



# **Mid-Term Review of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Swaziland, 2011-2015**

**Final report**

**15 November 2013**

**Angela Bester**

**Independent Consultant**

Map of Swaziland-Administrative Regions



# Contents

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Rationale and purpose of mid-term review .....	1
1.2 Scope of the mid-term review .....	2
1.3 Approach and methodology .....	2
1.4 Structure of the report .....	3
<b>2 National development context.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Country context.....	4
2.2 Economic context.....	4
2.3 Human development context and Millennium Development Goals .....	4
2.4 National frameworks.....	6
2.5 Development cooperation in Swaziland .....	7
<b>3 United Nations system in Swaziland.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Overview .....	8
3.2 UNDAF 2011-2015 .....	8
<b>4 Assessment of the UNDAF .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Part A: Progress towards UNDAF outcomes .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Effectiveness .....	12
4.2 Efficiency .....	23
4.3 Sustainability of results.....	25
<b>Part B: Strategic Position of United Nations in Swaziland .....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.4 Relevance .....	26
4.5 Use of comparative advantage .....	27
4.6 UN coherence.....	28
4.7 Partnerships with non-state actors.....	29
<b>5 Challenges, lessons learnt and future opportunities .....</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 Challenges and constraints.....	30
5.2 Lessons learnt.....	31
5.3 Future opportunities .....	32
<b>6 Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>33</b>
6.1 Conclusions.....	33
6.2 Recommendations .....	34
<b>Annex A: Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex B: List of documents consulted.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Annex C: List of persons consulted.....</b>	<b>42</b>

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Swaziland key development indicators.....	5
Table 2: MDG Progress at a glance .....	5
Table 3: UNDAF Pillars and Outcomes .....	9
Table 4: UNDAF 2011-2015 Indicative Budget.....	10
Table 5: UNDAF resource envelope per UN agency.....	11
Table 6: Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS - Achievements .....	12
Table 7: Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods - Achievements .....	14
Table 8: Pillar 3: Human development and basic social services - Achievements .....	17
Table 9: Pillar 4: Governance - Achievements .....	19

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACC	Anti-Corruption Commission
ACMS	Aid Coordination & Management Section
ART	Antiretroviral Therapy
CANGO	Coordinating Assembly of Non-Governmental Organisations
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
DaO	Delivering as One
DPMO	Deputy Prime Minister's Office
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
GFATM	Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
ILO	International Labour Organization
JUNPS	Joint UN Programme of Support on HIV and AIDS 2009-2015
MEPD	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NERCHA	National Emergency Response Committee on HIV and AIDS
PPSG	Policy and Programme Support Group
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
SEA	Swaziland Environment Authority
SWAGAA	Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse
UN	United Nations
UN WOMEN	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCT	UN Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

## **Acknowledgements**

This review benefited enormously from the openness and frankness with which the United Nations Country Team, the staff of the various UN agencies and the government partners and civil society responded to the reviewer. Government officials were generous with the time they gave to the reviewer. The consultant is grateful for the professional manner in which the Resident Coordinator's Office managed the review and for the enthusiastic support from the Programme and Policy Support Group.

Angela Bester

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

The United Nations Country Team (UNCT) commissioned a mid-term review of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2011-2015).

The main objectives of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) were to:

- (i) Assess the achievements and progress made against planned results, as well as assess the challenges and lessons learnt over the past two-and-a-half years of the UNDAF.
- (ii) Assess how emerging issues not reflected in the current UNDAF impact on outcomes and make recommendations to realign United Nations' assistance to these new priorities and achieve greater development impact.
- (iii) Serve as a comprehensive progress report of the UNDAF which will replace the 2013 annual review.
- (iv) Look into the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, coherence in the delivery of the overall United Nations programme and recommend ways in which the UN system may increase its effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.

The review was conducted between August 2013 and November 2013. It involved consultations with a large number of partners from government, as well as civil society, in addition to internal consultations within the UN system in Swaziland. The review also consulted documents and reports produced by the UN system and by the various ministries within the Government of Swaziland.

The MTR assessed performance under the UNDAF (2011-2015), as well as the strategic position of the UN system in Swaziland. The MTR assessed performance against the UNDAF outcomes articulated in the four UNDAF Pillars was done against the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. In assessing the strategic position of the UN system in Swaziland, the MTR used the criteria of strategic relevance and responsiveness; use of comparative strengths; UN coherence; and promoting United Nations values. The MTR also assessed the UNDAF design, partnerships and lessons learnt, and reflected on the post-2015 agenda for Swaziland.

### Key findings

#### Effectiveness

*Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS* made good progress towards expected results, especially in the areas of access to treatment, care and support; and impact mitigation. There are still challenges in preventing new infections, especially amongst younger people.

*Pillar 2: Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Livelihoods:* There was some progress in this pillar, and examples of good technical and policy advisory support; food assistance to vulnerable groups; work towards a comprehensive social protection strategy; innovative climate change projects; and building national monitoring & evaluation capacity. A major challenge for Pillar 2 was that the resources available for delivering in this pillar were not commensurate with breadth of its intended outputs.

*Pillar 3: Human Development and Basic Social Services:* There were several achievements in the health and education sectors. Examples include strengthening the Health Management Information

System and the Education Management Information System; GIS mapping of tuberculosis; development of the Education Policy and research on the quality of education; national immunisation campaigns in hard-to-reach areas; and capacity building on integrated service delivery for anti-retroviral treatment. The range of issues covered in Pillar 3 is extensive and there is a risk of losing sight of the strategic issues to be addressed, especially in the health sector. The work in water and sanitation lagged behind the other two sectors. This may be a reflection of the inadequate monitoring and reporting on activities in this sector.

*Pillar 4: Governance:* There were several achievements, for example, review of legislation; ratification of UN conventions; capacity building of institutions in the governance sector; and advocacy work under the Joint Gender Programme. Many interventions were small catalytic projects with no guarantee of Government scaling up the support or following through. Activities in the area of human rights education and awareness were disparate.

*Monitoring & Evaluation:* The UN system implemented improvements to the monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF, but there is need for further strengthening of monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF.

### **Efficiency**

There were two Joint Programmes implemented and a third Joint Programme initiated in July 2013. The practice of joint programming is evolving in the UN system in Swaziland. While the Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS functioned efficiently, the Joint Programme on Gender experienced challenges emanating in part from the system of parallel funding (each agency funding its own work within the joint programme).

The UN system mobilised 45 percent of the indicative UNDAF budget over the first three years of the UNDAF. The MTR was not able to assess efficiency in resource use as the tracking of expenditure was not done on an UNDAF pillar basis. There were many coordination points in the UNDAF. Given the small size of the UN system in Swaziland, having so many points of coordination does not reduce transaction costs.

### **Sustainability**

The UNDAF results were found to be sustainable to the extent that the interventions are aligned with national priorities and complement Government's on-going programmes. However, there are threats to sustainability. Factors affecting the sustainability of results include the sense of limited ownership of the UNDAF by government partners; and resource constraints experienced by government partners.

### **Relevance**

The UNDAF and its support interventions were broadly relevant to the national development challenges confronting Swaziland. The UN system gave appropriate emphasis and priority to the issue of HIV and AIDS as this was identified as a top priority by the Government of Swaziland. There are however economic structural issues that drive poverty and inequality in the country and the UN support interventions appeared to be obliquely relevant to these.

### **Promoting UN Coherence**

There was coherence between the UNDAF and the country programmes of the UN system as the latter reflected UNDAF outcomes. There was also a willingness amongst UN agencies to collaborate to the extent permitted by the mandates of their respective agencies. Coordination from the Resident

Coordinator's Office was hampered by the absence of well-developed information systems within the RCO.

### **Use of comparative advantages**

With very few development partners to compete with in Swaziland, the UN system was not always tested to think of its comparative advantage before responding to requests for assistance. It made limited use of its convening powers to promote dialogue on difficult or sensitive issues in the area of governance. There were examples of using its global links for south-south cooperation, but this was ad hoc. There was good advocacy on issues of gender equality.

### **Challenges and constraints**

The MTR identified challenges and constraints that impacted on the performance of the UNDAF. These included limited national ownership; UNDAF design problems; limited resources for implementation; few development partners; weak coordination capacity in the Resident Coordinator's Office; and limited knowledge sharing and learning from evaluations.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Conclusion 1:** The UNDAF was compatible with national development priorities as all the areas covered by the UNDAF reflected the development priorities set out in the National Development Strategy and the Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme. The UNDAF gave appropriate emphasis to the issues of poverty and HIV and AIDS as the top national development priorities. The relevance of approaches is debatable. There were many small 'downstream' projects, though relevant to the immediate needs, did not feed into or inform policies needed to achieve a step change in the development trajectory of Swaziland. The UNDAF covered a broad range of governance projects, spreading limited resources thinly. The UN system did not always having the requisite level of expertise in-house to deal with the range of governance issues covered by the UNDAF.

**Conclusion 2:** Although the UNDAF was aligned to national priorities, the level of ownership of the UNDAF by government partners was moderate. The co-chairing of the UNDAF pillars with senior government officials gave the Government an opportunity to participate in the management of the UNDAF and engendered some sense of ownership. Joint meetings, however, were not sufficiently frequent to reinforce ownership. There was no sense of ownership of the UNDAF from civil society.

**Conclusion 3:** There were several achievements in the first half of the UNDAF cycle, with the extent of progress varying across the UNDAF pillars and within the UNDAF pillars. Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS was largely on track. The coherence of UN agencies within the pillar, the coherence provided by NERCHA, the clarity of the joint programme and availability of resources contributed to the progress made. The remaining UNDAF pillars showed progress, though not to the same extent as Pillar 1. Resource constraints, delays in decision-making on the part of UN agencies and implementing partners were among the constraints under which these pillars operated. The sustainability of results achieved to date cannot be guaranteed without resources from Government and other development partners. The gap between the indicative budget of the UNDAF and the resources mobilised suggests that the UNDAF will only partially achieve its intended outcomes by the end of the UNDAF cycle.

**Conclusion 4:** The UNDAF promoted coherence within the UN system in Swaziland and fostered collaboration among the agencies, at the leadership level as well as in programmes and operations.

The overall coordination of the UNDAF was not as effective as it should have been, primarily as a result of limited capacity within the Resident Coordinator's Office. The UNDAF monitoring did not track performance against the outcomes and financial reporting on the UNDAF was fragmented. Documentation on the UNDAF and related matters was dispersed among the different agencies. The joint programmes approach offers potential for fostering UN coherence and Delivering as One on priority issues that are common to all UN agencies. The Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS was the most advanced of the joint programmes in Swaziland, not surprisingly given the role of UNAIDS at the global level, and the expectation that all agencies contribute according to the Division of Labour. Joint programmes require good coordination capacity in order to be effective.

**Conclusion 5:** The UN system's engagement with civil society was narrow and mostly confined to the NGO sector as implementing partners. There was some capacity building of civil society and some engagement with civil society in advocacy. The UN-Civil Society Advisory Forum held much promise when it was launched, but did not live up to its mandate. Balancing seemingly competing interests of Government and civil society is not an easy task. The UN system, however, has a convening power which it can draw on to facilitate constructive dialogue between parties.

### **Recommendations for remainder of UNDAF period**

**Recommendation 1:** The UNCT should review the UNDAF to re-prioritise and align activities to the level of resources it can realistically mobilise for the remainder of the UNDAF. There is little to be gained by continuing to plan for activities that have no hope of being funded. It would be better to do a few things well, that will serve as a foundation for the next UNDAF. This re-prioritisation should be done in consultation with the Government through the Joint UNDAF Steering Committee. Without pre-empting the decisions of the UNCT and the Government, the MTR recommends that consideration be given to the following:

- (i) Focus on those outputs and activities that require the joint effort of at least three UN agencies.
- (ii) Address gaps or lagging areas in the UNDAF, for example:
  - Creative strategies for prevention of HIV and AIDS among young people
  - Developing a comprehensive social protection policy
  - Strengthening the SWAps, in particular the SWAp for Water & Sanitation
  - Joint advocacy on outstanding legislation that impact on human rights, and working with parliamentary portfolio committees
- (iii) Test new areas to respond to emerging issues such as non-communicable diseases and youth unemployment, and use these as a basis for the next UNDAF. These should be on a small scale commensurate with available resources.

**Recommendation 2:** The UN system should work on strengthening joint programming as a modality for programming and implementation. The mid-term review of the Joint Programme on Gender made useful recommendations to strengthen the Joint Programme on Gender. These recommendations include revising the programme outputs and activities to focus only on those activities that are strictly joint activities, and to replace the parallel funding with pooled or basket funding. The new Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data should be checked to ensure that it focuses on joint activities and is not simply a collection of individual agency activities. A pooled funding modality should be introduced. Both joint programmes should have a dedicated coordinator.

**Recommendation 3:** The UNCT should request the Programme & Policy Support Group and Monitoring & Evaluation Committee to make improvements the management and coordination of the UNDAF. The following improvements should be prioritised:

- Monitoring and reporting should be done against the final set of agreed output indicators. The quarterly and annual reporting by the UNDAF pillars should be standardised.
- A means should be devised to track the UNDAF expenditure consistently across the four UNDAF pillars. This will mean having to extract financial data from the different agencies.
- Joint quarterly meetings with government partners should take place as scheduled and include non-resident agencies. The Joint UNDAF Steering Committee should meet every six months.
- A schedule should be introduced to improve coordination of capacity building (training) events.
- The Resident Coordinator's Office should set up a repository of all key UNDAF document, including all quarterly and annual reports, and relevant programming documents. Copies of agency evaluations and reviews should also be kept.
- The Resident Coordinator's Office should engage regularly with the Aid Coordination Management Unit of the Ministry of Economic Planning & Development to keep abreast of trends in development cooperation in the country, and to exchange information on the UNDAF.

**Recommendation 4:** The UNCT, under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator, should embark on expanding its range of partnerships. In this regard, the Civil Society Advisory Committee should be resuscitated and the Memorandum of Understanding should be finalised as a matter of priority. Partnerships with the private sector should be pursued, with the view to engaging them in job creation, development of small and medium enterprises and corporate social investment. The ILO has existing relationships with the peak employer body and chamber of commerce that can be built on. The Resident Coordinator has initiated discussions with other development partners, for example, the African Development Bank and this should be pursued.

