

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) for Angola was conducted by the Evaluation Office, UNDP, in 2012. The evaluation assesses UNDP's performance and its contributions to development outcomes in Angola between 2005 and 2011. The ADR provides recommendations for UNDP's future strategic positioning in Angola and its new Country Programme Document for cooperation in the country.

The ADR analysed UNDP's contributions to development outcomes by thematic areas and evaluated UNDP's strategic positioning in Angola.

The analysis of development results for each area used the following evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. UNDP's strategic positioning was analysed by the following dimensions: strategic relevance; capacity to respond to national demands while addressing UNDP's mandate; value added; comparative advantages; promotion of United Nations values; and contribution to the coordination of the United Nations System.

The assessment adopted a multi-method approach to both data collection and analysis. Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Triangulation techniques were employed for various sources of information and methods, in addition to verification and validation methods, such as internal team meetings and discussion of the preliminary results with two groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1. The programmes implemented by UNDP in Angola were relevant, because they were aligned to national priorities and adapted to the changing national context, particularly in light of the shift from

a post-conflict context to one more focused on development. The objectives and areas of work identified in UNDP's strategic programming documents were coherently aligned with national policies. During the period covered by this assessment, important transformations took place in Angola's national context. There was a shift in the focus of Government policies, and UNDP's programmes adapted from a post-war emergency perspective to a more development-oriented approach. UNDP demonstrated flexibility and a capacity to respond to the new challenges. There was a particularly clear shift from the emphasis on post-conflict national reconstruction in the first phase to a stronger focus on fighting poverty and fostering development in the second cycle.

Conclusion 2. During the period assessed, UNDP Angola has not always been able to leverage its comparative advantages or to effectively demonstrate its added value. With the exception of decentralization, the Government did not consider UNDP's actions to be sufficiently proactive. Evidence indicates that UNDP attempted to respond to many and diverse demands, but without a sufficiently well-defined and integrated strategy aimed at ensuring sustainable results. The adaptation of the programme to a development approach, with the focus shifting away from post-war assistance, was characterized by dispersion of limited resources and a lack of a more strategically-oriented approach.

Conclusion 3. UNDP Angola was particularly effective in providing certain policy-advisory and specialized support to the Government, transferring technologies, and promoting capacity development. The programme's best results came from introducing a debate on decentralization, providing various capacity building and technical support to Government institutions and civil society, transferring technology

on demining of explosive landmines, promoting microfinance, and supporting the fight against HIV and AIDS. UNDP was able to support policy making in the areas of gender, national biodiversity, domestic violence, response to HIV and AIDS, and science, technology and innovation. It helped to develop capacities, particularly in demining, microfinance and the HIV and AIDS response, ensuring more readily identifiable contributions to development outcomes.

Conclusion 4. Significant contributions UNDP Angola made to sustainable results in the period evaluated are most notably in demining, in fighting HIV and AIDS, and in gender, environment and microfinance. The support provided to the National Demining Institute (INAD) and to the National Intersectional Commission for Demining and Humanitarian Assistance (CNIDAH) successfully transferred knowledge. That gave continuity to the demining work, which was increasingly under the trained leadership of national institutions. The management capacity built in the national HIV and AIDS programme was also leveraged by UNDP's support to administration of the Global Fund. UNDP's efforts to promote gender equality and strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Family and the Promotion of Women, as well as the work with the Ministry of Environment and in microfinance, are equally important. It has led to strategic documents and policy guidelines being drafted, which means a greater chance of continuing work in these areas and ensuring the sustainability of results.

Conclusion 5. The programme contributed less than expected to outcomes linked to poverty alleviation, developing capacity for decentralization, and in advancing entrepreneurship. Poverty alleviation results, if obtained, are not evident. One factor linked to the lack of significant contributions can be associated with the dispersion of resources to many small projects, with little continuity or sustainability. UNDP's competences were of less use at the local project management level, where several projects were concerned with seminars and workshops. These

lacked appropriate strategic planning that would have delivered greater sustainability of results or concrete contributions of prolonged effects. The dispersion of funds to multiple projects only allowed the limited resources to be used for very specific, short-term activities.

Conclusion 6. The efficiency of UNDP's programme was low across all programme areas. Inefficiency was mainly due to unmet deadlines, inefficient use of funds and low implementation and achievement of targets, but not necessarily low rate of financial execution. The requirements of the management model and tentative participatory approaches to implementation did not contribute to efficiency, effectiveness, shared ownership and sustainability. They were adequate neither for the national context nor for the profiles of the Government representatives that UNDP mobilized. The lack of project management guidelines adjusted to the context and a more robust organizational structure, such as leaders for each of the projects or commissions for funding, contributed to delays and wasted resources, in some cases significantly jeopardizing project execution. The excessively restricted nature of certain pilot initiatives also presented evidence of low efficiency and effectiveness. The many small projects made for a fragmented programme and contributed minimally to planned development outcomes.

