



**United Nations System in Mozambique**

**United Nations Development  
Assistance Framework  
(UNDAF) Evaluation - UN in  
Mozambique**

**KPMG Mozambique  
December 2010  
This report contains 32 pages  
UNDAF Evaluation**

*Disclaimer*

*This report is furnished to you solely for your benefit and exclusive use, and cannot be disclosed, circulated, quoted or otherwise, in whole or in part, to any third party without KPMG's prior written consent.*

*The information contained is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act upon such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.*

*Our advice in this document is limited to the conclusions specifically set forth herein and is based on the completeness and accuracy of the representations, assumptions and documents analyzed. If any of the documents, assumptions or representations is not entirely complete or accurate, it is imperative that we be informed immediately, as the inaccuracy or incompleteness could have a material effect on our conclusions.*

*We assume that this report is accepted as final with any kind of qualifications and recommendations for change if comments, suggestions and recommendations are not provided to KPMG in the period of one month after receiving the same report.*

## Document review and approval


### Revision history

Version	Author	Date	Revision
1	Caroline Ennis	14/12/2010	1

### This document has been reviewed by

Reviewer	Date reviewed
1 Caroline Ennis	14/12/2010
2 Paulo Mole	16/12/2010
3	
4	
5	

### This document has been approved by

Subject matter experts	Signature	Date reviewed
1 Paulo Mole		16/12/2010
2		
3		
4		
5		

## **Contents**

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Mozambique at a glance	1
1.2	The UN in Mozambique	1
1.3	UNDAF in Mozambique	2
1.4	Evaluation Methodology	3
1.5	Purpose of the external evaluation:	3
1.6	Limitations of the report	4
2	UNDAF's elaboration process	5
2.1	Lessons learned and recommendations for future UNDAF	6
3	The role and relevance of UNDAF in relation to national priorities and UN conventions	8
3.1	Lessons learned and recommendation	10
4	Quality of design and comparative advantages	11
4.1	Assessment of the five programtic principles	11
4.2	Lessons learned and recommendations	14
5	Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework	16
5.1	Lessons learned and recommendations	19
6	Impact and effectiveness of UNDAF towards achieving MDGs, national development targets and international conventions	21
6.1	UNDAF mechanisms to report on impact	25
6.2	Lessons learned and recommendations	27
7	Sustainability of UNDAF process and outcomes	29
8	Conclusions and way forward	30

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Mozambique at a glance

Mozambique is located in Southern Africa, and has borders with six other countries (Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Swaziland) and more than 2,500 km of Indian Ocean coastline. The population of Mozambique is very young, with about 10 million children accounting for about half of the total population of 20 million. Since the end of a 16-year civil war in 1992, Mozambique's economy has grown at a strong pace. Between 1997 and 2003, economic growth averaged about nine per cent, which is well above the continent's average. Despite the recent financial crisis, Mozambique is estimated to grow at 6 % in 2010.

From 1997 to 2003 the proportion of Mozambicans living below the poverty line fell from 69 per cent to 54 per cent. However, this rapid reduction seems to have stalled, with the recent household survey indicating no reduction from 54%, albeit with regional and urban-rural variations. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – which range from halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV and AIDS, all by the target date of 2015, form a global blueprint to meet the needs of the world's poorest people. Although the 2008 National MDG Progress Report estimated that Mozambique was likely or has the potential to achieve 12 of the 21 MDG targets (among them are those relating to poverty, under-five mortality, maternal mortality, malaria and the establishment of an open trading and financial system), the 2010 report suggests that Mozambique is considered to be likely to meet only four out of the 21 country level targets, to potentially meet a further ten, and to be unlikely to meet one. Six do not have sufficient data for an assessment.

The country has also attracted strong donor support and high inflows of foreign direct investment. The state budget is mostly financed by aid, which represents around 15 per cent of Mozambique's Gross Domestic Product, as compared to 6–8 per cent for the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa.

## 1.2 The UN in Mozambique

UN agencies have been long-time partners of Mozambique, among which the following are currently working in the country:



**FAO**  
Food and Agriculture  
Organization



**IFAD**  
International Fund for Agriculture  
Development



**ILO**  
International Labour Organization



**ITC**  
International Trade Centre



**UN-HABITAT**  
United Nations Programme for  
Human Settlements



**UNHCR**  
United Nations High Commission  
for Refugees



**UNICEF**  
United Nations Children's Fund



**UNICRI**  
United Nations Interregional Crime

	<b>IOM</b> International Organisation for Migration		<b>UNIDO</b> United Nations Industrial Development Organization
	<b>UNAIDS</b> Joint United Nations Programme for HIV/AIDS		<b>UNIFEM</b> United Nations Development Fund for Women
	<b>UNDP</b> United Nations Development Programme		<b>UNV</b> United Nations Volunteers
	<b>UNEP</b> United Nations Environment Programme		<b>WFP</b> World Food Programme
	<b>UNESCO</b> United Nations Education Science and Culture Organization		<b>WHO</b> World Health Organization
	<b>UNFPA</b> United Nations Population Fund		