### **Recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle**

**Recommendation 5:** The post-2015 agenda as defined by the Government and citizens of Swaziland should guide the next UNDAF. The UN system should focus on a few areas where collectively, the UN agencies can maximise their impact and help shift the development trajectory onto a higher path. This will require the UN system to change from its current way of operating. The next UNDAF should shift its emphasis to upstream advisory work and focus on supporting the Government to develop integrated approaches to policy-making, planning and programming, and strengthening institutional capacities. This means that the UN system will need to become a reputable source of technical advice, and draw extensively on its global knowledge networks. While there should still be an element of downstream projects, these should be catalytic with the view to informing policies and larger programmes.

**Recommendation 6:** The UN system should articulate a vision and map a five-year path to shift towards 'One Programme' and 'One Budget Framework'. In doing so, the UNCT should draw on the experiences of other small countries and middle-income countries in implementing a 'One UN Programme', to develop and test a prototype that would be suitable for the context in Swaziland. The experiences of the current joint programmes should also inform the development of the prototype.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Rationale and purpose of mid-term review

The UN Country Team in Swaziland launched a mid-term review (MTR) of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), for the period 2011-2015. The UNDAF cycle requires that a joint mid-term review be conducted by the United Nations and national counterparts in Swaziland, as a precursor to the development of the next UNDAF. The need for a review was also precipitated by a number of significant developments within the country context, notably, the fiscal crisis that has constrained Government's ability to deliver on the development agenda. The report emanating from the MTR is to be used by the UNCT and the Government of Swaziland to fine-tune their UNDAF-related activities for the remainder of the UNDAF cycle and to serve as input in planning the next UNDAF.

The main objectives of the MTR were to:

- (i) Assess the achievements and progress made against planned results, as well as assess the challenges and lessons learnt over the past two-and-a-half years of the UNDAF.
- (ii) Assess how emerging issues not reflected in the current UNDAF impact on outcomes and make recommendations to realign United Nations' assistance to these new priorities and achieve greater development impact.
- (iii) Serve as a comprehensive progress report of the UNDAF which will replace the 2013 annual review.
- (iv) Look into the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, coherence in the delivery of the overall United Nations programme and recommend ways in which the UN system may increase its effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.

Specific objectives of the MTR were to:

- (i) Assess the extent to which the current UNDAF is compatible with national development priorities.
- (ii) Assess the achievement/progress towards attainment of results and reflect on how each agency has contributed to the UNDAF results through the implementation of programmes and projects.
- (iii) Assess the effectiveness of and advantage of the use of Joint Programmes modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and delivering as one, such as HIV and AIDS and Gender.
- (iv) Suggest the direction for future programming taking into consideration emerging development situations in the country and lessons learnt for implementation.
- (v) Reach consensus between the UN and key stakeholders on suggested strategies for programme implementation, partnerships and resource mobilisation.
- (vi) Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities.

## 1.2 Scope of the mid-term review

The Mid-Term Review assessed performance under the UNDAF (2011-2015), as well as the strategic position of the UN system in Swaziland. The MTR assessed performance against the UNDAF outcomes articulated in the four UNDAF Pillars was done against the following criteria:

- *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the intended results of UN-supported interventions have been attained.
- *Efficiency*: The balance between the results achieved by the UNDAF and the resources allocated to it.
- *Sustainability*: The likelihood that results and benefits generated through a set of interventions will continue once UN support is reduced or phased out.

The MTR did not assess impact, as this is a mid-term review and it is too early to assess impact. It should also be noted that the performance data for the UNDAF is for the period 2011 to 2012, and in some instances, there was information on the first six months of 2013.

The assessment of the UN system's strategic position considered how the UN system positioned itself in Swaziland's policy and development agenda and the strategies it used to assist Swaziland in meeting its development priorities and challenges. The following evaluation criteria were used:

- *Strategic relevance and responsiveness*: Relevance of UN-supported interventions to the national development challenges and priorities and responsiveness to changes in the country context.
- *Use of comparative strengths*: UN system's use of its comparative strengths in the Swaziland context.
- *UN coherence*: How the UN agencies coordinated their work to promote coherence.
- *Promoting United Nations values*: UN system's support to national policy dialogue on human development issues, contribution to gender equality, and addressing equity issues.

The MTR also considered the UNDAF design, partnerships, and lessons learnt. Consultations with the UNCT and stakeholders during the scoping mission emphasised the importance of reflecting on the post-2015 agenda for Swaziland and the implications for the UN system in the country.

## 1.3 Approach and methodology

The methodology for the MTR followed the guidelines, norms and standards promulgated by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) guidance on the preparation of the UNDAF.

An independent consultant conducted the MTR, between 29 July 2013 and 31 October 2013. Following a desk review of documents, the consultant conducted a scoping mission in Swaziland from 29 July to 2 August 2013. This involved interviews with Heads of UN agencies and senior programming staff in Swaziland as well as senior officials from the Government of Swaziland. The consultant produced an inception report setting out the scope, methodology, programme of work, evaluation matrix and the list of people to be consulted. The data collection mission took place from 9 September to 13 September 2013.

The consultant submitted the draft report to the UNDAF Steering Committee comments. The Steering Committee convened a validation workshop with stakeholders on 7 November 2013 to discuss the key

findings and recommendations. The report was finalised, taking into consideration the comments received.

The MTR used primary data collected through semi-structured interviews and group discussions, as well as secondary data emanating from reports and documents. In addition to the reports and documents that emanated from within the UN system, the consultant drew on reports from the Government of Swaziland. The UNDAF MTR consulted or interviewed a total of 103 people (57 from Government, 42 from the United Nations, and 3 non-state actors).

At the time the UNDAF MTR was being planned, other agencies, namely, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNDP and WFP were planning to conduct mid-term reviews of their CPAPs or specific outcomes (such as the Poverty Outcome for UNDP). It was hoped that these MTRs would be coordinated and allow for joint interviews and/or sharing of information from these MTRs to feed into the UNDAF MTR. Due to timing challenges, the UNDAF MTR only had two joint interviews with the UNFPA evaluation consultant.

The consultant tabulated all the information collected through the interviews and desk review against each of the evaluation criteria. The data were triangulated during the report-drafting phase to ensure rigor.

*Limitations:* The absence of a centralised information repository and database on the UNDAF was a major limitation for the MTR. The consultant spent an inordinate amount of time communicating with the Resident Coordinator's Office for documents that ordinarily should be available from the outset when conducting a review or evaluation of the UNDAF. The annual UNDAF reports were not comprehensive and financial information was fragmented. There are no interviews with other development partners, due to time constraints. Development partners were invited to, and attended the stakeholder validation workshop and thus had an opportunity to express their views on the preliminary findings and recommendations of the MTR.

## **1.4 Structure of the report**

The remainder of the report is structured into the following chapters:

- Chapter 2 provides an overview of the development context and challenges in Swaziland and how the Government of Swaziland has responded to these.
- Chapter 3 discusses the UNDAF 2011-2015 as a response to the development context outlined in Chapter 2.
- Chapter 4 discusses the key findings of the MTR in two sections. Section A discusses the performance in terms of the extent to which the outcomes within each of the UNDAF Pillars have been achieved. Section B discusses the key findings in respect of the UN system's strategic position in Swaziland.
- Chapter 5 discusses the main challenges and constraint, lessons learnt and future opportunities.
- Chapter sets out the conclusions and recommendations.

## 2 National development context

### 2.1 Country context

Swaziland is a small, landlocked country of 17,364 square kilometres, surrounded by South Africa and Mozambique. Its population of just over 1 million live mainly in rural areas. The Swazi system of governance has a traditional system that co-exists with a modern system of a parliament, an executive (Cabinet), and documented Roman Dutch Law and English Common Law. The country operates as a monarchy with constitutional powers vested in the King. The Constitution passed in 2005 provides for the separation of powers between the executive, legislative and judicial arms of Government. The Constitution also makes provision for various individual rights. Swaziland has a considerable way to go in meeting its Constitutional obligations and realising the rights set out in the Constitution. The term of the current Administration ended in September 2013 when elections were held.

### 2.2 Economic context

Swaziland is classified as lower-middle income country with a Gross National Income per capita (World Bank Atlas Method current USD) of \$2,860<sup>1</sup>. The country's economy is closely linked to the Republic of South Africa, its main trading partner. Swaziland is a member of the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU), the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa. It benefits from the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) of the United States of America, as well as the Cotonou Agreement signed with the European Union.

Like other emerging economies, Swaziland experienced the negative effects of the global financial crisis. The reduction in trade opportunities and lower revenue receipts from SACU have contributed to a dramatic decline in economic growth from 3.5 per cent in 2007 to an estimated 0.2 per cent in 2012<sup>2</sup>. The Government of Swaziland introduced the Fiscal Adjustment Roadmap in 2010, the Economic Recovery Strategy in 2011, and the Investor Roadmap in 2012 to put the country on the path to economic recovery and growth. The reduction in revenue has had a negative impact on the delivery of government programmes.

### 2.3 Human development context and Millennium Development Goals

Swaziland falls into the Medium Human Development category, with its Human Development Index (HDI) of 5.36 in 2012, ranked 140 out of 180 countries and territories.<sup>3</sup> Table 1 shows key development indicators for Swaziland. Life expectancy in the country is 48.9 years, and is beginning to reverse the decline in life expectancy resulting from the impact of HIV and AIDS. Income inequality, as measured by the GINI coefficient is high at 0.51 and 63 per cent of the population live below the national poverty line. A recent study commissioned by UNICEF Swaziland found that 70 per cent of children are poor, and the child extreme poverty rate is 34 per cent compared to 29 per cent for the population. Child poverty is predominantly a rural phenomenon, where access to clean water, adequate sanitation and electricity are major development challenges.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> World Bank data accessed 4 October 2013, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator>

<sup>2</sup> World Bank data indicate GDP growth to be 3.5 per cent in 2007. Estimate of 0.2 GDP growth is the estimate by the Government of Swaziland.

<sup>3</sup> UNDP International Human Development Report 2013

<sup>4</sup> Braithwaite, J., Djima, I.Y., and Pickmans, R., Child and Orphan Poverty in Swaziland, UNICEF, Swaziland, August 2013.

**Table 1: Swaziland key development indicators**

Indicator	2012
Human Development Index	0.536
Poverty head count ratio	63 (2010)
Employment to population ratio	33.6 (2010)
Youth unemployment (%)	64 (2010)
GINI coefficient	0.51 (2010)
Under-five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)	78
Life expectancy at birth (years)	48.9
Adult literacy rate, both sexes (% aged 15 and above)	87.4

Source: UNDP, Human Development Report 2013, New York; Government of Swaziland, MDG Progress Report 2012

Table 2 shows Swaziland's progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), for Goals 1 to 7. Swaziland has done well in MDG 2 and is on track to achieve the goal of universal primary education. Eradicating poverty remains a major challenge for Swaziland, with Target 1 A and 1B requiring acceleration. Swaziland is on track to eradicate extreme hunger by 2015. Other targets that require acceleration are Target 4 A (under-five mortality) and Target 5 A (maternal mortality).

Swaziland is making progress with MDG 6. HIV prevalence is said to be declining as coverage of ART increases (85.1 per cent of people enrolled in ART by end 2011). There has also been a significant decline in deaths resulting from malaria and the disease has been halted. However, the incidence and prevalence of TB has increased and Multi-Drug Resistant TB has emerged. Although Swaziland is on track at the aggregate level with regard to Goal 7, areas that require acceleration are biodiversity and increasing access to improved sanitation facilities.<sup>5</sup>

**Table 2: MDG Progress at a glance**

Goal	Status in 2012
<b>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</b>	
Target 1 A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of population below national poverty line	Acceleration required
Target 1 B: Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people	Acceleration required
Target 1 C: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people suffering from hunger	On track
<b>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</b>	
Target 2 A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling	On track
<b>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empowerment of women</b>	
Target 3 A Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels by 2015	On track

<sup>5</sup> Government of Swaziland Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland Millennium Development Goals Progress Report, September 2012

<b>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</b>	
Target 4 A: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality ratio	Acceleration required
<b>Goal</b>	<b>Status in 2012</b>
<b>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</b>	
Target 5 A: Reduce by three quarters , between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio	Acceleration required
Target 5 B: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health	On track
<b>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</b>	
Target 6 A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	On track
Target 6 B: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all who need it	On track
Target 6 B: Have halted , by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other diseases	On track
<b>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</b>	
Target 7 A: Integrate the principle of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources	On track

Source: Government of Swaziland, Swaziland Millennium Development Goals 2012 Progress Report, September 2012

## 2.4 National frameworks

The Government of Swaziland has introduced a number of policies, strategies and frameworks to achieve the requisite economic and social development for its citizens.

The *National Development Strategy (NDS) (1999)* is the national strategic plan for the period 1997 to 2022. It captures the vision for the country, the key macro-strategic areas (for example, sound economic management) and sectoral strategies to achieve the long term vision: “By the year 2022, the Kingdom of Swaziland will be in the top 10% of the medium human development group of countries founded on sustainable economic development, social justice and political stability”<sup>6</sup>. The National Development Strategy is implemented through three-year National Development Plans that link the NDS to the Budget.

The *Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme (PSRAP) 2007-2015*, approved in 2007, sets out the Government’s medium-to-long term development framework and action programme for sustainable economic growth and poverty reduction.

The *Government Programme of Action (2008-2013)* sets out the priorities of Administration for its five-year term of office. The Programme of Action identifies priorities in many areas, including achieving greater economic growth and job creation; health; education and skills development; food security; access to water; improved service delivery through decentralisation; environment and disaster management; strengthening governance institutions and public sector management; and safety and security.

The National Multi-Sectoral HIV and AIDS Policy (2006) provides the national policy response to HIV and AIDS. The Government has since introduced a *Multi-Sectoral Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS (2009-2014)*. Other sectoral policies include the National Social Development Policy (2009); the National Sexual and Reproductive Health Policy (2002); the National Youth Policy

<sup>6</sup> Government of Swaziland, National Development Strategy Vision 2022, p.78, Mbabane, 1999

(2008); the Food Security Policy; the National Disaster Management Policy; and the Education Policy (2012).

## 2.5 Development cooperation in Swaziland

The Government has established the Aid Coordination and Management Section (ACMS) in the Ministry of Economic Planning & Development. The ACMS is responsible for mobilising resources and monitoring official development assistance to Swaziland. Its functions include developing and advising on development cooperation; appraising projects to be funded by development partners; maintaining a database and reporting on aid flows; and organising the annual development partner retreat to discuss external assistance, donor coordination and aid effectiveness.