Conclusion 7. Lack of proper knowledge management adds to the challenge of further promoting internal and external synergies in an integrated and coordinated way, in line with a sound strategy focused on learning for human development results. The assessment found limited systematization of knowledge and promotion of synergies among programming levels. Few projects called for visible articulation with other projects. Even within the different areas, UNDP has not presented a clear strategy to leverage potential synergies. Work on United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) programming was oriented to the attainment of common objectives between agencies and programmes. However, project results

are still scarce. The use of synergies between agencies was not considered significant, as is partially reflected by the relatively small number of joint programmes, and by duplication of efforts and low cost-efficiency and effectiveness. Articulation with regional agencies was limited to the Okavango project, but the participation of Angola in international activities generated positive results for funding (the Global Environment Facility and the Global Fund) and participation in international summits and meetings.

Conclusion 8. UNDP's programmes and projects in Angola were unable to convey a commonly articulated vision on how UNDP achieves sustainable results with its contributions to the outcomes. This related to the lack of a results-oriented approach with a clear theory of change. It was not possible to determine, in rigorous methodological terms, if the projects and programmes were developed, planned and managed with a theory of change clearly articulated and oriented. It was also hard to ascertain if the means (inputs, activities and outputs) used to attain results (outcomes) will effectively contribute to behavioural change that is owned by national stakeholders and that will contribute to sustained human development in Angola.

Conclusion 9. There is still work to be done to improve UNDP's support to the coordination role of the United Nations Resident Coordinator in promoting more harmonized interagency actions and programming in Angola. Despite joint UNDAF planning, there has been little synergy between agencies. This is reflected in the reduced number of joint programmes, along with duplication of efforts and resources. Each agency defines its activities without seeking significant synergies and complementarity. That can lead to duplication of efforts and an inefficient use of resources. While some projects have brought agencies together to coordinate and plan activities, these have been essentially bilateral, with each agency implementing its activities. A strong coordination mechanism is absent. Partnership was mainly apparent to the extent that participants distributed tasks to each other.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1. The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA) should assist UNDP Angola to develop the next programme with clearer and logical theories of change for each agreed outcome. They should be grounded in results-oriented management that focuses more on the contributions to outcomes and less on the delivery of isolated products and services of limited sustainability. It is important to ensure that staff, partners and donors are able to understand the logic of results. They should understand how each stakeholder supports implementation, allowing monitoring of UNDP's work and evaluation of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. It is also important to design a programme, based on this analysis, that addresses the need for a constant flow of precise, timely and reliable information to support decision-making, promote learning and, when necessary, redirect courses of action. In the next programming cycle, UNDP Angola should prepare its programme and projects to include more adequate baselines and indicators at product and outcome level. These should at least measure relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Progress needs to be made on feeding and using available corporate monitoring instruments that can facilitate more cautious assessments. That includes the possible introduction of experimental or quasi-experimental models capable of indicating more precisely the interventions that work better and why they work better. It should also include indications of the cost-effectiveness of UNDP's interventions.

Recommendation 2. UNDP Angola needs to strengthen formal and informal means of proactive dialogue with Angolan partners at the level of decision-making, and with technical implementation staff. This applies particularly to sensitive areas in which UNDP could have a greater impact while carrying out its mandate and more significantly contributing to national priorities. The Government of Angola recognizes the relevance of UNDP's contribution to the country's development. However, more proactivity by

UNDP Angola is expected for closer dialogue and better communication, particularly at the mid-ministerial level. This would enable UNDP to carry out its mandate more effectively and work with the Government in areas where it has comparative advantage and can contribute with proposals that clearly align the country's development needs with UNDP's added value. Specific relationship strategies need to be established to better articulate relations and activities and leverage synergies. UNDP should consider a new round of negotiations on potential Government funding to allow UNDP's focal points to be introduced at priority agencies. This would enable them to work more closely with their Government counterparts to improve the effectiveness of dialogue, overcome obstacles and systematically identify more innovative areas of action.

Recommendation 3. UNDP Angola should concentrate interventions in fewer and more strategic areas where it can add more value. It should avoid the necessity of managing projects with smaller budgets where UNDP's contribution cannot be sustained. There needs to be a greater shift from a project logic to a programme approach that is focused on results-oriented management, particularly for innovative programming. This would prevent extended intervention periods and help create mechanisms, such as innovative programme designs, that are capable of ensuring the sustainability of contributions. Exit strategies should be aligned with coordinated ownership of these initiatives by Angolan counterparts. UNDP should reinforce its strategy so that it has a more direct influence on reducing poverty and promoting human development. It should focus on measures to promote the empowerment of beneficiaries and to ensure the sustainability of initiatives that may eventually be owned by the Government. The work with business development, and with the private and informal sectors, may contribute significantly to this and should be given more attention. Efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability should be improved. Environment, disaster prevention and reduction, decentralization and responses to HIV and AIDS should also be given more

attention in future programming, avoiding small-scale projects of limited scope that consume time and effort. There should be a greater focus on exit and sustainability strategies and transference, and on strengthening national ownership. Given the Angolan context and project-execution limitations, as well as interactions with the responsible agencies and local management, a concentrated, long-term approach focused on ensuring effective Government ownership will certainly produce better results. However, it is recommended that an integrated and coordinated strategy, one that is more directly linked to the above advantages, be adopted to reinforce UNDP's role and contribution to Angola's development.

