMA and the UN Coordination Office, producing a first draft of the UNDAF Midterm Review;
• Producing a short analysis of UN coordination challenges and lessons learnt drawn from the UNDAF M&E Chairs and UNCT, which will be useful for the completion of this UNDAF cycle and in preparation to the next.
• Supporting the UN Coordination Office and PEMA in organizing a joint mid-term review validation workshop to discuss the report, recommendations and implementation plan, to be organized with all partners, the Government and other stakeholders.

Key Milestones and Deliverables of the Review

• Participants into the UNDAF MTR identified;
• UNDAF MTR work plan (drafted) in coordination with the UNDAF M&E task-Forces and UN Coordination Office, including a strategy for the dissemination of the UNDAF Midterm Review Report results;
• UNDAF MTR work plan finalized;
• Draft 1 of UNDAF MTR prepared and shared as relevant;
• Comments on Draft 1 UNDAF MTR incorporated;
• Final UNDAF MTR drafted and presented to all stakeholders.

Timeframe: The UNDAF Midterm Review will be carried out by early June 2009.

Estimated Working Days and Budget for the Review

Estimated Work Days: TBD
Estimated Budget: TBD

Qualifications of Review Team

• Experience must primarily relate to management of complex national level M&E frameworks and/or strategic plans involving multiple stakeholders;
• Ample understanding of the following approaches: Human Rights- Based Approach, Gender, Participatory processes and Results Based Management;
• Ability in compiling data and strong understanding of its quantitative and qualitative analysis within a logical framework;
• Deep knowledge of UN Reform, the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG);
• Ability to understand the implementation of UN Programmes and to reinforce strategic partnerships for the UNDAF implementation; familiarity with the UN system would be a strong asset;
• Ability to build and sustain effective partnerships with UN Agencies and main constituents, advocate effectively, communicate sensitively across different constituencies.
## Annex 2: List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of International Cooperation, Center for Project Evaluation and Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA)</td>
<td>Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek</td>
<td>PEMA Executive Director &amp; Economic Advisor to the Minister. Chair of the UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Coordination Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Hanan O. Khedr</td>
<td>Senior Research &amp; Evaluation Officer &amp; Coordinator Government/Donor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cabinet Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC)</td>
<td>Dr. Magued Osman (missed appointment, met subsequently)</td>
<td>Chairman, Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Dr. Heba Handoussa</td>
<td>Development expert and senior economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Local Development, Organization for Reconstruction and Development of Egyptian Village</td>
<td>Dr. Ibrahim Rihan MOLD</td>
<td>Chairman ORDEV-MOLD, Chair UNDAF Outcome 3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng. Ahmed Foad</td>
<td>Under Secretary for Research and Finance, ORDEV-MOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng. Mohamed Ahmed Melouk</td>
<td>Director General of Foreign Relationship and Technical Operation, ORDEV-MOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency, Nature Conservation Sector</td>
<td>Dr. Moustafa M. Fouda</td>
<td>Director, Nature Conservation Sector, Chair UNDAF Outcome 3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Khaled Allam Harhash</td>
<td>Manager, Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Council for Women (NCW)</td>
<td>Amb. Samiha Abou Steit</td>
<td>Adviser to the Secretary General, Chair of UNDAF Outcome 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN Coordination Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Coordination Office</td>
<td>Mr. James W. Rawley</td>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP Resident Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John Apruzzese</td>
<td>Head, UN Coordination Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Daiana Marino</td>
<td>UN/Donor Coordination Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Pablo Valenzuela Gibson</td>
<td>UN Coordination Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Fatoumatta Sabally</td>
<td>UN Coordination Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Mr. Mounir Tabet</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Mohamed Bayoumi</td>
<td>Environment Specialist, Assistant Resident Representative / Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Noha Rifaat</td>
<td>Results Based Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Ghada Waly</td>
<td>Programme Officer / Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Mr. Ziad Rifai</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Mona Moustafa</td>
<td>Programme Officer / Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Naglaa Arafa</td>
<td>Programme Officer, Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO, Sub-regional Office for North Africa, Cairo</td>
<td>Ms. Amal Mowafy</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer, Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 2 (ad interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Mr. Sibi Mohamed Boubakar</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Mr. Shahidul Haque</td>
<td>Regional Representative for the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Mathieu Luciano</td>
<td>Senior Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Siobhan Simojoki</td>
<td>Junior Project Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Mr. Gianpietro Bordignon</td>
<td>Country Director &amp; Representative Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Nadine El-Hakim</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Rania El-Razzaz</td>
<td>Programme Officer, M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Khaled Chatila</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Nivine Osman</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Nora Nairi</td>
<td>Senior Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Ms. Wessam El Beih</td>
<td>UNAIDS Country Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td>Ms. Maya Morsy</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator / Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Erma Manoncourt</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gillian Wilcox</td>
<td>Deputy Representative / Co-Chair UNDAF Outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dennis Arends</td>
<td>Chief, Social Policy, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nivine El-Kabbag</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Essam Allam</td>
<td>Health Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. German Reyes-Suarez</td>
<td>Health Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vijayakumar Moses</td>
<td>Young Child Survival and Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Amira Fouad</td>
<td>Education Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nadra Zaki</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dina Khaled</td>
<td>HIV &amp; Adolescent Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Salma Wahba</td>
<td>HIV &amp; Adolescent Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sahar Hegazy</td>
<td>Communication for Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manar Soliman</td>
<td>Monitoring Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Mexico</td>
<td>Mr. Alejandro Noriega Valdez Attache for Economic and Cooperation Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Embassy with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)</td>
<td>Ms. Caroline Lavoie First Secretary (Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Manal Guindi Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Mr. Antonino CREA First Counselor, Head of Social Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Javier Menéndez Bonilla First Secretary, Social Affairs Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Spain, Technical Cooperation Office</td>
<td>Mr. Luis de Torres Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KfW Bankengruppe</td>
<td>Mr. Andreas Holtkotte Director KfW Office, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of France</td>
<td>Mr. Benoît Cathala Attache de Coopération Technique et Multilatérale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Embassy, USAID</td>
<td>Ms. Latanya Mapp Frett JD Program Office Director, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Robert R. Lopez, PhD Program Development Officer, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Nevine M. Lotfi, M.A. Senior Economist, Program Analysis Division, USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Society Organizations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Hoda M. Sobhy</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, UNFPA, EGY/08/POS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Revised UNDAF Results Matrix and UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*