Swaziland has a very small number of development partners that provide official development assistance. In addition to the United Nations, the other development partners are:

- African Development Bank
- Arab Bank for Economic Development
- European Union
- Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria
- Japan (JICA)
- Republic of China (Taiwan)
- United States of America (PEPFAR)
- World Bank

Other donors, namely, Kuwait and the European Investment Bank also provide external assistance but this is not channelled through the ACMS. According to the ACMS, a total of US\$ 132,948,293 was disbursed in 2011/2012, with the largest amount (US\$ 29.2 million) coming from the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). The total amount disbursed by the United Nations was US\$ 16,756,388, placing it at number 5 out of the 8 development partners, behind the Republic of China (Taiwan) – US\$ 22,267,169, the European Union - US\$ 19,122,559, JICA – US\$ 17,784,702.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Kingdom of Swaziland, Ministry of Economic Planning & Development, Status of Official Development Assistance in Swaziland 2011/2012 Inaugural edition, August 2013

### 3 United Nations system in Swaziland

#### 3.1 Overview

The United Nations has had a presence in the Swaziland since the country's independence in 1968. There are six resident agencies<sup>8</sup>: UN Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS (UNAIDS), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Food Programme (WFP) and World Health Organization (WHO). United Nations Education Science Culture Organization (UNESCO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) maintain a small presence in Swaziland, through attachment of officials to the Ministry of Education and Training, and the Ministry of Agriculture, respectively. The International Labour Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provide support mainly from their regional offices in Pretoria, South Africa.

The heads of resident agencies form the UN Country Team (UNCT). Monthly meetings are convened by the Resident Coordinator. The Resident Coordinator is supported by the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) to coordinate and foster harmonisation of the work of the UN agencies. The UNCT is supported by the Programme and Policy Support Group (PPSG). The PPSG serves as the 'think tank' to the UNCT and is the main advisor of the UNCT on technical matters. It plays a critical role in the design and implementation of the UNDAF, and supporting the UNCT to '*deliver as one*'. Members of the PPSG are senior programme officers of resident agencies, and the PPSG is chaired by an agency head.<sup>9</sup>

#### 3.2 UNDAF 2011-2015

The Government of Swaziland and the United Nations formulated the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), for the period 2011-2015. The UNDAF outlines the United Nation's planned support to achieving the national priorities of Swaziland and also serves as the framework for coordinated development assistance from the United Nations, in those areas where the United Nations has comparative advantage. The current UNDAF is the second one for Swaziland, succeeding the first UNDAF 2006-2010. The UNDAF document and the MTR interviews with implementing partners and civil society indicate that the process of developing the UNDAF was consultative process.

The UNDAF 2011-2015 is organised around four pillars, namely, HIV and AIDS; Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods; Human Development and Basic Social Services; and Governance.

*Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS* seeks to support the national response to HIV and AIDS in Swaziland, guided by the Multi-Sectoral Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS. UN support is operationalized through the Joint UN Programme of Support on HIV and AIDS 2009-2015 (JUNPS).

*Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods* seeks to support Government's efforts to reduce and ultimately eradicate poverty as set out in the National Development Strategy. Through the UNDAF, UN agencies are engaged in a wide range of areas, for example, social protection, and sustainable ways of addressing hunger and malnutrition for vulnerable groups.

*Pillar 3: Human Development and Basic Social Services* focuses on supporting Government to address major developmental challenges through strengthening delivery and quality of social services

<sup>8</sup> The term 'agencies' is intended to cover United Nations programmes, funds and specialised agencies.

<sup>9</sup> UN PPSG Terms of Reference (undated)

and increasing equitable access to these basic social services. Women, children and disadvantaged groups are the target. Education, health, and water and sanitation are the focus of Pillar 3.

*Pillar 4: Governance* aims to support the Government in addressing some of the challenges in achieving the realisation of Swaziland's Constitution. Areas of support outlined in the UNDAF include capacity strengthening for implementation of the Constitution; addressing gender and human rights; capacity enhancement to promote transparency and accountability in the public sector and public office; strengthening national partnerships for development; and enhanced participation of civil society in governance.

The UNDAF includes three cross-cutting focal areas, namely, monitoring and evaluation; capacity development; and ICT.

Table 3 maps the outcomes of the UNDAF for each of the UNDAF pillars.

**Table 3: UNDAF Pillars and Outcomes**

<b>Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS</b>	
<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b>	<i>1. To contribute to reduced new HIV infections and improved quality of persons infected and affected by HIV by 2015</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Risky behaviour for prevention of HIV reduced</li> <li>1.2 Access to comprehensive HIV treatment, care and support increased</li> <li>1.3 Impact mitigation services for vulnerable children, PLHIV and elderly scaled up</li> <li>1.4 HIV and AIDS response effectively managed at all levels</li> </ul>
<b>Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods</b>	
<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b>	<i>2. Increased and more equitable access of the poor to assets and other resources for sustainable livelihoods</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 The poor's access to productive resources increased</li> <li>2.2 Effective social protection systems that secure the livelihoods of vulnerable communities in place</li> <li>2.3 Capacity of government and partners to address hunger and food insecurity among vulnerable groups is strengthened</li> </ul>
<b>Pillar 3: Human Development and Basic Social Services</b>	
<b>UNDAF Outcome</b>	<i>3. Increased access to and utilization of quality basic social services, especially for women, children and the disadvantaged</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1 Effective and efficient social services delivery (particularly health, education, water and sanitation) in place</li> <li>3.2 Basic social services to vulnerable groups, including women and children, equitably accessed</li> </ul>
<b>Pillar 4: Governance</b>	
<b>UNDAF Outcome</b>	<i>4. Strengthened national capacities for the promotion and protection of human rights</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1 Supportive policy and legal framework for improved governance in place</li> <li>4.2 Knowledge of rights by the people increased</li> <li>4.3 Gender equality enhanced</li> <li>4.4 Access to justice for all improved</li> </ul>

The results chain or logic of the UNDAF is not clear. The UNDAF outcomes appear to be the ‘higher order’ outcomes, while the joint country programme outcomes, if achieved, should contribute to achievement of the UNDAF outcomes. The logic is reasonably clear for UNDAF pillar 1, but not for the remaining UNDAF pillars.

A National Steering Committee, with representatives from Government, civil society and the UN system manages the UNDAF. Principal Secretary: Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, and the UN Resident Coordinator co-chair the National Steering Committee. Each UNDAF pillar is co-chaired by a head of agency and a Principal Secretary. The National Steering Committee convenes a Joint UNDAF Annual Review to review progress and achievements made by the UNDAF, address challenges and share lessons learnt.

The UNDAF had an indicative budget of US\$159,810,238 distributed across the four pillars, with the highest proportion (43.8 per cent) allocated to Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS, and the lowest proportion (6.1 per cent) allocated to Pillar 4: Governance (see Table 4).

**Table 4: UNDAF 2011-2015 Indicative Budget**

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Amount (USD)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS	69,992,000	43.8
Pillar 2: Poverty & Sustainable Livelihoods	35,553,488	22.3
Pillar 3: Human Development and Basic Social Services	44,504,000	27.8
Pillar 4: Governance	9,760,750	6.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>159,810,238</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Kingdom of Swaziland 2011-2015

Table 5 shows the resource envelope for the various agencies for the first three years of the UNDAF. The total amount mobilised over the three years is US\$ 72,023,676, representing 45 percent of the total indicative budget for the UNDAF. WFP constituted nearly one-third (31.2 percent) of the UNDAF resource envelope for the three-year period. The bulk of this funding was for food assistance to mitigate the impact of HIV and AIDS (Pillar 1) and to address hunger and food insecurity amongst vulnerable groups (Pillar 2). UNDP’s resource envelope constituted less than 10 percent of the overall UNDAF resources. UNAIDS is a coordinating body, so its resources envelope is not large as the expenditure on HIV and AIDS is incurred primarily through other agencies, for example, UNICEF, WHO and UNFPA.

**Table 5: UNDAF resource envelope per UN agency**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
FAO	4,670,000	4,700,000	2,500,000	11,870,000	16.5
ILO	120,000	135,000	149,000	404,000	0.6
UNAIDS	254,000	300,000	362,500	916,500	1.3
UNDP	1,967,000	1,200,000	3,123,950	6,290,950	8.7
UNESCO	380,000	300,000	N/A	680,000	0.9
UNFPA	1,350,000	1,630,000	2,460,000	5,440,000	7.6
UNICEF	5,700,000	5,900,000	3,300,000	14,900,000	20.7
UNODC	28,238	67,000	156,054	251,292	0.4
WFP	3,263,650	11,832,000	7,363,734	22,459,384	31.2
WHO	3,900,000	2,600,000	2,311,550	8,811,550	12.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,632,888</b>	<b>28,664,000</b>	<b>21,726,788</b>	<b>72,0236,676</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Resident Coordinator's Office, November 2013. All amounts are in US dollars.

## 4 Assessment of the UNDAF

### Part A: Progress towards UNDAF outcomes

This section assesses the UNDAF in terms of progress towards UNDAF outcomes. It evaluates the progress made in achieving the Joint Programme Outcomes in each UNDAF Pillars. The MTR did not assess the individual contributions of each agency to the UNDAF results as the programme and reporting cycles of agencies varied. Furthermore, some agencies were conducting mid-term reviews of their country programmes. The annual UNDAF reporting is done on the basis of the collective efforts of agencies within each pillar, and the MTR elected to adopt a similar approach.

The information from the UNDAF pillar reports and individual agencies focused on reporting activities and achievements, rather than results in terms of outcomes. Even though the UNDAF has outcome indicators, these were not tracked. This posed a challenge in making an assessment of the progress made towards achieving the UNDAF outcomes and Joint Country Programme Outcomes. The ensuing section of the report therefore looked at the achievements and tried to make an assessment of their contribution towards achieving the Joint Country Programme Outcomes. It should be noted that the tables in this section captures the main achievements as reported in the Annual UNDAF reports, and updated with more recent information where this information was available.

#### 4.1 Effectiveness

##### 4.1.1 Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS

The UN system's response to HIV and AIDS is captured in the Joint UN Programme of Support on HIV and AIDS 2009-2015 (JUNPS). The JUNPS serves as the operational plan for the UNDAF Pillar 1 and is operationalised through the Joint UN Team on HIV and AIDS (JUTA).

The UN system supported many initiatives with the aim of contributing to a reduction in new HIV infections and improving the quality of life of persons infected and affected by HIV. Table 5 shows the main achievements for Pillar 1.

**Table 6: Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS - Achievements**

<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b> <i>To contribute to reduced new HIV infections and improved quality of life of persons infected and affected by HIV by 2015</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>1.1 Risky behaviour for prevention of HIV reduced</i>
<p><b>Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacitated 119 institutions and traditional structures to provide comprehensive behavioural change training to individuals, using the National HIV Prevention tool kit</li> <li>• Assisted the development of the Sexual Reproductive Health Policy and the Integrated Sexual Reproductive Health Strategy and piloting commenced in 2013.</li> <li>• Advocacy for the adoption and integration of the HIV and AIDS in the curriculum through the national life skills education curriculum. By end 2012, 72 peer educators and 44 support system peer educators were trained. They are estimated to have reached in excess of 100,000 young girls at the annual Reed Dance.</li> <li>• Several community dialogues and community mobilisation undertaken in different communities to increase comprehensive knowledge of HIV.</li> <li>• Conducted situational analysis of HIV and AIDS in prisons; supported development of strategy for health and HIV and AIDS in prisons; trained master trainers in HIV and AIDS, STIs and TB in prison setting.</li> </ul>

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 1.2 Access to comprehensive HIV treatment, care and support increased**

**Achievements**

- In partnership with the Swaziland Business Coalition for HIV and AIDS (SWABCHA), the UN system supported extending access to HIV testing and counselling for men in the timber and sugar industries.
- Supported the follow-up on children receiving ART, through use of mobile phones and home visits, thereby increasing treatment adherence in 800 children.
- Supported 30 sites for screening of TB among PLWHIV.
- A total of 11 health facilities supported to provide nutritional food assistance to patients in treatment. Food assistance was provided to over 42,000 clients enrolled in ART, TB and PMTCT services and their households
- Supported capacity in social services and communities to reduce HIV-related stigma and discrimination in 10 chiefdoms in 2011.

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 1.3 Impact mitigation services for vulnerable children, PLHIV and elderly scaled up**

**Achievements**

- Supported capacitation of all 495 Schools as Centres of Care and Support – 62 per cent of schools were implementing the concept by the end of 2012
- Supported Neighbourhood Care Points (NCPs) strategy as a social protection system for vulnerable children. A total of 39,330 children received food assistance from NCPs as part of the package of support to orphans and vulnerable children. Supported integrated ECD for OVCs through NCPs
- Supported the development of several strategic documents, including the Early Learning Development Standards, the National Standards for Residential Care Facilities, and the Social Welfare Strategic Plan (2011-2015). Also, supported the dissemination of the Social Development Policy (2009) and the National Standards and Guidelines for Alternative Care.
- Supported development of a monitoring & evaluation framework for OVCs
- Supported distance learning for community-based caregivers (256 graduated)

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 1.4 HIV and AIDS response effectively managed at all levels**

**Achievements**

- Provided technical support for the development of institutional M&E systems for SWABCHA and the Public Service HIV and AIDS Coordinating Committee (PSHACC). These are operational.
- Supported the Regional Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS Coordinating Committee (REMSHACC) to convene quarterly progress meetings; supported CANGO to complete the Coordination Sector Plan.
- Capacitated sub-recipient of the GFATM on reporting procedures, financial management, governance, leadership and programme development. A total of 100 NGO representatives were trained.
- Supported the extension of the National Strategic Framework for HIV.

Source: Interviews with UN and government officials; UNDAF Annual Reports 2011 and 2012

Overall assessment:

**The UN system in Swaziland implemented several initiatives in the period under review. Government partners acknowledged the positive contribution of the UN system to Swaziland's response to the HIV and AIDS challenges. There is evidence of progress towards the expected results under Pillar 1, though not always at the level envisaged in the UNDAF.**

According to the 2012 Swaziland MDG Report, the country is on track to achieve universal access to treatment for HIV and AIDS, for those who need it. The Government has prioritised treatment and there has been a considerable injection of resources by development partners, notably, PEPFAR. The UN system complemented treatment through various care and support initiatives, for example, food assistance to HIV and TB patients and following up of children on ART. The UN system also contributed to impact mitigation through capacitating schools as centres of care and support, and

social protection measures for orphans and vulnerable children through Neighbourhood Care Points. In addition, the UN system contributed to strengthening institutional capacities for the effective management of the HIV and AIDS response, through for example, capacity building of sub-recipients of the GFATM.