and Justice Research Institute

### 1.3 UNDAF in Mozambique

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) is a common strategic framework for operational activities within the UN system in a country. It outlines the collective response of the UN agencies to the national development objectives identified in the national poverty reduction strategy (PARPA). In Mozambique, the UNDAF covered the period 2007-2009 and was aligned to the PARPA. Both the PARPA and UNDAF have been extended and the UNDAF will remain effective until 2011. Like the PARPA, UNDAF is organized around four thematic areas or pillars, namely governance, human capital, HIV/AIDS and economic development. The UNDAF is an instrument of the UN reform process aimed at ensuring greater coherence and coordination of UN agencies' activities, and greater alignment with national priorities, in order to better achieve the MDGs. It also responds to the principles established in the Paris Declaration and reiterated in the Accra Agenda for Action regarding the need for greater country ownership, harmonization and alignment, mutual accountability and results based management.

In 2007, the Government of Mozambique agreed that Mozambique should be a pilot country for Delivering As One. Subsequently, the UN Country Team developed a range of mechanisms and structures to move forward, including the finalization of the Delivering As One operational plan and start-up of the "five ones" (one programme, one budgetary framework and one fund, one leader, one office/common services, and one voice). Delivering as One is a subset of UNDAF, comprising 10 Joint Programmes, each involving participation of multiple agencies (at least two). These Joint Programmes are financed through the One Fund and together they now constitute 25% of total delivery. Joint delivery also includes three Joint Programmes financed by the Millennium Development Goal Fund.

## **1.4 Evaluation Methodology**

The methodology used for this external evaluation follows the standard ToR developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). After discussion with the KPMG team, UNDAF Evaluation Management Group, UNDAF Evaluation Task Force and UNCT, the team proceeded as follows:

- Review of documentation;
- Semi-structured interviews with key UN staff and government counterparts, CSOs and beneficiaries;
- Drafting of preliminary findings based on literature review and interviews with UN staff and government, to obtain feedback from the extended UNCT;
- Field visits to selected project sites in each country's regions (south, centre, north);
- Presentation of findings to government partners; and
- Finalization of the draft report based upon feedback received during the debriefing session with UNCT personnel and government representatives.

## **1.5 Purpose of the external evaluation:**

- According to the ToR, the external evaluation should satisfy the following objectives:
  - 1) Assess the role and relevance of the UNDAF in relation to the issues and their underlying causes and challenges identified by the CCA and in the context of national policies and strategies; and as a reflection of the internationally agreed goals, particularly those in the Millennium declaration, and international norms and standards guiding the work of the agencies of the UN system and adopted by the UN member states.
  - 2) Assess the design and focus of the UNDAF, i.e. the quality of the formulation of results at different levels, the result chain.
  - 3) Assess the validity of the collective comparative advantages of the UN System.
  - 4) Assess the effectiveness of the UNDAF in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes, including an assessment of the performance of its Joint Programs.
  - 5) To the extent possible, assess the medium term impact of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there are any major changes in UNDAF indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF, notably in the realization of MDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and treaties.

- 6) Analyze to what extent results achieved and strategies used by the UNDAF are sustainable as a contribution to national development and in terms of the added value of UNDAF for cooperation among individual UN agencies.

## **1.6 Limitations of the report**

The evaluation took place between July and December 2010. This was longer than originally intended, due to a number of logistical issues and a decision to include field work to three provinces, which had not been contemplated in the original proposal. However, this was to some extent mitigated by holding a number of presentations given by the consultants, on emerging findings and specific findings from field work, such that the current UNDAF process could incorporate some of the findings prior to the final report being ready. One lesson learned for future processes would be that the UN should provide consultants with a proposed list of people to be interviewed and key project sites to visit, taking into consideration the timeframe allocated to interviews.



## 2 UNDAF's elaboration process

### 2.1 Current UNDAF and Extension

The UNDAF under review (2007 – 2009) and its extension (2010 – 2011) constitute the third UNDAF for Mozambique. While previous UNDAFs had been based on the Common Country Assessment (CCA), the preparation of the third generation CCA/UNDAF coincided with the elaboration of PARPA II, and this provided the opportunity to simplify and align the process of the third UNDAF with that of the PARPA II. The UNCT agreed not to conduct a CCA but rather to adopt PARPA II as its third generation CCA and align the content and cycle of UNDAF with PARPA II.