*The UNDAF Mid-Term Review exercise did not encompass the revision of the existing M&E framework. UNDAF M&E task-forces will be requested to individually revise their M&E frameworks, including the indicators, vis-à-vis the amended UNDAF Results Matrix Outcomes.

The tables annexed in the next page represent the revised and ‘pruned’ UNDAF Results Matrices, reflected in a user-friendlier format than the original UNDAF Results and Resources Framework, which can be requested from the Office of the Resident Coordinator.
UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2011, state’s performance and accountability in programming, implementing and coordinating actions, especially those that reduce exclusion, vulnerabilities and gender disparities, are improved

CP Outcome 1: Government and non-governmental organizations are better equipped to fulfill citizens’ rights and MDGs at the local level in a well-planned and coordinated manner (FAO, IFAD, ILO, IMF, ITU, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UNIDO, World Bank, WFP, WHO).

1.1 Government and non-governmental organizations have enhanced capacity to plan, manage and implement the decentralization process for improved service delivery and more efficient use of resources (UNDP, FAO, IFAD, IMF, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UNIDA).

1.2 Government agencies have capacity to adequately coordinate donor support and intersectoral collaboration between ministries and national councils (UNDP, IFAD, FAO, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UNIDO, World Bank, WFP, UNAIDS).

1.3 National capacity and institutionalized integrated monitoring and mapping system for MDGs in place to monitor poverty status and conditions of vulnerable groups (WFP, UNICEF, FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNFPA, World Bank).

1.4 Governmental and non-governmental organizations increasingly adopting ICT, including e-governance, e-learning, e-science, to implement development policies and programmes (UNDP, FAO, ITU, UNESCO).

1.5 Ministry of Education has capacity to ensure quality, nationally mainstreamed, pre-primary, primary and vocational education (UNICEF, WFP, World Bank, UNESCO).

1.6 Government has an integrated food security strategy and food fortification action plan in place (WFP, FAO, WHO, IOM, World Bank).

1.7 Ministry of Health and healthcare providers have capacity to manage and provide primary and reproductive healthcare services within the framework of the Health Sector Reform (UNFPA, UNICEF, World Bank).


1.9 Government organizations have capacity to integrate sustainable development, environmental and natural resources management into national development frameworks and sector strategies (UNDP, FAO, IMF, World Bank, WHO, ILO, UNESCO).