The UN system and government partners expressed concern that the rate of new HIV infections especially among the young population (15-24 years) and that greater effort was required in the area of prevention. The Swaziland MDG 2012 report identified the need to accelerate efforts to address the HIV prevalence among 15-24 year olds and ensure that all in this age group have access to accurate knowledge of HIV and AIDS. UN agencies expressed the need to develop innovative strategies for prevention, and to have a more focused initiative rather than several smaller pieces of work. The need for greater attention to prevention was raised at the UNDAF 2012 Annual Review. In particular, the meeting called for designing new strategies to address issues of adolescent health, scaling up male circumcision, and male involvement in the prevention of mother to child transmission (PMTCT).<sup>10</sup>

Resource constraints within the UN system impacted on progress in Pillar 1, for example, impact mitigation for OVCs at the beginning of the UNDAF period only covered about one-third of children, though there was improvement in the subsequent 18 months.

The MTR identified systemic constraints on the side of government partners. Mainstreaming HIV and AIDS into non-health ministries is a challenge as HIV and AIDS is seen primarily as a health issue and the responsibility of the Ministry of Health.

#### 4.1.2 Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods

The Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods Pillar sought to address the interrelated challenges of high poverty and income inequality; food insecurity and nutrition; and non-sustainable environmental conditions. Table 7 shows the main achievements in respect of the outcomes in Pillar 2.

**Table 7: Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods - Achievements**

<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b> <i>2. Increased and more equitable access of the poor to assets and other resources for sustainable livelihoods</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>2.1 The poor's access to productive resources increased</i>
<p><b>Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building on SWAPs for Education, Health, Agriculture and Water and Sanitation, most progress in health SWAP</li> <li>• Poverty Adviser in place, national M&amp;E framework development in progress</li> <li>• National Disaster Management Policy approved. Contingency plans in one region. Capacity building plans for decentralisation and devolution of disaster management. Advocacy on disaster risk reduction.</li> <li>• Institutional capacity development for emergency preparedness and response for education sector, health sector and NGOs (Red Cross)</li> <li>• National Statistics Act review in progress</li> <li>• Agriculture Extension policy reviewed</li> <li>• Enhanced availability of national information and capacitated government and civil society to analyse secondary data</li> <li>• Trained government planners on integrating population variables in development plans and policies</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> United Nations in Swaziland, 2012 Swaziland UNDAF Annual Review, p.4 (undated)

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 2.2** *Effective social protection systems that secure the livelihoods of vulnerable communities in place*

**Achievements**

- Built capacity of 250 youth for income generating and other small scale livelihoods projects
- Smallholder farmers trained to improve self-reliance and increase food production
- Food assistance programme providing incentive for NCP care givers of vulnerable children (see also Pillar 1)
- Support to primary school feeding – reached all schools with about 260,000 children fed
- Convened high level dialogue on social protection; provided technical assistance to evaluate pilot Cash Transfer programme; facilitated South-South learning on social protection

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 2.3** *Capacity of government and partners to address hunger and food insecurity among vulnerable groups is strengthened*

**Achievements**

- Technical and financial support provided to Vulnerability Assessment Committee (though amounts of funding channelled declined) to conduct annual vulnerability assessment to inform programming
- Supported Swaziland Household Income and Expenditure Survey to inform poverty levels and patterns
- Supported rapid assessment to understand the impacts of the 2011 fiscal crisis and how the UN and Government can respond
- Supported development of National Climate Change Strategy and National Adaptation Management Policy
- Supported Cost of Hunger study

Source: Interviews of UN and government officials; UNDAF Annual Reports 2011 and 2012; UNDAF Pillar Review June 2013

Overall assessment:

**Progress towards the outcomes in Pillar 2 is uneven and is lagging considerably in some areas. Progress has largely been hampered by the UN system’s resource constraints, and the resource constraints within government.**

The UN system supported the government to develop its capacity to improve its policies and strategies for enhancing poor people’s access to resources for sustainable livelihoods. The appointment of technical advisory capacity to the Ministry of Economic Planning & Development (MEPD) Poverty Unit and National Population Unit has according to ministry, assisted with advancement of important policy analysis and building the national Monitoring & Evaluation system. Other contributions of the UN system include the ‘Food assistance for care givers, youth income-generation projects, and training of small scale farmers. In 2013 the UN system sought to engage the Government and other partners in dialogue on social protection, as a step towards developing a National Social Protection Strategy.

The UNDAF 2012 Annual Review raised several issues under Pillar 2, notably, the need for support from development partners and Government to strengthen the institutional capacity in the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives to reduce poverty through increased agricultural productivity. There was also a call for policy interventions to be put in place to enhance agricultural productivity; and the need to re-strategise the country’s response to food security.<sup>11</sup> The need to consider sustainable alternatives to food assistance through increased food production at local level was reiterated at the stakeholder workshop.

<sup>11</sup> United Nations in Swaziland, 2012 Swaziland UNDAF Annual Review, p.5 (undated)

A major challenge for Pillar 2 is that the resources available for delivering in this pillar were not commensurate with breadth of its intended outputs. WFP, for example, scaled back its activities in this pillar in 2011, due to resource constraints and the amount of funding channelled through the Vulnerability Assessment Committee was reduced. Problems were exacerbated by internal delays in government due to resource constraints or government decision-making processes. The funding situation from WFP improved in 2012 and 2013.

Due to resource constraints, the UN system's support fell short of the extent of support that government partners desired. The FAO for example, does not have a fully-fledged country office and it is impossible for the single focal point person to be available to government partners at all times. Areas of concern raised by the Ministry of Agriculture include the delay in finalising the Agriculture policy and the shift from focusing on the rehabilitation of agricultural training facilities to the training of agricultural extension officers. The Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA), while appreciating the support provided by the UN system to address the challenge of climate change, felt that other important environmental issues, for example, biodiversity, did not receive sufficient attention.

The SWAPs were identified as a priority for the Government and an important vehicle for coordinating the efforts of government ministries and development partners. The MEPD commissioned an in-depth assessment of the SWAPs. The assessment concluded that there was a relatively good implementation progress in the Health Sector SWAp, but overall progress with SWAPs has been slow. The assessment identified several challenges facing SWAPs, ranging from structural issues within government ministries; lack of adequate knowledge and skills in SWAP processes; and weak monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The assessment also identified inadequate and delayed funding from development partners as a factor delaying the implementation of SWAP work plans. It further noted that delayed funding may be attributable to weaknesses in public financial management.<sup>12</sup> The report made several recommendations, including the need to urgently re-launch the SWAPs in the Education Sector and the Agriculture Sector. The Education Sector, at the time of the MTR, was finalising the process of appointing a SWAp coordinator. The Agriculture Sector was yet to appoint a SWAp coordinator at the time of the MTR. According to the Ministry, there were also technical requirements, for example, a number of sector development assessments that had to be completed before the SWAP could be put in place.<sup>13</sup>

#### **4.1.3 Pillar 3: Human development and basic social services**

Pillar 3 of the UNDAF focused on contributing to the Government's efforts to improve Swaziland's human development index through improved access and quality of service delivery in areas of health, education and water and sanitation. The contribution of the UN system was through:

- (i) Strengthening national institutional capacities in evidence-based policy-making; enhanced information systems; and engagement of civil society and marginalised populations in policy-making.
- (ii) Enhancing demand creation by supporting stakeholders to mobilise vulnerable groups to access basic social services.

Table 8 shows the main achievements under Pillar 3.

<sup>12</sup> Hope, K. Ronald, The Sector Wide Approach Final Report, November 2012. Study commissioned by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland

<sup>13</sup> Minutes of the consultations on Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2013.

**Table 8: Pillar 3: Human development and basic social services - Achievements**

<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b> <i>3. Increased access to and utilization of quality basic social services, especially for women, children and the disadvantaged</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>3.1 Effective and efficient social services delivery (particularly health, education, water and sanitation) in place</i>
<p><b>Achievements (Education sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributed to improved Education Management Information System (EMIS); Education Policy (2012) and Education Strategy</li> <li>• Primary school operational costs study conducted to inform Schools regulations and procedures revision</li> <li>• Development of Early Childhood Education learning standards, teaching and learning materials</li> <li>• Child Friendly School initiative</li> <li>• Integration of HIV and AIDs prevention in school curriculum</li> <li>• Supported research on quality of education</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achievements (Health sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginalised populations (youth, commercial sex workers) contributed to Sexual Reproductive Health Policy</li> <li>• Health Management Information System (HMIS) reviewed, GIS-based mapping for TB supported</li> <li>• 20 health institutions including NGOs capacitated to provide integrated service delivery on ART and family planning; 67 service providers trained providing integrated services; 134 health workers trained on quality improvement; 90 nurses trained on improved management of labour and delivery</li> <li>• Reproductive health commodities integrated in national pharmaceutical and medicine's systems in 20 health facilities. 114 nurses trained in logistics management information systems. Capacity building in 4 regions in Emergency Preparedness and Response</li> <li>• Mid-term review of the National Health Sector Strategic Plan (2008-2013)</li> <li>• National Medicines Regulatory Framework established</li> <li>• Various guidelines for health developed</li> <li>• Supported provision of equipment in health facilities, TB laboratory, centres of excellence for SRH/HIV integrated services; medical equipment for one-stop centre for sexual and GBV cases</li> <li>• Supported NERCHA and Ministry of Health to access Global Funds</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achievements (Water and sanitation sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASH Forum established (multi-sectoral forum for water and sanitation), meets quarterly</li> </ul>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>3.2 Basic social services to vulnerable groups, including women and children, equitably accessed</i>
<p><b>Achievements (Education sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support of primary schools operational costs, school furniture</li> <li>• Supported national conference on children with disabilities in schools</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achievements (Health sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IEC materials provided to 170 health facilities</li> <li>• National immunisation campaigns and outreach programmes conducted in hard-to-reach areas – measles and polio, malnutrition, integrated child health services national campaign</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achievements (Water and Sanitation sector)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of safe drinking water source to 10 under-served communities (10 new hand pumps and 65 renovated hand pumps)</li> <li>• Rural schools supported with basic sanitation intervention schemes</li> </ul>

Source: Interviews of UN and government officials; UNDAF Annual Reports 2011 and 2012; UNDAF Pillar Review July 2013

Overall assessment:

**Progress within Pillar 3 was uneven. There was evidence of contributions in the health sector and in the education sector, particularly in relation to Joint Country Programme Outcome 3.1. The water and sanitation sector was lagging.**

The annual reports for Pillar 3 as well as the interviews with the UN agencies and government partners reveal uneven progress in Pillar 3. The health sector within Pillar 3 reported several initiatives and instances of support provided to government partners to strengthen partners' capacity. Within the education sector, much of the capacity support focused on enhancing information systems, research and development of policy frameworks. There were also examples of direct support to hard-to-reach communities and under-serviced rural areas. By contrast, the water and sanitation sector did not feature prominently in results-reporting under this pillar. According to the minutes of the Pillar 3 review meeting of 30 August 2013, there are many achievements under WASH but these were not captured in a monitoring & evaluation framework.<sup>14</sup> A WASH Forum has been established and has representation from multiple sectors. The WASH Forum initiated water point mapping, but at the time of the MTR, the forum was still in the process of appointing a consultant to do the mapping, with the aim of mapping all 55 Tinkhundla by June 2014, subject to the availability of funds.<sup>15</sup> The issue of government's capacity for coordination in the water and sanitation sector was discussed at the 2012 Swaziland Aid Effectiveness Retreat.<sup>16</sup> The SWAp for this sector was in the early stages of establishment.

The range of issues and partners covered under Pillar 3 of the UNDAF is extensive. Within the health sector component of Pillar 3, the UN system supported many capacity development and advocacy initiatives, and this was appreciated by government partners. This broad coverage runs the risk of losing focus and bogging the UN system down in minutiae at the expense of strategic health issues. Government partners expressed concern about the negative impact of the WHO restructuring on the level of capacity within the country office. Government partners also expressed concern that the advocacy work of the UN system did not provide for sufficient follow through to ensure that the advocacy 'bears fruit' in the form of policy and programme implementation. Given the UN system's limited resources, the realities of global restructuring of WHO, and the presence of other partners with much more funding, the UN system in Swaziland will need to consider where best it can make a contribution in the health sector. There is also the question of how the UN system is to respond to the issue of the re-emergence of non-communicable diseases raised in the 2012 UNDAF Annual Review.

Within the education sector, the support of the UN system was acknowledged positively by government partners who attributed the improvements in school enrolments and retention to the mitigation support provided by the UN system. The capacity development provided to the Ministry to strengthen evidence-based policy and decision-making was also appreciated by government partners. The Ministry of Education and Training expressed the need for training of EMIS officials in monitoring & evaluation, as the training currently is confined to planners seconded by the MEPD.

---

<sup>14</sup> Minutes of Pillar 3 Review Meeting, 30 August 2013

<sup>15</sup> Minutes of 50<sup>th</sup> WASH Stakeholder Forum, 27 September 2013

<sup>16</sup> Ministry of Economic Planning and Development: Aid Coordination and Management Section, Piggs Peak II: Swaziland Aid Effectiveness Retreat, 26-27 July 2012

#### 4.1.4 Pillar 4: Governance

Pillar 4 of the UNDAF aims to strengthen national capacities in Swaziland for the promotion and protection of human rights, in response to the governance challenges identified in the Complementary Country Analysis. The initiatives of the UN system sought to achieve four outcomes:

- (i) Supportive policy and legal framework for improved governance in place
- (ii) Knowledge rights by people increased
- (iii) Gender equality enhanced
- (iv) Access to justice for all improved

Table 9 shows the main achievements under Pillar 4.