This decision was justified on several grounds: firstly, the UN agencies actively participated in the PARPA II elaboration process, which allowed them to ensure that core UN concerns such as human rights, MDGs, and the mainstreaming of gender and HIV were reflected. Secondly, in 2005 the UN supported the Government to produce its second national MDG Progress Report, which already provided a comprehensive overview of the socio-economic situation in the country. It was also felt that this was in line with the commitments made under the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness around alignment.

Overall, the process seems to have been inclusive and participatory with good technical input from UN agencies, government, and civil society organizations. The concern with inclusiveness meant that the process was quite lengthy, in particular where space was created to enable the non-Resident Agencies to make meaningful contributions to the elaboration process. It is noted that the RCO played a key factor in enabling all non-resident agencies to engage with the process.

One specific concern raised by UN staff interviewed is the uneven level of capacity among the agencies. In particular, many smaller agencies did not always have the necessary staff time available to fully participate in all aspects of the UNDAF document, and had to focus their time and resources on those aspects that most directly concerned them or offered them suitable entry points for programming. While this is a pragmatic approach, it does mean that the overall UNDAF goal of creating a situation in which all UN agencies are perfectly aware of who is doing what and in what type of partnership is somewhat weakened.

Some agencies overcame this problem by recruiting consultants to prepare technical inputs, but others, especially non-resident agencies, found it difficult to obtain appropriate input from their headquarters in time for the deadlines established by the agreed calendar/Road Map. To a significant extent, staff turnover resulted in the loss of institutional memory. This was compounded by the limited level of documentation of the process.

Another concern was the capacity of both UN staff and partners to define indicators and apply the RBM approach. However, this has been addressed in the run up to the development of the forthcoming UNDAF by training in this area for UN staff and partners. One aspect of the process which was highlighted is the need for a mechanism for prioritizing and selecting Country Team Programme Outcomes. The UNDAF became somewhat cumbersome due to the large number of agencies and the fact that each agency was compelled to contribute a significant number of objectives in order to adequately reflect its mandate and country programme.

Government, development partners and civil society organizations participated in the UNDAF Strategic Planning Retreat held in November 2005 – where the three broad areas of the UNDAF

were agreed upon – as well as in the Joint Strategy Meeting of January 2006, in which UNDAF results and M&E matrixes were agreed upon and validated. When PARPA II was extended until 2011, the UNCT, following consultations with government, similarly developed an extension of UNDAF until 2011, ensuring that UN strategic planning remains aligned with the key Government planning processes.

While the process itself aimed to be highly inclusive, with the aim that the UNDAF would be co-owned by the UN and government, some UN staff interviewed felt that the involvement of Government initially seems to have been limited at first, although increasing over time. Several issues are noted:

- Government involvement took place only at central level. In the field work, it was noted that provincial and district authorities have very little – if any – information about UNDAF and were not consulted or asked by central level authorities to provide input for the UNDAF. They were, however, consulted for the elaboration of joint programmes and joint initiatives but the level of consultation was different for each joint initiative. This is related to the fact that reportedly, agencies have different styles of consultation with some “sitting down with their partners with a blank piece of paper ready for a joint brainstorming” while others “do some preparatory work, arriving at a meeting with fairly detailed ideas that partners are asked to review and comment on”.
- At central level, the Government participated in reviews of successive drafts, agreed to and signed off on the final version. However, several government officials interviewed indicated that they perceived the UNDAF process, and to a lesser extent the framework, as largely UN-driven (e.g. “the UNDAF is essentially a management tool for the UN and naturally the UN took the lead, but this meant that government sometimes had little time and opportunity to actively contribute to this process”).

The main mechanism whereby partners participated in UNDAF elaboration process was consultation. In essence, this means that the UNDAF was presented and shared to partners who were then invited to contribute with comments. Civil society organizations participated both in their individual capacities and represented by umbrella organizations such as G-20. The emphasis on consultation in once-off meetings precluded a more proactive, phased dialogue with CSOs and little space for a joint analysis of priorities. The need for inputs within tight deadlines also made it difficult for CSOs to obtain feedback from their constituencies.

## **2.2 Lessons learned and recommendations for future UNDAF**

UNDAF presupposes the participation of all agencies, but non-resident agencies and smaller agencies may not have the necessary staff to engage in all aspects of the process; furthermore, agencies need sufficient time to obtain inputs from their headquarters. The RCO has played an important role in ensuring that non-resident agencies have the space to provide their contributions.

While the process is quite lengthy and evolves through distinct phases, the process is essentially geared to establish common understanding and consensus. The negotiations are reflected in the documents that are produced, and this in itself helps to track the evolving logic and rationale behind the UNDAF process, but much institutional memory is lost when staff that was closely

involved in the elaboration process leaves the duty station. For that reason, it is recommended to establish a working group, composed of both international and national senior staff, to document the process and provide continuity from one UNDAF to the next as well as provide critical input to the MTR and final evaluations.