1.10 Government and non-governmental organizations have capacity to plan for disaster risk reduction and respond to climate change, natural disasters and emerging infectious diseases (WFP, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, World Bank, WHO).

CP Outcome 2: Pro-poor policies and related legislative measures developed, enacted and implemented through appropriate mechanisms and allocated resources (FAO, IFAD, ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UN HABITAT, World Bank, WFP).

2.1 Basic social protection policies and legislation revised including social safety nets, and the use of budget allocation for social development optimized (UNDP, ILO, UNHCR, UNICEF, World Bank, WFP, UNAIDS).


2.3 National ownership of the MDGs plan as presented in the 2005 EHF is ensured and reflected in the National Development Plan 2007-2011, and the EHF vision programme for Egypt gradually implemented (UNDP, UNESCO).

2.4 Multi-sectoral public policies and national strategic development plans developed in a participatory manner (UNICEF, FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNIC, UNIFEM, World Bank, WFP, UNAIDS).

2.5 Policy development for decentralization, also based on decentralization strategies, tested in Upper Egypt (UNDP, IFAD, World Bank, UNAIDS).
## UNDAF MTR
8-9 June 2009
09:00-17:00, Conrad Hotel

### Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Registration and coffee/tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td><strong>Welcome</strong> by Mr. James Rawley, UNRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations for the Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 10:15</td>
<td><strong>Reflections on the first half of the UNDAF process/results and the evolving national priorities</strong> by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15</td>
<td><strong>Egypt's current development challenges</strong> by Dr. Heba Handoussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 11:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Discussion on the UN’s response to evolving national priorities</strong> by Mr. Ziad Rifai, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working Groups &amp; report to plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:00</td>
<td><strong>Challenges of strategic management in the UN</strong> by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 16:45</td>
<td><strong>Presentation and highlights of the draft MTR Report</strong> by Mr. Christian Privat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working Groups &amp; report to plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 – 17:00</td>
<td><strong>Synthesis, Conclusions &amp; Wrap-up</strong> by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 2: Tuesday, 9 June 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Registration and coffee/tea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 – 9:20   | Welcome and Overview by Mr. James Rawley, UNRC  
  - Feedback on Day 1                          |
| 9:20 - 9:30   | Expectations for the Day by Mr. Christian Privat                           |
| 9:30 – 10:30  | Review of the revised UNDAF Results by UNDAF M&E Chairs and Co-Chairs  
  - Outcomes 1 “Pro-poor” & Outcome 2 “Unemployment”  
  - Questions & Discussion                       |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Coffee Break                                                               |
| 10:45 – 11:45 | Review of the revised UNDAF Results by UNDAF M&E Chairs and Co-Chairs  
  - Outcome 3 “Regional Disparities” & Outcome 3 “Environment”  
  - Questions & Discussion                         |
| 11:45 – 12:45 | Review of the revised UNDAF Results by UNDAF M&E Chairs and Co-Chairs  
  - Outcomes 4 “Gender” & Outcome 5 “Governance”  
  - Questions & Discussion                         |
| 12:45 – 13:45 | Lunch                                                                      |
| 13:45 – 15:15 | Challenges for the next UNDAF 2012-2016 by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel  
  - Questions & Discussion  
  - Working Groups and reporting to plenary        |
| 15:15 – 15:30 | Roadmap for UNDAF 3 by Mr. John Apruzzese, UNCO  
  - Questions & Discussion                         |
| Break         |                                                                             |
| 15:45 – 16:15 | Synthesis, Conclusions & Wrap-up by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC, and  
  Ms. Erma Manoncourt, UNICEF                      |
### Annex 5: Roadmap for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle (2012-2016)

The roadmap in preparation for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle was presented to, and agreed by participants to the UNDF MTR Workshop, 8-9 June 2009. It will be useful in the process leading to the next UNDAF (2012-2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF 2007-2011 Mid-Term Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of engagement and set up of management committee (Egypt 2011 CCA preparations started)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation Analysis and publication of Egypt 2011 Common Country Assessment (CCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Retreat in preparation for the UNDAF 2012-2016 (Identification of Top 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of UNDAF 2012-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Strategy Meeting for the UNDAF 2012-2016 -- Endorsement of UNDAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoE and UN co-signature of final UNDAF 2012-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>