**Table 9: Pillar 4: Governance - Achievements**

<b>UNDAF Outcome:</b> <i>4. Strengthened national capacities for the promotion and protection of human rights</i>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>4.1 Supportive policy and legal framework for improved governance in place</i>
<p><b>Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported review of 27 pieces of legislation for gender mainstreaming (2011), 6 laws reviewed in 2012 (e.g. Children's Act, Prevention of Organised Crime, Administrative Justice Bill)</li> <li>• 29 UN conventions ratified and deposited with the UN</li> <li>• Anti-Corruption Commission policy developed</li> <li>• Supported formulation of 3 strategic plans (Swaziland Revenue Authority, Ministry of Justice &amp; Constitutional Affairs, Commission for Human Rights &amp; Public Administration)</li> <li>• Enhanced skills for reporting by state party on key conventions</li> <li>• Supported compilation and submission of Swaziland's first Universal Periodic Review to the UN (2011)</li> <li>• Trained 12 senior investigators of Anti-Corruption Commission</li> </ul>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>4.2 Knowledge of rights by the people increased</i>
<p><b>Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voter education manual developed for use by civil society</li> <li>• Partnered with Leadership Development Foundation on civic education</li> <li>• Partnered with CHR&amp;PA and International Committee of Jurists to train police and correctional services staff and the media on human rights</li> </ul>
<b>Joint Country Programme Outcome:</b> <i>4.3 Gender equality enhanced</i>
<p><b>Achievements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender Policy Action Plan M&amp;E framework developed</li> <li>• Technical assistance to Gender and Family Issues Unit to strengthen capacity</li> <li>• Training of planners in gender responsive budgeting</li> <li>• Mobilised community leaders and traditional justice systems for prevention and response to gender-based violence in one region. Resulted in mapping GBV service and service providers and establishment of a GBV referral and surveillance system in the region. Psychosocial support for survivors of GBV.</li> <li>• Supported monitoring GBV cases within the formal court system</li> <li>• Partnered with NGO to train aspiring women candidate in local government elections</li> </ul>

**Joint Country Programme Outcome: 4.4 Access to justice for all improved****Achievements**

- Supported development of electronic case management system to institutionalise case flow management
- Supported development of Legal Aid policy
- Capacitated Members of Justice Portfolio Committee on Bills targeting women and children
- Training court officials on Constitution and Human Rights matters
- Training magistrates to handle juvenile witnesses and juvenile offenders
- Support for training prosecutors on GBV, sexual offences and human trafficking
- Child-friendly interviewing rooms established
- Support to Director of Public Prosecutions maintain electronic records on prosecutions

Source: Interviews of UN and government officials; UNDAF Annual Reports 2011 and 2012; UNDAF Pillar Review June 2013

Overall assessment:

**The UN system implemented several projects to strengthen capacities of government partners in the promotion and protection of human rights. These were primarily small, catalytic projects distributed across a number of government institutions. Their potential to contribute to the achievement of the country programme outcomes was constrained by the pace at which the Government was willing and able to scale up the interventions and follow through.**

The Governance pillar with its four outcomes covered a wide range of issues – international obligations; legislative and policy review; capacitating institutions through training, strategic planning, systems modernisation; citizen rights education; access to justice; and gender equality. With many partners to support in the governance sector and the UN system's limited resources, this meant spreading the support thinly.

*Joint country programme outcome 4.1:* The UN system supported the review of legislation to align with the provisions of the Constitution. The enactment of new legislation or amendments to reviewed legislation has to await the new parliament following the September 2013 elections. Engagement with the legislature was limited in the period under review, and the 2012 Joint Annual Review of Pillar 4 noted the difficulty in engaging with the legislature because of lack of the doctrine of the separation of powers of the different arms of Government.<sup>17</sup> The assumption of office by new parliamentarians following the September 2013 elections is an opportunity for the UN system to engage with the legislature. Notwithstanding the constraints noted in the 2012 Joint Annual Review, the legislature, in particular, the portfolio committees are potential avenues for UN advocacy, not only issues of governance, but on issues of development in general.

The ratification and deposit of 29 UN conventions is an achievement, and the real test is the extent to which the Government of Swaziland takes steps to enact new legislation or amend existing legislation to give domestic effect to these conventions. The UN system oriented Principal Secretaries on steps to take following ratification, and there were requests for further capacitation in this area.

The UN system supported the Government of Swaziland to submit its first Universal Periodic Review (UPR) to the Human Rights Council of the United Nations in 2011. The Government in its response to the 57 recommendations made by Member States informed the Human Rights Council that the recommendations had been reviewed and 90 per cent of these received favourable responses from the Government. Also, the National Steering Committee established to prepare the UPR was made

<sup>17</sup> UNDAF Pillar 4: Governance and Gender, 2012 Performance Report, October 2012

permanent and tasked with preparing state reports to the Treaty Monitoring Bodies.<sup>18</sup> The Commission on Human Rights and Public Administration (CHR&PA) was established in 2009 is expected to play a significant role in the UPR reporting process. At the time of the UNDAF MTR, the Commission was not yet fully capacitated in terms of staff and offices, and Commissioners operate on a part-time basis.<sup>19</sup> The UN system supported the CHR&PA to develop a strategic plan; built capacity in reporting on international obligations; and supported engagement with community leaders in preparation for civic education. However, without substantive support from the Government, the CHR&PA will not be able to fulfil adequately its constitutional mandate.

*Joint country programme outcome 4.2:* The UN system made a very limited contribution to increasing the knowledge rights of people. This is to be expected if the CHR&PA, which should be its main partner, is itself not sufficiently capacitated to perform its functions effectively. Civil society, the other key partner in Outcome 4.2 has limited capacity and operates in an environment in which advocacy on human rights is perceived with suspicion.

*Joint country programme outcome 4.3:* The UN system's support is organised under the Joint Programme on Gender. The 2012 MDG Report for Swaziland indicated that, at an aggregate level, the country is on track to achieve the MDG targets, except for the target relating to the proportion of women employed in the non-agricultural sector.<sup>20</sup> Gender-based violence is a significant problem in Swaziland, and the UN system supported several initiatives working with government as well as the NGO sector, notably, Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse (SWAGAA). The UN system provided technical and human capacity to the Family and Gender Unit in the Deputy Prime Minister's Office; supported the development of a gender policy action plan and monitoring & evaluation framework; and trained planners in gender-responsive budgeting. Results in this programme outcome are constrained by legislation that has not been finalised. The Sexual Offences and Domestic Violence Bill is not yet enacted. The mid-term review of the Joint Programme on Gender concluded advocacy campaigns contributed to influencing legislative reforms and the ratification of international instruments pertaining to women's rights. However, capacity building, technical assistance and awareness creation were done by individual agencies rather than jointly, and that there was a considerable way to go in achieving the outcomes of the Joint Programme on Gender.<sup>21</sup>

*Joint country programme outcome 4.4:* The UN system supported capacity development at the institutional level, through the development of electronic case management and records in the courts and the Directorate of Public Prosecutions. Government partners were optimistic that these capacity development interventions would result in efficiencies and enhance people's access to justice. Prosecutors, magistrates and court officials were trained in aspects of GBV, human rights, juvenile justice, and human trafficking, though government partners raised concerns that not all magistrates could be trained due to logistical problems.

The introduction of legal aid has the potential to significantly enhance poor people's access to justice. The UN system supported the development of a legal aid policy framework. The Legal Aid Bill has been drafted, but the Government has not made funding provision for the establishment and operationalisation of the Legal Aid Board.

<sup>18</sup> Statement to the Human Rights Council by Chief Mgwagwa Gamedze, Honourable Minister for Justice and Constitutional Affairs of the Kingdom of Swaziland, 15 March 2012

<sup>19</sup> The Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs advised that the CHR&PA would have a budget for staff recruitment and offices would be in place by end 2013, Minutes of consultations on Pillar 4: Governance, 13 June 2014

<sup>20</sup> Government of Swaziland Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland Millennium Development Goals Progress Report, September 2012, p.55

<sup>21</sup> United Nations Swaziland, Mid-Term Review of the GoS/UN Joint Programme on Gender, June 2013

#### 4.1.5 UNDAF monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is one of the cross-cutting areas of the UNDAF. The mid-term review of the UNDAF 2006-2010 identified monitoring and evaluation as a major weakness.

**The UN system implemented improvements to the monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF, but there is need for further strengthening of monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF.**

The UN system took a positive step in establishing a Monitoring & Evaluation Committee as part of the management structure of the 2011-2015 UNDAF. The main duties and responsibilities of the M&E Committee are to<sup>22</sup>:

- (i) Provide support to the UNCT in implementing the UNDAF M&E system. This includes advising on improvements to the M&E system; defining communication and reporting channels; designing M&E tools; designing and conducting M&E training; assisting with the UNDAF Annual Review and preparing the UNDAF Annual Review Report; and reviewing national M&E mechanisms to align with the UNDAF M&E system.
- (ii) Provide support to the UNCT in enhancing the M&E of joint UN initiatives. This includes proposing and implementing M&E systems for joint programmes and joint activities; and advising on M&E requirements to report on the UNDAF implementation.
- (iii) Provide support to the UNCT in communicating the results of the UNDAF and joint projects and activities. This includes developing a communication plan and assisting with the dissemination of information.

The M&E Committee contributed to the development of the UNDAF Monitoring & Evaluation Framework and the Monitoring & Evaluation Calendar. Each UNDAF pillar has an M&E focal point and M&E sub-committees for each UNDAF pillar are required to meet quarterly to prepare the quarterly UNDAF reports. Joint Annual Reviews of the UNDAF were held to discuss progress with the implementation of the UNDAF, challenges and lessons learnt. The review of 2012 performance was attended by government, other development partners and civil society. From the available evidence, it appeared that the quarterly reviews by the pillars did not always take place as scheduled.

The M&E Committee was integrated into the Programme and Policy Support Group (PPSG). In doing so, the PPSG was able to draw on information from the Monitoring & Evaluation Committee to improve the quality of programming. The M&E Committee also led the development of the Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data and is responsible for the oversight of the joint programme. Subsuming the Monitoring & Evaluation Committee under the PPSG runs the risk of compromising the relative independence required by the Monitoring & Evaluation Committee to carry out its tasks.

The M&E Committee reviewed and revised the indicators in the UNDAF. The original number of 110 indicators was reduced to 42 main indicators and 22 alternative indicators. Of these 42 main indicators 20 are new indicators and six are modified indicators. This means that a very large proportion of the original indicators in the UNDAF were not applicable for monitoring the UNDAF. It is good practice to refine indicators, but the large number of new indicators raises questions about the capability of the UN system to develop robust indicators in the UNDAF process. Significant changes to indicators also make for discontinuities in measuring progress.

---

<sup>22</sup> United Nations in Swaziland, Terms of Reference UN Monitoring Committee (undated), obtained from Resident Coordinator's Office

The annual reporting from each UNDAF pillar was not standardised. The reports focussed on the achievements within each pillar, but do not track these achievements against the output indicators of the UNDAF, except in the case of the HIV and AIDS pillar.

One of the challenges for monitoring and evaluation in the UN system in Swaziland was the absence of an effective information repository on UNDAF quarterly and annual reports, agency-specific evaluations and reviews that are relevant to the UNDAF, and UNDAF-related programme documents. These documents were not readily available from the country-level websites and it is therefore difficult for external partners to access information relating to the UNDAF.

## 4.2 Efficiency

One of the intentions of the UNDAF is to achieve efficiencies through having a single framework for the collaborative efforts of the UN system in a given country. The UNDAF should reduce or eliminate duplication and overlap between agencies, and to some extent reduce the transaction costs of the government partners dealing with agencies. This section of the report assesses the efficiency of the UNDAF in terms of resource mobilisation and programming. It also touches briefly on administrative efficiency issues.

### 4.2.1 Programming efficiency

The practice of joint programming and development and implementation of joint programmes is evolving. The UN system implemented two joint programmes in the period under review, and a third joint programme launched in July 2013<sup>23</sup>.

The *Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS (2009-2015)* is well-established, and from the available evidence, the Joint Programme functions optimally. Roles and responsibilities were defined clearly, in line with the Division of Labour set out by UNAIDS.<sup>24</sup> All 10 UN agencies with a presence in Swaziland participate in the joint programme. In most instances, parallel funding was used, that is, each agency funded its own work within the Joint Programme.

The *Joint Programme on Gender* was established under the current UNDAF in 2011 with all 10 UN agencies active in Swaziland. The programme was subjected to a mid-term review in 2013. The review noted the achievements made in delivering, but found that except for advocacy campaign, the Joint Programme on Gender did not ‘deliver as one’. Capacity development, technical assistance support and awareness creation were implemented by individual agencies in parallel or in isolation of one another. The review found weak coordination and monitoring, exacerbated by the model of parallel funding. Limited partnerships and resource mobilisation were also identified as shortcomings of the joint programme.<sup>25</sup>

The *Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data (2013-2015)* is the most recent of the joint programmes and commenced in July 2013. The objective of the joint programme is to strengthen the capacity of the Central Statistics Office, key line Ministries and partners in data collection, analysis and use of strategic information for decision-making and learning. Government partners and UN staff involved in monitoring & evaluation are expected to benefit from training provided under the joint programme. Internally, the project is managed by the UNDAF Monitoring & Evaluation Analyst with

<sup>23</sup> The MTR had sight of an unsigned programme document for this third joint programme.

<sup>24</sup> UNAIDS, Division of Labour: Consolidated Guidance Note 2010, Geneva

<sup>25</sup> United Nations Swaziland, Mid-Term Review of the GoS/UN Joint Programme on Gender, June 2013

oversight provided by the UNDAF M&E Group. Activities that form part of existing agency plans are funded through a parallel funding arrangement. Future funding will be on a Pass-through arrangement with UNDP acting as the Administrative Agent.<sup>26</sup>

#### **4.2.2 Resource mobilisation for the UNDAF**

The UNDAF set itself an indicative budget of US \$159,810,238 over the five-year period. The total amount mobilised over the first three years is US\$ 72,023,676, representing 45 percent of the total indicative budget for the UNDAF. The UNDAF, when developed, did not identify how much funding had to be mobilised each year over the UNDAF period. It was therefore difficult for the MTR to determine whether the amount mobilised to date is more or less in line with the UNDAF indicative budget. A crude estimate suggests that 66 percent of the indicative budget should have been mobilised within the first three years of the UNDAF cycle. UN agencies and government partners identified the need for more effective resource mobilisation. MTR of the Joint Programme on Gender identified a 64 per cent funding gap.

The MTR could not obtain information of how much of the resources mobilised were actually spent in each of the UNDAF pillars. This information was not tracked by the Monitoring & Evaluation Committee. The information could not be reconstructed from the expenditure reports obtained from the different agencies as each agency had its own reporting format and reporting conventions. The ODA figures from the Aid Coordination Management Section show that collectively the UN system in Swaziland disbursed US\$ 16,756,388 in 2011/2012. As the Government and the UN system have different financial reporting cycles it is difficult to make an assessment of the expenditure under the UNDAF.

#### **4.2.3 Administrative efficiency**

The UN system, through its Operations Management Team (OMT) embarked on an efficiency drive. This included the development of a single financial reporting format which implementing partners found useful in their reporting. The OMT also harmonised rates for implementing partners. Some agencies such as UNDP included the OMT in the quarterly meetings with implementing partners to sensitise the implementing partners to agency procedures.