The UNDAF is largely perceived as an internal framework for the UN system and in spite of consultation of government and civil society, it is often perceived as UN-owned and UN-driven process. While participation of government and especially civil society should be strengthened, particularly at local level, the evaluation team feels that it is not feasible for government to engage in the elaboration process in equal measure to the UN (especially not when the UN and government are already jointly involved in sectoral joint planning exercises). More important than jointly writing the UNDAF is the question to what extent there are broad agreement, regular reviews and communication between the UN and its partners. On the whole this appears to have been the case, especially in the case of government. While civil society was also involved in the elaboration process, its role in future UNDAF elaboration processes needs to be strengthened and this will require more participatory mechanisms instead of essentially consultative mechanisms and a sustained dialogue throughout the entire UNDAF life cycle.

Thus the extent to which government's priorities are reflected in the UNDAF and the government's participation of the government in the ongoing M&E and its ability to steer the direction of UNDAF strategies is of prime importance to national ownership, more than 'who held the pen at the time of writing'. This should take place within an ongoing dialogue. It is noted that both the UN staff and government officials interviewed indicated that the relationship between both is characterized by an open dialogue, even though government's involvement in M&E of UNDAF is not entirely clear appearing to a large extent to have been limited to their input in the DaO MTR.

## 3 The role and relevance of UNDAF in relation to national priorities and UN conventions

### 3.1 Current UNDAF and Extension

Overall, Mozambique's UNDAF and its extension that together cover the period 2007 – 2011 very clearly address issues that were jointly identified with the UN's national partners and the outcomes relate to the national policies and strategies that were prioritized by the Government. The reason for this close match – and resulting high level of relevance – is that the UNDAF was closely aligned to PARPA II.<sup>1</sup> This alignment primarily ensures that, through the UNDAF UN, resources are directed at supporting national priorities, causes and challenges.

However, such close alignment is not without risks. Alignment is only possible if there is a clear consensus between government and the UN system on the accuracy and scope of the situational and sectoral analysis, appropriateness of policy priorities and strategic approaches. Alignment may not be possible, if there is any significant divergence between government and UN objectives or approaches (which is not considered to be the case at the moment, but presents a theoretical risk). This highlights the constant tension between government ownership and ensuring that international norms and standards that guide the work of the UN agencies are adopted and upheld by UN member states. Several concerns were noted:

- Some UN staff interviewed indicated that the current PARP process has been less consultative so far than the previous PARPA II process such that there is a certain concern that not all UN objectives will be included.<sup>2</sup> If there is significant divergence, alignment may be neither appropriate nor strategic for the UN system.
- Close alignment and the implicit endorsement by the UN of government models may limit the UN's ability to exercise its comparative advantage in the area of advocacy and policy support. This is of special concern to those UN agencies and entities that deal with humanitarian issues which are often politically sensitive. In that respect, these

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted before, the UN agencies decided it was unnecessary to engage in a full-fledged CCA and opted to align UNDAF with PARPA II, effectively taking PARPA II as the CCA. Such alignment was largely made possible by the fact that the UN, bilateral donors, civil society were closely involved in the elaboration of PARPA II. It was also a consequence of the UN's previous investments in national capacity development which had resulted in better planning, better accountability mechanisms, and reliable implementation structures. Furthermore, it was consistent with the principles of the Paris Declaration and other donors' increased focus on General Budget Support and programmatic approaches in the sectors.

<sup>2</sup> Due to diverse reasons such as competing priorities and limited capacity within the Ministry of Planning in the first half of 2010, the analysis of IOF data and overall delays caused by the 2009 elections, and pressure from international partners for greater consultation, the process for the PARP has been extended into the first quarter of 2011. While these delays have resulted in less consultation the extension of the timeframe will allow for ongoing consultation.

agencies need to maintain their neutrality as well as their ability to advocate for the defense of human rights.

- Several agencies expressed a concern that alignment to national priorities should not be limited to *government* priorities and it is important to ensure that the focus of UNDAF is defined not merely in political terms but also, and more importantly, based on technical grounds. In that respect close alignment presents a risk as it may result in limited analysis. For example, it is noted that in the UNDAF under review some key questions and policy debates were not fully explored.<sup>3</sup> This reflects a wider debate around alignment, reflected in the Accra Agenda for Action, which highlighted the role of parliaments and civil society.
- Close alignment gives very little space to address issues and policy gaps outside of government planning documents and processes such as PARPA, sectoral plans, annual PES and Joint Reviews. It is also noted that key government planning documents are bound to a five year outlook whereas many policies require a long term perspective of 10-25 years.