Recommendation 4. UNDP Angola should improve knowledge management and better communicate the results already obtained. It should reinforce the exchange of knowledge and the use of UNDP's specialized networks to generate and promote learning that can strategically feed into timely and better informed decision-making. This will help Angola to promote South-South cooperation. UNDP Angola must make better use of opportunities to position itself more strategically by better systematizing learning and achievements and sharing its knowledge and results. In particular, there should be more frequent exchanges with its specialized resources, such as United Nations networks, local media, the Government, civil society and academia. UNDP has demonstrated capacity to support the Government in defining a strategy, to promote South-South partnerships and Angola's participation in international fora, as in the Okavango project, and to support the country's participation in relevant international summits. This is clearly a UNDP competence, and the Government of Angola could benefit from specialized support to further strengthen its role in South-South cooperation. The UNDP Country Office, with support from the RBA, needs to be able to show the Government that UNDP can add value to Angola's regional human development work. Using existing networks, UNDP can improve the process of recruiting qualified personnel in those areas where Government is open

to collaboration, and UNDP has comparative advantages to contribute strategically. A related issue that should also be addressed is UNDP's lack of a specialized communication department in Angola, including a website in the country's official language. UNDP needs to have a website in Portuguese and improve its capacity to dialogue with the Government and to realize its results. To that end, it should design a communication strategy capable of supporting the programme and of strengthening and expanding UNDP's image, facilitating dialogue between partners, and monitoring outcomes so that they are better explained and disseminated. It has been challenging for the UNDP Country Office to find an appropriate professional for this work in the country. The RBA or the Regional Centre may consider establishing an international post, if necessary, to provide the UNDP Country Office with this much needed support.

Recommendation 5. UNDP Angola needs to improve efficiency in operations and should invest in an added-value flow analysis of existing operations processes, which are not adequately understood by some staff in programme and operations. The way that processes are conducted in UNDP Angola is excessively complex. They are poorly understood by many staff, who report insufficient orientation to the processes, causing frequent errors, duplication of efforts and prolonged delays. That can hamper the programme's efficiency and UNDP's image, and adds little value. It is recognized that the processes in Angola follow corporate procedures and guidelines, which may not necessarily be easy to change. The way the guidelines are understood and applied should be reviewed with staff, the aim being to simplify them and eliminate repetition and errors. It is important to engage staff in this process, particularly as the current system dilutes accountability and often duplicates efforts. Better adapted to the Angolan context, accountability layers, checklists and different instruments should be considered to help simplify processes, prevent errors, save time and gain efficiency. The operations team will need to dedicate more time, with programme staff, to developing mechanisms

and to frequent reviews so that rules are better understood and incorporated. Particular attention should be given to adjusting to local contexts and routines.

Recommendation 6. UNDP Angola needs to improve programme efficiency to avoid delays and promote better articulation and communication between operations and programme units and between UNDP and stakeholders. UNDP needs to introduce measures that address constraints linked to proper and timely follow-up of plans, targets, actions and agreements. Project management structures should also be reviewed, making them simpler and better adapted to the types of projects, the workload, the available human resources and internal capacities. More flexibility should be introduced where possible, in line with the potential of staff and partners. UNDP Angola should also systematically develop programmes that are better adapted to the Angolan context to increase the agility of its processes, at least internally. It should discuss with partners, the RBA and headquarters, ways of extending the stability and permanence of technical staff; and of promoting greater integration of teams through adequate socio-linguistic competencies, especially at the higher levels of political and technical responsibility.

Recommendation 7. In coordination with the RBA, the country office should examine ways of improving interagency efforts, learning from what has worked well elsewhere in the region, to strengthen coordination of the United Nations System. This will also help reduce dispersion, duplication of efforts, and low cost-efficiency in the use of resources, particularly for future interagency projects. UNDP Angola should focus more on projects and activities that are coordinated between agencies and truly implemented in synergy, and not in isolation, by each agency. Like its resources and responsibilities, interagency projects should not be simply divided between agencies, they must be shared for coordinated action and improved results. The objective of interagency actions is to stimulate the unique values that each agency may add, so that together a greater result

may be achieved. Interagency initiatives should not be a set of separate and isolated activities without synergistic engagement, but should allow the exchange of comparative advantages. If joint programmes are to be continued, particularly those involving jointly managed funds, UNDP needs to develop ways to improve the efficiency of its

management and to coordinate its programmes in a more strategic and integrated manner. It should leverage thematic group synergies and the value added by each agency to justify investments in joint initiatives. This often requires additional efforts, but these are justified if they produce enhanced results.