From the perspective of government partners, the UN system was generally seen to be efficient. Government partners did however express frustration with delays in decision-making and procurement for one of the Non-Resident agencies where procurement decisions had not been delegated to the country level focal point and approval had to be sought from the global headquarters.

#### **4.2.4 Overall assessment of efficiency**

The UNDAF is managed, implemented and monitored through a number of structures within the UN system. There are four thematic working groups (one for each pillar), reporting to the UNCT. The UNCT in turn is supported by the PPSG and M&E Committee. Each pillar has an M&E focal point. The structures meet on a monthly basis as well as on a quarterly basis, and quarterly consultations are held with government partners. Although there is a large degree overlap between the activities of the UNDAF and the activities of the activities under the country programmes, officials still have to attend to their agency-specific activities, meetings and reporting. Given the small size of the UN system in Swaziland, having so many points of coordination does not reduce transaction costs. This is consistent

---

<sup>26</sup> United Nations, Swaziland, Government of Swaziland and UN Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data, July 2013. FAO, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP and WHO participate in the joint programme

with research findings on the evaluation of UNDAFs – it was found that UNDAF programming requirements were additional to agency programming at country level and does not substitute for programming processes at individual agency level.<sup>27</sup>

### 4.3 Sustainability of results

The sustainability of results is an important consideration in the assessment of the UNDAF. Swaziland is a relatively small country in terms of population and geography and although the UN system's financial and technical resources are relatively small, there is the potential to make an impact and achieve sustainable results. The country's categorisation as a medium human development country suggests that there is potential human capital in the country to leverage the support provided by the UN system and other development partners.

**The UNDAF results were found to be sustainable to the extent that the interventions are aligned with national priorities and complement Government's on-going programmes. However, there are threats to sustainability. UN agencies and government partners raised concerns about sustainability, albeit for different reasons.**

Government partners such as the Ministry of Education and Training expressed confidence that the results of support from the UN system were sustainable as the training received by officials helped to develop their capacity. Similarly, the High Court officials were confident that the case management system would be sustainable through the training provided to relevant court officials.

However, the overall picture on sustainability was that it is an area that required greater attention on the part of the UN system and government partners. There was no evidence of deliberate monitoring of exit strategies that appeared in programming and project documents. The UNDAF document did not address sustainability of results explicitly, although it did make reference to issues such as capacity development and national ownership that potentially contribute to sustainability of results.

The following factors impact negatively on the sustainability of results:

- (i) There are very few donors in Swaziland, and the UN system is often the first and only port of call for government partners. From the interviews conducted in this MTR, there was a perception on the part of a number of government partners that the United Nations is a donor, in much the way as bi-lateral development agencies (JICA or DfID). There was an expectation that the UN system in Swaziland should provide funding for scaling up initiatives.
- (ii) Although there has been some fiscal relief through increased revenues from SACU, government partners did not always have the funds to scale up projects or implement the policies and programmes that the UN system had supported them to design.
- (iii) Some government partners felt that they did not have any ownership in the UNDAF. Although they acknowledged that they had participated in the UNDAF consultations, they believed that ultimately, the UNDAF was biased towards priorities of the UN System and that the UNDAF document did not sufficiently acknowledge the role and contribution of the Government. It should be noted that the UNDAF results matrix spells out the role of partners,

---

<sup>27</sup> Balogun, P., The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF): A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, May 2012

including government partners. Nevertheless, there was a sense on the part of some government partners that they did not have any ownership in the UNDAF.

- (iv) The UN system engaged in upstream work as well as downstream work. However, there was no conscious attempt, except in the case of social protection, to make the connections between upstream and downstream work so that upstream policy work was informed by the practical experiences of downstream projects and vice versa.

Many of the UN system's support initiatives aimed to strengthen institutional and individual capacity and these in turn would contribute to the sustainability of results. A significant proportion of capacity development was in the form of training. The UN system, however, did not undertake any evaluations of follow-up on the many training events to assess whether or not training participants were able to apply the learning in the work place.

The SWAps offer the potential to enhance the sustainability of results, as they *crowd in* technical and financial resources from several development partners into a particular sector. Furthermore, SWAps are driven and owned by government partners.

## Part B: Strategic Position of United Nations in Swaziland

This section of the report discusses the UN system's strategic position in Swaziland. The evaluation criteria are relevance, use of comparative advantage and UN coherence. It also discusses cross-cutting issue of partnerships.

### 4.4 Relevance

The MTR assessed the relevance of the UNDAF in terms of how relevant the programmes identified in the UNDAF responded to national development challenges and priorities; and how the UNDAF responded to significant changes in the country situation. The assessment of relevance also considered the relevance of approaches used by the UN system in responding to these national development challenges and priorities.

#### **The UNDAF was relevant to the national development challenges and priorities of Swaziland to the extent that it reflected the priority areas identified in national strategies and frameworks.**

The UNDAF outcomes were linked to the National Development Strategy, the Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme (2007-2015), the Government Programme of Action (2008-2013), and the Multi-Sectoral Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS (2009-2014). Swaziland has the highest HIV prevalence in the world, and given the potentially devastating impact of HIV and AIDS on a small population as Swaziland, the UNDAF's emphasis on HIV and AIDS was appropriate. Areas identified in the Government Programme of Action include improved service delivery, health, education and skills development, environment and disaster management, and strengthening governance institutions. All of these were reflected in the UNDAF.

Poverty and income inequality are major national development challenges. **Although the UNDAF prioritised poverty reduction, the kinds of support interventions in the UNDAF were obliquely relevant to addressing the fundamental economic structural issues that drive poverty and income inequality.** The type of support interventions under this UNDAF pillar did not respond to the growing national challenge of declining economic growth and increasing unemployment, especially youth unemployment.

**The UNDAF displayed a balance between ‘upstream’ and ‘downstream’ work. However, there were no explicit links between upstream support and downstream support.** In implementing the UNDAF, there were projects or initiatives aimed at strengthening the legislative and policy environments (upstream) and downstream projects such as training small holder farmers to increase food production. In most instances upstream work and downstream work were implemented as discrete projects, with no attempt to link the two. The value of downstream projects as a source of learning and feeding into policy and programme development was not exploited sufficiently.

#### 4.5 Use of comparative advantage

The UNDAF identified the following areas of comparative advantage for the UN system in Swaziland:

- (i) The mandate to address human development and associated challenges
- (ii) The know-how in social and governance spheres
- (iii) The capacity to mobilise and leverage resources from a diversity of sources
- (iv) Global reach with respect to expertise and knowledge brokering
- (v) Possess convening powers

The MTR assessed the extent to which the UN system made use of these comparative advantages.

**The UN system made good use of its mandate to address human development challenges, but could do better.** As it is one of the few development partners, the UN system was sought out by government partners for assistance on a broad range of human development challenges. The various UN agencies responded to these needs, in keeping with their mandates. The several examples of the UN system supporting the country to address human development and related challenges were given in the preceding chapter of this report. However, these will not necessarily shift the development trajectory as they do not address the structural and governance challenges that impede Swaziland’s progression towards the higher level of human development that the country seeks.

**Although the UN system had the mandate to address a broad range of human development issues, it did not always have the technical expertise to respond to all these issues.** Government partners valued the technical expertise that the UN system. Undoubtedly, the UN system had a comparative advantage in HIV and AIDS and used this effectively. However, there was concern on the part of some government partners that the UN system was not always able to bring new and innovative ideas to the table or the level of technical expertise required for a particular issue. Resource constraints within the UN system limited its capacity to draw the best technical expertise from its global networks, though there were examples of leveraging regional UN technical expertise in the area of HIV and AIDS.

**There were a few examples of the UN system brokering knowledge.** Examples include government partners learning about cash transfers from Lesotho and Malawi; learning from SWAps in Malawi and Uganda; and from South Africa on the small claims court. This knowledge brokering, though valued by government partners, was ad hoc and did not form part of a coherent knowledge management strategy.

**The UN system made limited use of its convening powers in the period under review.** There are many sensitive and difficult issues in Swaziland, especially in the area of governance. There was a sense from civil society that the United Nations could make more effective use of its convening powers to bring government and civil society around the table to discuss difficult and sensitive issues, as the United Nations is neutral. Some government partners were of the view that the UN system

should focus on supporting the Government, and if the UN system is to build capacity of civil society, it should be to strengthen their service delivery role.

**The UN system promoted the UN values of gender equality and women’s empowerment; and human rights.** The UNDAF had a Joint Programme on Gender and also incorporated a gender perspective in projects in all the pillars of the UNDAF. The issue of gender was very visible on the agenda of the UN system in Swaziland. Children’s rights as human rights featured prominently in the implementation of the UNDAF. Although the UN system supported institutions and processes aimed at promoting human rights, the UN system was severely curtailed by the Government’s pace in implementing the recommendations of the Universal Periodic Review and the domestication of the various international conventions to which it is a signatory.

#### 4.6 UN coherence

System-wide coherence, including coherence at the country level is an important aspect of the United Nations reform agenda, and there are several General Assembly resolutions on the issue of coherence. ‘Delivering as One (DaO) has been one of the key reform initiatives of the United Nations, and there are currently 30 countries operating within the DaO model.<sup>28</sup> Delivering as One calls for One Programme, One Leader, One Budgetary Framework, One Office, and some UNCTs have adopted the principle of ‘Communicating as One’.

Swaziland is not an official ‘Delivering as One’ (DaO) country, but the UN system sought to “...*strive to forge greater internal coherence and enhance its efficiency and effectiveness and work towards “Delivering as One” as part of its comprehensive strategy for increasing development impact...*”<sup>29</sup>

Having an UNDAF is not the same as having ‘One Programme’ as in the DaO model, but it has the potential to promote coherence in the UN system at country level. The MTR perused the Country Programmes of individual agencies and found that, generally country programmes made reference to the UNDAF. Staff in the various agencies reported that coordination under the current had improved steadily over the previous UNDAF, and could be strengthened even further.

**There was evidence of constructive collaboration amongst the UN agencies in Swaziland.** The interviews with head of agencies and staff reflected a willingness to collaborate. This willingness is an essential ingredient in building a coherent UN system in Swaziland. However, the architecture, processes and mandates of the different UN agencies, as well as global priorities emanating from headquarters reinforce a focus agency-specific agendas rather than a collective agenda as envisaged by the DaO approach. The joint programming approach that the UN system has adopted in Swaziland is a potential vehicle to strengthen coherence within the UN system.

**The Resident Coordinator’s Office, though small, provided an adequate level of coordination support to the United Nations Resident Coordinator. However, the RCO did not always have the requisite information from the UN agencies to play its coordination support role as effectively as it could.** The Regional Coordinator’s Office supported the UN Resident Coordinator in critical phases of the UNDAF development and implementation. It worked closely with the Programme and Policy Support Group and the UNDAF Monitoring & Evaluation Committee. In addition to providing secretariat support for the UNCT, the RCO also provided secretariat support to

<sup>28</sup> United Nations, Remarks by Debbie Landey, Director of the United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO), Plenary Session 2: Impact and Sustainability of Delivering as One, High-level Intergovernmental Conference on Delivering as One: Tirana Conference, 27 June 2012

<sup>29</sup> United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Swaziland 2011-2015, p3.

the UNDAF Pillar 3. The information systems in the RCO, however, were not well-developed and the RCO was very dependent on the information provided by the individual agencies and the monitoring & evaluation committee. There was no ‘one-stop-shop’ for information on the UNDAF. The One UN website is not sufficiently developed or updated with the latest information on the ‘One UN’ in Swaziland. The Aid Coordination Management Section within the Ministry of Economic Planning noted the challenges of obtaining information from the RCO, and that it had to approach agencies directly for information.

**Government partners experienced the UN system as reasonably coordinated, but identified areas where coordination could improve.** The main area of concern was capacity development. Each of the UN agencies was involved in capacity development but there is no common approach to capacity development. Capacity development activities such as training were not adequately coordinated, with different agencies training the same staff albeit covering different things. Individual agencies do not check with one another what training is being delivered to whom and individual agencies have their own capacity development methodologies. Apart from the potential confusion created by different approaches of the UN agencies, this lack of coordination also imposes a burden on ministries and service delivery as government officials spend a great deal of time in training and workshops.

#### **4.7 Partnerships with non-state actors**

The MTR of the 2006-2010 UNDAF recommended that the role of non-state actors be further developed and clarified so that they could participate effectively in the UNDAF processes, and that the establishment of a UN-CSO advisory forum be formalised. The United Nations Civil Society Advisory Committee was launched in September 2009, with 13 members from the NGO sector, the media, faith-based organisations, civic organisations, organised labour, youth, environment and the international NGO sector. The role of the UN-Civil Society Advisory Committee (CSAC) was essentially to facilitate the participation of civil society in the work of the UN system; bring civil society perspectives to UNCT deliberations; ensure that civil society played an active role in monitoring the MDGs and holding Government and development partners accountable; and advising on capacity building of civil society in Swaziland.<sup>30</sup>

The Resident Coordinator’s Office advised the MTR that the CSAC met regularly to strategise on key areas for advocacy, for example, matters pertaining to resource mobilisation, strengthening revenue collection through the Swaziland Revenue Authority and commemoration of Human Rights Day. The last meeting of the CSAC is reported to have taken place in July 2013 where a decision was made to develop a memorandum of understanding to govern the partnership. The memorandum is expected to cover, among other things, how the United Nations engages with and collaborates with civil society, capacity development and resource support.<sup>31</sup> That the CSAC is developing a framework for engagement four years after it had been launched suggests that there was a considerable lull in activities of the CSAC in this current UNDAF cycle. The Resident Coordinator’s Office advised that a number of very active CSAC members have since moved on.

The UN system involved civil society, in particular, the NGO sector in consultations on the UNDAF and specific programmatic areas, for example, social protection. Some NGOs have also been appointed as implementing partners, for example, SWAGAA in the gender-based violence project.

<sup>30</sup> United Nations Swaziland, Concept note and ToR for the establishment of the UN-Civil Society Advisory Committee (CSAC), 18 May 2009

<sup>31</sup> Email communication from the RCO, dated 30 and 31 October 2013. The RCO was requested to provide minutes of meetings of CSAC, but these were not available.

The MTR did not have the opportunity to interview a broad range of members from civil society, although an attempt was made to do so. From those interviewed, the view expressed was that the UN system should do more to capacitate the NGO sector of civil society, not only as implementing partners in development, but also for their advocacy role.

The UN system's engagement with the private sector was primarily through the ILO under the Decent Work Country Programme for Swaziland (2010-2014). The UN Resident Coordinator has initiated discussions with the private sector, but these discussions were at a very early phase at the time of the MTR.