When governments ratify treaties on human rights, every person within the country is entitled to have those human rights respected, protected and fulfilled. All UNCTs need to use a human-rights based approach to support country analysis, advocate for priorities in the national development framework, and prepare an UNDAF that demonstrates a strategic use of UNCT resources, expertise and comparative advantages to support compliance with these treaties.

Generally speaking, UNDAF activities are characterized by a human rights-approach but it is striking that the UNDAF narrative does not refer to any of the major human rights treaties. Only in the result matrices is there a brief mention of CEDAW and the policy commitments made by Mozambique under the Convention on the Rights of the Child (e.g. CP Output 1.4.3.). This may be a consequence of the fact that the UNDAF only refers to the Government's Five Year Programme, PARPA and MDG frameworks.

The MDG framework, which seeks the universal attainment of the most fundamental human rights such as the survival, food, education, food, health etc., has been closely integrated into the UNDAF. In particular, UNDAF Outcome 1 on Governance is defined with a view to facilitate national strategies to achieve the MDGs: "By 2009, Government and CSO capacity at national, provincial and local level, strengthened to plan, implement and monitor socio-economic development in a transparent, accountable, equitable and participatory way in order to achieve the MDGs". In effect, the MDGs are being mainstreamed into this outcome/pillar.

The relationship between UNDAF and MDGs is even more deliberate in UNDAF Outcome 3: "Individuals, civil society, national and local public and private institutions are empowered to spread the halt of HIV/AIDS among population at higher risk and to mitigate its impact". Since

---

<sup>3</sup> Examples include the policy debates on "What drives the economy and what are the different scenarios for economic growth?", "What are priorities for redistribution of wealth", "How effective is the proposed Green Revolution to ensure food security" etc.

UNDAF identified HIV/AIDS as one of the major threats to development in Mozambique, a specific outcome and pillar were dedicated to supporting the National Multisectoral Strategic Plan to Combat HIV/AIDS 2005 – 2009 (PEN II) and the operational framework of PARPA II.

Overall, the UNDAF is a sufficiently flexible instrument to adjusting to evolving national policies and strategies. Evidence of this is seen in:

- the fact that UNDAF defines only outcomes and outputs, leaving scope for the definition of activities;
- various re-scoping exercises, both at the level of Joint Programmes and Pillars (when the Government reviewed its HIV/AIDS prevention strategy in 2007, the UNDAF HIV/AIDS Pillar also revised its matrix and work plans to support the new government orientation; and
- the extension to harmonize UN and government planning cycles.

Another example of the flexibility of the UNDAF is the inclusion of a fourth pillar, Economic Development, for the period of the extension. This was done to reflect the fact that many activities of some agencies including non-resident agencies that are active in this area were not covered by the original UNDAF. This also ensured greater alignment with PARPA II, which counts Economic Development as one of its pillars.

Field work showed that the national priorities are also supported at operational level through the various modalities of joint delivery such as Joint Programme, joint programming, MDG-F, and Millennium Villages. Joint interventions also have strong linkages with the MDGs. However, joint interventions are rarely based on provincial or district plans.

National priorities are not defined only by government, but also by civil society. As noted before, the mechanisms used by the UNCT to engage CSOs in the UNDAF elaboration and design process were essentially consultative. This limited the potential for joint analysis as well as the extent to which the development priorities identified by CSOs were effectively integrated into the UNDAF and supported by specific strategies.

## **3.2 Lessons learned and recommendations**

On the one hand, the alignment between UNDAF and national planning documents such as PARPA and MDG framework ensures that UN support targets the national priorities identified by Government. On the other hand, given such intimate alignment, the extent to which international conventions that protect and uphold other human rights, gender equality and cross-cutting issues are visible and clearly integrated in the UNDAF also depends on the extent to which these issues will be addressed by the PARP. This suggests the need for continuous policy dialogue at all levels, to ensure that government planning to which the UN is so closely aligned take into account all UN principles and objectives. In addition, it is also necessary to more closely align UNDAF outcomes and outputs to the development priorities identified by civil society.

## 4 Quality of design and comparative advantages

This section assesses how well the UNDAF was designed. Special attention is given to the level of integration of the five programmatic principles and the extent to which outcomes, outputs and joint activities seek to maximize the UN's comparative advantages. The five programmatic principles are: results-based management, human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, and capacity development.

### 4.1 Assessment of the five programmatic principles

The UNDAF document uses the results-based management format to show how the UN system in Mozambique intends to respond to MDG-related national priorities. However, there is no doubt that the results chain is cumbersome, which affects its internal coherence and dilutes the focus. UN staff unanimously indicated during interviews that the design and focus of the UNDAF are compromised by the multitude of outcomes, results and indicators which make it very difficult to accurately gauge progress against agreed targets. This has been widely recognized by the UN agencies as a major shortcoming of the UNDAF under review and specific RBM trainings for UN staff and government partners have since been initiated.

In addition, a consensus has evolved that in the future outcomes and outputs must be limited and that the M&E framework must be improved, harmonized and pared down (i.e. reduce the number of indicators: currently there are 371). The large number of outputs is related to the fact that many agencies had already developed their Country Programme documents and needed to reflect the priorities contained therein in the UNDAF. UN staff described how each agency in effect ended up providing a list of programmes or activities it intended to implement— or was implementing —and these were grouped under diverse UNDAF outputs. Related to this, there also seems to have been a relatively weak prioritization process, with the process being much more “bottom up” than “top down”. This highlights the need for greater strengthening of the RCO as coordinating a more focused prioritization of outcomes which should be based on technical grounds. The evaluation team thus finds that while individual outcomes may have been realistic, the UNDAF was too ambitious and it was unrealistic to expect that *all* outcomes would be achieved.

Results-based management requires the identification of critical assumptions about the programme environment and risk assessments, clearly defined accountabilities and indicators for results, and performance monitoring and reporting. In this respect, the UNDAF M&E framework mentions risks and assumptions but these appear to be based on a fairly loose analysis and the risks identified are not fully addressed in the proposed strategies and outputs.

A sound analysis of risks and assumptions is critical when outcomes do not depend solely on the actions of UN agencies.

Ideally, human rights should be mainstreamed throughout the entire UNDAF and its implementation; raising the question of how to integrate human rights indicators in the M&E framework. The UNDAF reflects human rights based programming, but as it was noted before the emphasis on human rights would be much stronger if there were a clear reference to the relevant human rights instruments and conventions. While the activities themselves relate to human rights (e.g. seek to improve access to fundamental human rights such as justice, water, health, education, livelihood etc.) the M&E framework does not fully capture the extent to

which these rights are attained and what is their impact on the life of Mozambican citizens.<sup>4</sup> The evaluation team finds that although it is already a key aspect of many UNDAF activities, the human rights perspective needs to be fleshed out (i.e. articulated at output level) and better reflected in the M&E system.

Achieving gender equality and eliminating all forms of discrimination on the basis of sex are key aspects of human rights based programming. The UNDAF has opted for the twin strategy of mainstreaming gender into all thematic areas while also developing a Joint Programme dedicated to gender equality. While the Joint Programmes have enabled UN agencies to partner with women's groups and with gender equality advocates that can influence the development agenda and demand accountability for implementation of gender equality dimensions of national laws, policies and strategies, the gender audit and scorecard methodologies that have been used as tools for assessing progress on gender mainstreaming at an operational level show that more can be done to mainstream gender equality throughout the UNDAF.

Although most Joint Programmes have gender activities, the field work suggests that these are rarely seen as prime concerns. Thus gender equality appears to be primarily dealt with in the form of a Joint Programme dedicated to gender. Several staff members recognized that gender and other cross-cutting issues are often 'lost' due to lack of staff or expertise on such issues. This lack of analysis hides the fact that several agencies in fact have very strong commitments to gender equality and gender mainstreaming. Nonetheless, these commitments appear to be a result of policy commitments and targets set by each agency rather than the result of UNDAF. There is a need to ensure that gender and other cross cutting issues are taken into account in the design of the UNDAF, and also integrated into the M&E framework, such that the effectiveness of Gender mainstreaming can be assessed. For example, of the 96 Country Programme Outputs, only 20 (21%) mention gender; out of the 320 indicators at output level only 46 (14%) refer to gender oriented actions.

The UNDAF/HIV Pillar was designed to support the strengthening of the HIV and AIDS response in Mozambique through three strategic components in areas of comparative advantage of the UN namely prevention, treatment and HIV mainstreaming. The framework of HIV Pillar is named Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS which was developed taking account of several key national plans and policies, among them PARPA II (2005-2009) and the HIV National Strategic Plan (2005-2009). The UNTAM provides the overall umbrella under which the UN agencies implement and monitor the HIV Joint Programme.<sup>5</sup> The Joint Programme itself was sufficiently flexible to respond to new approaches and challenges.<sup>6</sup> The UNDAF/HIV Pillar or Joint

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, the right to justice cannot be measured alone by access and the existence of formal justice courts or by the implementation of civic education campaigns to disseminate new laws: what is also required is a discussion about the quality of justice and the extent to which citizens have faith in the justice system, and these in turn require a deeper analysis of additional elements such as measures to reduce corruption, improve the quality of legal training, availability of inexpensive legal aid etc. Another example is UN's successful advocacy to pass a law prohibiting discrimination and stigmatization of people living with HIV/AIDS. Although the law was approved in 2009, the M&E system does not measure compliance with the law.