## 5 Challenges, lessons learnt and future opportunities

### 5.1 Challenges and constraints

This section of the report discusses the challenges and constraints implementing the UNDAF. Some of these have been alluded to in the preceding chapter.

*Limited national ownership:* The UNDAF was seen primarily as a document of the United Nations, even though there was a consultative process in designing the UNDAF. The co-chairing of UNDAF pillars by Government and the UN system at senior level went some way to instil a sense of ownership by government partners, but these sessions were too infrequent to sustain a sense of joint ownership of the UNDAF and its results. The UNDAF was not promoted in any extensive way beyond government partners, to non-state actors.

*UNDAF design problems:* The theory of change or programme logic was not obvious in UNDAF design, and so the link between UNDAF outcomes, Joint Programme Outcomes and Outputs was not always clear. This was the case for all UNDAF Pillars, except Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS. Problems with the indicators in the UNDAF were noted earlier. The large number of indicators in the initial UNDAF document suggests a lack of clarity in articulating the results to be achieved and how these were to be measured. Indicators were not annualised making it difficult to discern the period covered when reporting on a particular indicator. There was also confusing terminology used in UNDAF reporting – it was unclear what was meant by “strategic results” as they did not appear in the UNDAF Results Framework or in the UNDAF Monitoring & Evaluation Framework. There was an overlap between Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 with regard to food security for vulnerable groups and double reporting as a result of this overlap.

*Limited resources for implementation:* The availability of financial resources to implement the UNDAF was a major assumption that did not hold true for all the pillars of the UNDAF. Activities were scaled back, as was the case in Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods. However, another serious consequence of limited resources is that the UN system spread small amounts of funding across a wide spectrum of activities. This was especially the case in Pillar 4: Governance. The potential impact of UN support is diluted and sustainability is at risk. The limited resources also impacted on the length of technical support that the UN system could provide. The short-term technical support was in a number of instances not sufficient to achieve the desired result. Financial resources from the Government's side were also constrained.

*Limited number of development partners:* There were few development partners in Swaziland and the UN system was the first and last option for assistance. In being responsive to the many requests from Government, the UN system's support was fragmented and spread across many initiatives in many ministries. With little or no competition from other development partners, the UN system did not

always reflect on its comparative advantage before responding to requests. The limited number of development partners also impacted negatively on the UN system's ability to mobilise resources to fill significant funding gaps.

*Weak coordination capacity:* The stated willingness amongst UN agencies to collaborate was not backed up by good coordination capacity at various levels. The Resident Coordinator's Office, as the key coordinating unit for the UNDAF, lacked the information systems for the overall monitoring of the UNDAF, and for disseminating information to implementing partners, including the Aid Coordination Unit in the Ministry of Economic Planning & Development. Coordination capacity for the Joint Programme on Gender was weak.<sup>32</sup> The Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data, according to the programme document, was to be managed by the UNDAF M&E Analyst located in the Resident Coordinator's Office. The person would be responsible for facilitating the technical coordination of various activities and outputs, consolidate activities into work plans and budgets, and prepared narrative and financial reports based on contributions from all participating agencies.<sup>33</sup> This arrangement is similar to that envisaged under the Joint Programme on Gender that was not implemented.

*Limited knowledge sharing and learning from evaluations:* Individual agencies commissioned evaluations of aspects of their country programmes. Although there was a PPSG and M&E Committee in place, this structure did not process these evaluation reports in a way that the results could form part of the knowledge base of the UN system and inform the UNDAF programming.

## 5.2 Lessons learnt

The following lessons were identified in the course of the MTR:

*Government ownership and leadership:* The results of the UNDAF are dependent on the extent to which Government is willing and able to take ownership and leadership of initiatives. Government ownership and leadership of the HIV and AIDS agenda were very apparent. NERCHA, as Government's primary agency leading the HIV and AIDS strategy, was able to provide leadership, articulate its needs and priorities. The UN system was able to align its support to these clearly articulated needs.

*Involve partners in the conceptual phase:* It is important to involve implementing partners as early as possible in the project or programme, ideally at the conceptual phase. In this way, potential obstacles and risks that may not be obvious to UN officials can be identified and mitigation strategies developed. Early involvement also fosters a greater sense of ownership and hence commitment, to ensuring that the project is implemented effectively and that intended results are achieved.

*Quality of support matters:* Swaziland is a middle-income country with an educated public service that is capable of engaging on complex development issues. Government partners are very capable of discerning between poor or mediocre technical support and good quality technical support. When the UN system provides technical advisory support that are of poor quality, government partners are critical and dissatisfied with the support. Quality support also includes an understanding of the local context, so a combination of national and international expertise can enhance the quality of technical advice and support provided through the UN system.

---

<sup>32</sup> United Nations, Final Report of the MTR of the GoS/UN Joint Programme on Gender, June 2013

<sup>33</sup> Programme Document for Government of Swaziland and UN Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data, July 2013

*Resources for coordination:* Coordinating the UNDAF and joint programmes cannot be left to chance or dealt with as an add-on task. Coordination requires dedicated resources, in the form of staffing and systems, in particular, information systems. The experiences of the SWAs underscore the importance of having dedicated resources for coordination.

*Test assumptions in design phase:* It is essential to test assumptions and identify risks in the planning phase of the UNDAF. A thorough testing of assumptions, for example, availability of resources and political will, might have led the UNDAF drafting team to question some of the outcomes and outputs that were proposed. While the outcomes and outputs might not have changed, there would at least be an opportunity to put strategies in place to mitigate and manage the risks.

*Monitoring, evaluating and documenting:* It is essential to have a sound monitoring and evaluation framework from the outset of the UNDAF. The framework should be developed simultaneously with the development of the UNDAF, as it also helps to test how realistic the outcomes and outputs are. Good documentation of UNDAF implementation is necessary to make informed assessments about the progress. It is essential to evaluate key projects and programmes under the UNDAF to assess their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact. A mid-term review of the UNDAF is done at too high a level to develop a solid evidence base of which UN support interventions have worked or not worked and why.

### 5.3 Future opportunities

There are several opportunities for the UN system to leverage.

*Post-2015 agenda:* The Government conducted a national consultative process to shape the development agenda beyond 2015. The consultations identified the following top six priorities<sup>34</sup>:

- Ending Poverty;
- Quality Education and Lifelong Learning;
- Ensuring Health Lives;
- Ensure Food Security & Nutrition;
- Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods and Equitable Growth; and
- Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions

The post-2015 agenda provides an opportunity for the UN system to rethink or refine its strategy in Swaziland. An important message from these national consultations was the desire for new approaches to addressing development challenges in Swaziland, for approaches that empowered and capacitated citizens to have productive, healthy lives. The consultations highlighted the need to improve integrated development policy-making, planning and programming, and strengthening key institutions in order to achieve the new development goals. The consultations identified need for an integrated framework for implementation, management and monitoring of the agenda in a more coordinated way.<sup>35</sup> The UN system will need to carve out its role within this new agenda, based on its mandate, comparative advantages and resources.

---

<sup>34</sup> Kingdom of Swaziland, The Post-2015 Development Agenda: The Swaziland We Want, A report on the National Consultations on the United Nations post-2015 Development Agenda, September 2013, p.32

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p.34

*International, Continental and Regional conventions:* Swaziland has ratified many conventions and has conducted a Universal Periodic Review. The report on the implementation of the UPR recommendations is scheduled for completion in 2014. These conventions will require domestication, an area where the UN system can support. The UN system's comparative strength in advocacy is also pertinent in the area of international conventions pertaining to development and human rights.

*New parliament:* The September 2013 elections ushered in a new parliament. Working with the relevant portfolio committees provides an opportunity for the UN system to broaden its partnership base and advocacy on development issues and enactment of legislation.

*Potential for new partnerships:* The private sector in Swaziland is small but has expressed interest in extending its collaboration with the UN system. The African Development Bank has through its regional resource centre offers an opportunity to complement the knowledge resources of the UN system in Swaziland.

*Government commitment to SWAs:* The Government has adopted sector-wide approach to planning and budgeting as a means for sector stakeholders to engage, and for development partners to harmonise their activities and resources. SWAs offer the potential to 'crowd in' resources to priority sectors, thereby enhancing the sustainability of development results.

*Maturing of Delivering as One model:* Several UNCTs have adopted the Delivering as One model. There is a wealth of knowledge and experience to draw on the global UN system. Small countries such as Albania and Cape Verde with few resident UN agencies have adopted the 'One Programme' are potentially useful learning sources for the UN system in Swaziland to strengthen its coherence.

## 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 6.1 Conclusions

**Conclusion 1:** The UNDAF was compatible with national development priorities as all the areas covered by the UNDAF reflected the development priorities set out in the National Development Strategy and the Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme. The UNDAF gave appropriate emphasis to the issues of poverty and HIV and AIDS as the top national development priorities. The relevance of approaches is debatable. There were many small 'downstream' projects, though relevant to the immediate needs, did not feed into or inform policies needed to achieve a step change in the development trajectory of Swaziland. The UNDAF covered a broad range of governance projects, spreading limited resources thinly. The UN system did not always having the requisite level of expertise in-house to deal with the range of governance issues covered by the UNDAF.

**Conclusion 2:** Although the UNDAF was aligned to national priorities, the level of ownership of the UNDAF by government partners was moderate. The co-chairing of the UNDAF pillars with senior government officials gave the Government an opportunity to participate in the management of the UNDAF and engendered some sense of ownership. Joint meetings, however, were not sufficiently frequent to reinforce ownership. There was no sense of ownership of the UNDAF from civil society.

**Conclusion 3:** There were several achievements in the first half of the UNDAF cycle, with the extent of progress varying across the UNDAF pillars and within the UNDAF pillars. Pillar 1: HIV and AIDS was largely on track. The coherence of UN agencies within the pillar, the coherence provided by NERCHA, the clarity of the joint programme and availability of resources contributed to the progress made. The remaining UNDAF pillars showed progress, though not to the same extent as Pillar 1.

Resource constraints, delays in decision-making on the part of UN agencies and implementing partners were among the constraints under which these pillars operated. The sustainability of results achieved to date cannot be guaranteed without resources from Government and other development partners. The gap between the indicative budget of the UNDAF and the resources mobilised suggests that the UNDAF will only partially achieve its intended outcomes by the end of the UNDAF cycle.

**Conclusion 4:** The UNDAF promoted coherence within the UN system in Swaziland and fostered collaboration among the agencies, at the leadership level as well as in programmes and operations. The overall coordination of the UNDAF was not as effective as it should have been, primarily as a result of limited capacity within the Resident Coordinator's Office. The UNDAF monitoring did not track performance against the outcomes and financial reporting on the UNDAF was fragmented. Documentation on the UNDAF and related matters was dispersed among the different agencies. The joint programmes approach offers potential for fostering UN coherence and Delivering as One on priority issues that are common to all UN agencies. The Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS was the most advanced of the joint programmes in Swaziland, not surprisingly given the role of UNAIDS at the global level, and the expectation that all agencies contribute according to the Division of Labour. Joint programmes require good coordination capacity in order to be effective.

**Conclusion 5:** The UN system's engagement with civil society was narrow and mostly confined to the NGO sector as implementing partners. There was some capacity building of civil society and some engagement with civil society in advocacy. The UN-Civil Society Advisory Forum held much promise when it was launched, but did not live up to its mandate. Balancing seemingly competing interests of Government and civil society is not an easy task. The UN system, however, has a convening power which it can draw on to facilitate constructive dialogue between parties.

## 6.2 Recommendations

### 6.2.1 Recommendations for remainder of UNDAF period

**Recommendation 1:** The UNCT should review the UNDAF to re-prioritise and align activities to the level of resources it can realistically mobilise for the remainder of the UNDAF. There is little to be gained by continuing to plan for activities that have no hope of being funded. It would be better to do a few things well, that will serve as a foundation for the next UNDAF. This re-prioritisation should be done in consultation with the Government through the Joint UNDAF Steering Committee. Without pre-empting the decisions of the UNCT and the Government, the MTR recommends that consideration be given to the following:

(iii) Focus on those outputs and activities that require the joint effort of at least three UN agencies.

(iv) Address gaps or lagging areas in the UNDAF, for example:

- Creative strategies for prevention of HIV and AIDS among young people
- Developing a comprehensive social protection policy
- Strengthening the SWAps, in particular the SWAp for Water & Sanitation
- Joint advocacy on outstanding legislation that impact on human rights, and working with parliamentary portfolio committees

(iii) Test new areas to respond to emerging issues such as non-communicable diseases and youth unemployment, and use these as a basis for the next UNDAF. These should be on a small scale commensurate with available resources.

**Recommendation 2:** The UN system should work on strengthening joint programming as a modality for programming and implementation. The mid-term review of the Joint Programme on Gender made useful recommendations to strengthen the Joint Programme on Gender. These recommendations include revising the programme outputs and activities to focus only on those activities that are strictly joint activities, and to replace the parallel funding with pooled or basket funding. The new Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data should be checked to ensure that it focuses on joint activities and is not simply a collection of individual agency activities. A pooled funding modality should be introduced. Both joint programmes should have a dedicated coordinator.

**Recommendation 3:** The UNCT should request the Programme & Policy Support Group and Monitoring & Evaluation Committee to make improvements to the management and coordination of the UNDAF. The following improvements should be prioritised:

- Monitoring and reporting should be done against the final set of agreed output indicators. The quarterly and annual reporting by the UNDAF pillars should be standardised.
- A means should be devised to track the UNDAF expenditure consistently across the four UNDAF pillars. This will mean having to extract financial data from the different agencies.
- Joint quarterly meetings with government partners should take place as scheduled and include non-resident agencies. The Joint UNDAF Steering Committee should meet every six months.
- A schedule should be introduced to improve coordination of capacity building (training) events.
- The Resident Coordinator's Office should set up a repository of all key UNDAF documents, including all quarterly and annual reports, and relevant programming documents. Copies of agency evaluations and reviews should also be kept.
- The Resident Coordinator's Office should engage regularly with the Aid Coordination Management Unit of the Ministry of Economic Planning & Development to keep abreast of trends in development cooperation in the country, and to exchange information on the UNDAF.

**Recommendation 4:** The UNCT, under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator, should embark on expanding its range of partnerships. In this regard, the Civil Society Advisory Committee should be resuscitated and the Memorandum of Understanding should be finalised as a matter of priority. Partnerships with the private sector should be pursued, with the view to engaging them in job creation, development of small and medium enterprises and corporate social investment. The ILO has existing relationships with the peak employer body and chamber of commerce that can be built on. The Resident Coordinator has initiated discussions with other development partners, for example, the African Development Bank and this should be pursued.