<sup>5</sup> Established in April 2007, the UNTAM works under the authority of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) and is facilitated by the UNAIDS Country Coordinator (UCC) with the primary purpose of implementing UN strategic assistance to strengthen the national response to HIV and AIDS. This includes the provision of technical inputs and monitoring of decisions made by national fora. The UNTAM facilitates the application of the "Three Ones" principles, especially through joint programming, policy dialogue and inclusive partnerships with national and international stakeholders.

<sup>6</sup>Through UNTAM was decided to revise all priorities of HIV Pillar in order to ensure coherence with Government priorities in the area of HIV and AIDS aligning Joint Programme with the National Accelerated Prevention Strategy



Programme was designed based on the partnerships of UN agencies with government institutions such as the CNCS, MISAU, MMAS and the Provincial Directorates as well as other stakeholders. In addition there are several NGOs and community based organizations that are also implementing partners.

While HIV/AIDS is addressed in a specific way (i.e. as a separate pillar), there are indications that it has not been fully integrated in other pillars of the UNDAF, apart from some specific exceptions (e.g. law on discrimination). UNDAF does not give sufficient attention to the linkages between HIV and gender. Considering that women are consistently at higher risk of contracting HIV than men in Mozambique, the evaluation team finds that these linkages should be more clearly developed in future UNDAFs.

Some UN staff indicate a need to create a mechanism that can support gender mainstreaming within the UN generally and in relation to UNDAF in particular. This mechanism should be composed only of UN Gender Focal Points or staff involved in gender programmes and/or mainstreaming. As such it will be in a position not only to consolidate the UN position (‘speak as one’) vis-à-vis other partners but also to advise the UNCT and PMT on gender equality concerns. The gender scorecard methodology found that gender mainstreaming in UNDAF lacks consistency; the evaluation team is of the opinion that a gender mechanism could contribute to more consistent mainstreaming by developing a UN-wide strategy for gender equality.

Environmental sustainability is a programmatic principle of the UNDAF, and this is addressed both through a joint programme, financed by the MDGF, on environmental mainstreaming and adaptation to climate change, and through inclusion of environmental sustainability concerns in other activities under other outcomes. For example, under outcome 2 “*Government capacity....improved to implement, coordinate and support the efficient and accountable delivery of integrated basic services*” training was provided to Government at various levels in how to integrate environmental concerns into planning.

The comparative advantages that the UN system offers are manifold. They include universality, neutrality, multilateralism, grant-nature of contributions, and the special mandates of the UN agencies. In Mozambique the UN agencies have identified four specific approaches that are considered most relevant and strategic to the national context: (i) advocacy for the realization of the MDGs; (ii) policy support engaging the UN’s global experience and data analysis; (iii) capacity development of government and CSO for better policy development, implementation and oversight; and (iv) technical support to ensure that policies are appropriate and gender responsive and implemented effectively. The UNDAF document includes for each of the four UNDAF Outcomes/pillars a section that outlines specifically what each agency will contribute towards the achievement of that UNDAF outcome. From those it is clear that the UNDAF builds on each of the approaches and Government expressed great appreciation and satisfaction

---

in 2009. Up to this point the UNDAF prevention activities had predominantly focused on youth prevention, but with the development of the National Prevention Strategy, it was evident that UN support in the area of prevention needed to become more encompassing. This alignment broadened the scope of the Joint Programme by including areas linked to HIV prevention that were not initially taken into account in the original Joint Programme like male circumcision, a component which was neglected by PARPA II. In this case, UN have played an active role in terms of including in the mentioned new strategic component to prevent HIV/AIDS spread in the Joint Programme to ensure that a basic framework will be established in this field.

with the UN's role in advocacy and policy support, which they consider are made possible by the UN's neutrality (as opposed to other multilateral and bilateral donors).

However, at implementation level most joint activities were designed to deliver technical support and capacity building, with each agency contributing its specific area of expertise at both central and local level. In that sense, capacity development is the central thrust and main purpose of UNDAF cooperation. For there to be national ownership, capacity development takes place within the national development framework and it responds to national capacity assessments and capacity development strategies. Nonetheless, there are specific challenges associated with delivering capacity development and technical support to government and CSO. Several concerns are noted regarding the UNDAF's capacity building strategies:

- How innovative is capacity building (e.g. are promoted technologies really innovative and empowering: how effective are trainings and seminars; how empowering is it for women to acquire sewing machines if they lack money to buy material?)
- Capacity building cannot be simply a question of demonstrating technology: if new technologies are going to be applied in community-based projects, then there is a need to better understand the process of acceptance, adaptation and adoption.
- The UN has encountered difficulties in strengthening the capacity of CSO. On the one hand, the UNDAF seeks to mainstream CSO capacity building in all areas of the UNDAF, but on the other hand it has also developed a Joint Programme designed specifically to build the capacity of CSOs. One of the lessons learned of this experience is that it is necessary to clearly define the objectives and delivery areas of the Joint Programme as opposed to the overall CSO mainstreaming across the UNDAF.