### 6.2.2 Recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle

**Recommendation 5:** The post-2015 agenda as defined by the Government and citizens of Swaziland should guide the next UNDAF. The UN system should focus on a few areas where collectively, the UN agencies can maximise their impact and help shift the development trajectory onto a higher path. This will require the UN system to change from its current way of operating. The next UNDAF should shift its emphasis to upstream advisory work and focus on supporting the Government to develop integrated approaches to policy-making, planning and programming, and strengthening institutional capacities. This means that the UN system will need to become a reputable source of technical advice, and draw extensively on its global knowledge networks. While there should still be an element of downstream projects, these should be catalytic with the view to informing policies and larger programmes.

**Recommendation 6:** The UN system should articulate a vision and map a five-year path to shift towards ‘One Programme’ and ‘One Budget Framework’. In doing so, the UNCT should draw on the experiences of other small countries and middle-income countries in implementing a ‘One UN Programme’, to develop and test a prototype that would be suitable for the context in Swaziland. The experiences of the current joint programmes should also inform the development of the prototype.

Ends \_\_\_\_\_

## **Annex A: Terms of Reference**

### **UNDAF MIDTERM REVIEW (MTR), SWAZILAND**

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

##### **1. General Context**

The Swaziland Government in collaboration with the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) formulated the Swaziland UNDAF 2011 - 2015 which outlines the United Nations planned support to achieving national priorities. The UNDAF is also a cooperation framework for coordinated development assistance where the UN has comparative advantage.

The UNDAF has four outcomes and these are namely 1) To contribute to reduced new HIV infections and improved quality of life of persons infected and affected by HIV by 2015, 2) Increased and more equitable access of the poor to assets and other resources for sustainable livelihoods, 3) Increased access to and utilization of quality basic social services, especially for women, children and disadvantaged groups, 4) Strengthened national capacities for the promotion and protection of rights.

The UNDAF is approaching its midterm point of review which requires joint assessment by the UN and national counterparts on how the UNDAF is currently contributing to the national priorities of the country and consider questions of efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the various UN interventions.

##### **2. Rationale and Purpose**

The Government of Swaziland and the UN Country Team has decided to undertake a MTR of the UNDAF in 2013. The review is necessitated by a number of significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment which include the fiscal crisis that has constrained Government's ability to deliver on the development agenda.

The review will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt over the past first two and a half years of the UNDAF cycle. The review will also reflect how each agency has supported UNDAF goals and identify areas requiring additional support either in programme management or new implementation strategies.

The expected outcome will be consensus on the findings of the review and agreement on the options suggested for reinforcing efficiencies and effectiveness of development results including deliberations on new and emerging challenges beyond the current UNDAF.

##### **3. Objective of the MTR**

The main objective of the MTR is to:

- Assess the achievements and progress made against planned results, as well as assesses challenges and lessons learnt over the past two and a half years of the UNDAF.
- Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the current UNDAF impact on outcomes and make recommendations to realign UN assistance to these new priorities and achieve greater development impact.
- Serve as a comprehensive progress report of the UNDAF which will replace annual reviews.
- Look into the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, coherence in the delivery of the overall UN programme and recommend ways in which the UN may increase its effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.

In specific terms, the MTR should achieve the following:

- The extent to which the current UNDAF is compatible with national development priorities.
- The achievements/progress towards attainment of results and reflect on how each agency has contributed to the UNDAF results through the implementation of programmes and projects.
- Assess the effectiveness of and advantage of the use of the Joint Programmes (JUNPS) modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and delivering as one such as HIV/AIDS and Gender
- Suggest the direction for future programming taking into consideration emerging development situations in the country and lessons learnt for implementation.
- Reach consensus between the UN and key stakeholders on the suggested strategies for programme implementation, partnerships and resource mobilization.
- Document lessons learnt challenges and future opportunities.

#### **4. Methodology and Process**

The situation analysis of the UNDAF MTR will entail both internal and external participatory processes led by an external consultant. Considering that some agencies will be undertaking their own midterm reviews, agency MTR's will inform the UNDAF MTR. It has been agreed that the UNDAF MTR review processes will be light, informative and forward looking. The consultant will be supported by the RCO and the M&E Group. The MTR will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government through its National Steering Committee of the UNDAF. The approach will include the following:

- Consultative stakeholder workshops
- Reviews of Country Programme Agency Programmes (CPAPS)
- Interviews with Key Stakeholders
- Focus Group discussions including women, young persons and those with disability
- Desk reviews

The UNCT will engage a consultant for 30 working days which will be spread over several weeks beginning with a public launch of the MTR in August and will end in November 2013.

**5. Deliverables**

- Inception Reports
- A Draft MTR Report document
- Final MTR report
- Presentation to UNDAF Steering Committee, maximum 30 minutes and discussion time
- Validation workshop of MTR and agreement reached
- A final MTR report

**6. Qualifications.**

The consultant should possess the following qualities listed below:

- Post graduate degree in development studies, economics, political science, public policy /and or relevant field of social sciences.
- Experience in field research, development assessments, monitoring and measurement of development effectiveness.
- Capacity to undertake independent work and produce high quality reports
- Excellent analytical and communication skills
- Excellent oral and written skills
- Computer literacy
- Fluency in English

## **Annex B: List of documents consulted**

Balogun, P., The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF): A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, May 2012

Braithwaite, J., Djima, I.Y., and Pickmans, R., Child and Orphan Poverty in Swaziland, UNICEF, Swaziland, August 2013.

Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland Millennium Development Goals Progress Report, September 2012

Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland Millennium Development Goals Progress Report, September 2012

Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development: Aid Coordination and Management Section, Piggs PeakII: Swaziland Aid Effectiveness Retreat, 26-27 July 2012

Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, National Development Strategy: Vision 2022, September 1997

Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, Statement to the Human Rights Council by Chief Mgwagwa Gamedze, Honourable Minister for Justice and Constitutional Affairs, 15 March 2012

Hope, K. Ronald, The Sector Wide Approach Final Report, November 2012. Study commissioned by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland

International Labour Organization, Decent Work Country Programme for Swaziland 2010-2014

Kingdom of Swaziland, Statement by His Majesty King Mswati III Head of State of the Kingdom of Swaziland on the occasion of the General Debate of the 68<sup>th</sup> session of the United Nations General Assembly, 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013, New York

Kingdom of Swaziland, The Post-2015 Development Agenda: The Swaziland We Want, A report on the National Consultations on the United Nations post-2015 Development Agenda, September 2013

Mugore, J., Swaziland 2006-2010 United Nations Development Assistance Framework Terminal Review

Saasa, O., Final Report Mid-Term Review Kingdom of Swaziland United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2006-2010, January 2009

UNAIDS, Division of Labour: Consolidated Guidance Note 2010, Geneva

UNDP, Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015, Swaziland

UNDP, International Human Development Report 2013, New York, 2013

United Nations Swaziland, 2012 Swaziland UNDAF Annual Review

United Nations Swaziland, Complementary Country Analysis: Kingdom of Swaziland, September 2009

United Nations Swaziland, Concept note and ToR for the establishment of the UN-Civil Society Advisory Committee (CSAC), 18 May 2009

United Nations Swaziland, Final Report of the MTR of the GoS/UN Joint Programme on Gender, June 2013

United Nations Swaziland, Minutes of the consultations on Pillar 2: Poverty and Sustainable Livelihoods, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2013

United Nations Swaziland, Programme Document for Government of Swaziland and UN Joint Programme on Strategic Information and Data, July 2013

United Nations Swaziland, The United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Kingdom of Swaziland 2011-2015, Mbabane (undated)

United Nations Swaziland, UN PPSG Terms of Reference (undated)

United Nations Swaziland, UNDAF Pillar 4: Governance and Gender, 2012 Performance Report, October 2012

World Bank data accessed 4 October 2013, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator>

## **Annex C: List of persons consulted**

### **United Nations Swaziland**

Israel Dessalegne, United Nations Resident Coordinator, Swaziland

Lolo Makhabela, UN Coordination Specialist,

Zandile Simelane, Monitoring & Evaluation Analyst, Resident Coordinator's Office

Kwame Ampomah, Country Coordinator, UNAIDS

Pepukai Chikukwa, UNAIDS

Kabiru Nasidi, Deputy Representative, UNDP

Fatou Leigh, Senior Economist, UNDP

Senelisiwe Ntshangase, Programme Analyst, Governance & HIV/AIDS, UNDP

Sakinah Lukhele Morris, Programme Finance Associate and M&E Focal Point (Pillar 4), UNDP

Nonhlanhla Bhiya, Human Resources, UNDP

Hassan Mohtashami, Representative, UNFPA

Rachel Masuku, UNFPA

Majorie Mavuso, UNFPA

Bongani Motsa, Operations, UNFPA

Happiness Mkhathswa, Sexual Reproductive Health, UNFPA

Thamary Silindza, RHCS, UNFPA

Bongani Dlamini, Programme Specialist, Prevention & Integration, UNFPA

Emmanuel Tofoasti, Technical Specialist, UNFPA

Tenetile Tsabedze, Monitoring & Evaluation, UNFPA

Rachel Odede, UNICEF Representative, Swaziland

Florence Kitabire, HIV/AIDS Specialist, OIC, Deputy Representative, UNICEF

Ibrahima Diaffo, Education Specialist, UNICEF

Boniswa Dladla, WASH Officer, UNICEF

Neliswe Dlamini, M&E Specialist, UNICEF

Vumile Dlamini, Education Officer, UNICEF

David Grineria, Child Protection Specialist, UNICEF

Lucas, Thula, Education Specialist, UNICEF

Bernadette Njiratunga, Operations Manager, UNICEF

Nonhlanhla Nkambule, Communication Specialist, UNICEF

Linda Nxumalo, Child Protection, UNICEF

Owen Kaluwa, WHO Country Representative  
Dudu Dlamini, Family Health & Population, WHO  
Hleli Dlamini, Operations, WHO

Heather Hill, Representative and Country Director, World Food Programme  
Margherita Coco, Head of Programme, WFP  
Sandile Thwala, Programme Assistant (Food Security), WFP  
Nana Dladla, Senior Programme Assistant M&E, WFP  
Bhekinkosi Kunene, Field Coordinator, WFP

### **Non-Resident Agencies**

Vic Van Vuuren, Director, ILO, Southern Africa, Pretoria, South Africa  
Ehab Salah, Regional Programme Coordinator, HIV/AIDS Unit, UNODC, Pretoria, South Africa  
Harsheth Virk, Kaur, Regional Advisor, HIV/AIDS in Prison Setting, Africa, UNODC, Pretoria, South Africa  
David Makapela, UNODC, Pretoria, South Africa

### **Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland**

Mbuso Dlamini, Secretary to Cabinet, Prime Minister's Office  
Esau Dlamini, Acting Principal Secretary, Under Secretary, Prime Minister's Office

Albert Chibi, Macro Unit, Aid Coordination, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Collin Tshabalala, Principal Economist, Poverty Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Deepak Sardiwal, Economist, Aid Coordination, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Duduzile Dlamini, Director, National Population Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Hendry Mndawe, Senior Economist, Poverty Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Hezekiel Magagula, Economist, Policies and Programmes Sector Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Lonkululeko Magagula, Chief Economist, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Lungile Dladla, Senior Economist, Poverty Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Peter Ndlela, Senior Economist, National Population Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Thabo Hlope, M&E Officer, National Population Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development  
Thuli, Dlamini-Teferi, NPPP Policy Analyst, National Population Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development

Vangile Dlamini, Principal Economist, Aid Coordination, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development

Simon Zwane,, Director of Health Services, Ministry of Health

Allen Walligo, Technical Support Coordinator, NERCHA

Innocent Maziya, OD Coordinator, NERCHA

Mandla Luphondyo, Communications, NERCHA

Nolwazi Matabela, Monitoring & Evaluation, NERCHA

Nolwazi Mkhathswa, NERCHA

Thembi Gama, Head of Department, NERCHA

Thembinkosi Mamba, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs

Gugu Simelane, Acting Under Secretary, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs

Ishmael Nwandwe, Environment Analyst, Swaziland Environment Authority

Mboni Dlamini, Director, Assessment and Compliance, Swaziland Environment Authority

Steven Zuke, Director, Policy and Research, Swaziland Environment Authority

Thabile Dlamini, Air Pollution Officer, Swaziland Environment Authority

Jane, Mkhonta, Director, Gender & Family Issues Unit, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Doris Masilela, Department of Social Welfare, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Ellen Mabuza, Senior Social Welfare Officer, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Gideon Gwebu, Programme Officer: Gender, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Moses Dlamani, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Mpumelelo Simelane, Child Protection, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

N Nhlabatsi, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Nombulelo Dlamini, NCCU, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Sindi Dube, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Thandie Maziya, Director, Department of Welfare, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Thando Maziya, Department of Social Welfare, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Verah Hlatswayo, Department of Social Welfare, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Victoria Khumalo, Gender & Family Issues Unit, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Xolisile Hlope, Deputy Prime Minister's Office

Lorraine Hlope, Registrar, High Court

Ms Nxumalo, Assistant Registrar, High Court

Sabelo Khumalo, Assistant Registrar, High Court

Sihle Dlodlu, Assistant Registrar, High Court

Jabu, Pakhathi, Public Relations Officer, Anti-Corruption Commission

Wamala, Sheila, Senior Investigator, Anti-Corruption Commission

Bongani Masuka, Under Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture

Nelson Mavuso,, Senior Agricultural Officer, Ministry of Agriculture

Musa Mkhonta, Acting SLP Officer, Ministry of Agriculture

SM Mtshali-Dlamini, Director, Education, Ministry of Education and Training

Lindiwe Dlamini, Director, ETGPS, Ministry of Education and Training

Nkuleleko Gwebu, Principal Planning Officer, Education Planning Unit, Ministry of Education and Training

Phineas Masinga, Chief Inspector of Primary Education, Ministry of Education and Training

Patrick Muir, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Education and Training

Jabu Shabalala, EMIS Manager, Ministry of Education and Training

Nonhlanhla Shongwe, Senior Planning Officer, Education Planning Unit, Ministry of Education and Training

#### **Civil society**

Emmanuel Ndlangamandla, Director, CANGO

Meketane Mazibuko, Programs Manager, SWAGAA

#### **Private sector**

Mdudzi Lokotfwako, Coordinator, Trade & Commerce, Federation of Swaziland Employers and Chamber of Commerce