## 4.2 Lessons learned and recommendations

Certain aspects of the design (results chain and M&E matrix) can be improved, but this is widely acknowledged and agencies are well aware of the need to reduce the number of outcomes and outputs in future UNDAFs. There is a need to better articulate human rights, and capacity building of civil society, and both these themes should be in effect 'mainstreamed' and integrated in M&E.

Generally, the evaluation team finds that cross-cutting issues should be mainstreamed, rather than have a Joint Programme or pillar dedicated to them. A key concern is how to ensure that each agency will adequately consider and support cross-cutting issues. Firstly, to address the lack of expertise or staff time to backstop and monitor cross-cutting issues and gender equality in particular, the evaluation team suggests that all joint initiatives appoint Focal Points (one or several depending on the nature and number of pertinent cross-cutting issues). Secondly, considering the lack of accountability mechanism for cross-cutting issues, it is suggested, following the example of Joint Reviews, to develop a *ficha tecnica* for each UNDAF outcome that requires agencies to identify what are relevant cross-cutting concerns (gender, HIV, environment, etc). This would also improve accountability and make reporting and monitoring progress on cross-cutting issues easier (See Annex for a possible example). Thirdly, with specific reference to gender equality, it is advisable to support gender mainstreaming across all UNDAF components through an internal coordination mechanism whose primary functions would be to consolidate the UN position *vis-à-vis* national partners and other donors, to advise

the UNCT and PMT on emerging gender issues and develop a UN wide strategy for gender mainstreaming.

The UN's comparative advantages form the basis for UNDAF outcomes, outputs and joint activities. There is a need for the UN to pilot innovative forms of capacity development, both targeted at institutional partners and community-based beneficiaries. Although UNDAF includes a focus on strengthening the capacity of CSO to monitor public policy, this was weak and it is recommended that the future UNDAF place greater emphasis on it by mainstreaming the capacity development of CSO in all joint activities.

## 5 Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework

### 5.1 Effectiveness

At country level there is full buy-in and commitment by the UN system to UNDAF as the prime means to achieve UN inter-agency collaboration, coordination, harmonization and strategic partnerships. Government and other partners also agree that UNDAF, Delivering As One, and One UN is the way forward for a more strategic and effective UN. In Mozambique UNDAF has defined a cohesive strategy for UN support which has both enhanced joint programming by agencies and resulted in specific Joint Programmes.

Government officials interviewed pointed to the improved overview of UN support, showing where funding gaps occur and the fact that coordination among the UN agencies has also promoted internal coordination among government institutions, but unlike SWAPs, UNDAF did not define new funding and institutional arrangements for government. Other partners also highlighted advantages such as capacity development through joint planning and monitoring sessions; better structure for partners to liaise with UN, and better insight into the UN system and UN reform process.

The integrated and multi-sectoral approach that characterizes the Joint Programmes, Millennium Villages and MDG-F programmes can potentially reduce the risk of fragmented programming but in practice it appears that jointness is still dominated by each agency's mandate and own country programme. As noted before, in many cases Joint Programmes and joint programming were essentially mechanisms to group together a series of activities that agencies already intended to implement around specific themes. Often the drive to develop Joint Programmes was founded on the fact that this would guarantee funding and/or a concern to visibly participate in joint delivery. Evidence of this is the fact that some agencies went ahead and used their own funds to implement even though the Joint Programmes in question had not yet been signed. In another case, most interventions were already being implemented before the initiation of the Joint Programme but in a less coordinated manner.

These examples raise questions about the real gains of oneness and doubts about the extent to which activities were seen as part of one, integrated, strategic overall programme which serves as the framework for coordination and partnership. To a significant extent this was largely due to the incomplete harmonization of agencies' programming cycles – this will be much better in future as Country Programming will coincide with UNDAF elaboration processes – but still, not all agencies will be able to harmonize their cycle and in the future, all joint interventions must be based on a more rigorous analysis of internal linkages, synergies and agencies' comparative advantages.

The UNDAF pillars consist of components that complement each other but are technically very specific – in fact, each agency implements separately but all contribute to the same results and same outcome. This highlights the importance of joint planning, joint monitoring and joint reporting to achieve the proposed objectives. It also points to the risk that, when the pillar lead agency has insufficient resources and influence, in effect no-one will be responsible for planning and coordination at outcome level, which will make it extremely difficult to measure

both oneness and impact of UNDAF.<sup>7</sup> There are also risks related to sequencing – if one agency's inputs are sequentially planned to follow other agencies' inputs, then careful planning and good coordination is essential. This aspect was raised as causing implementation problems for agencies where others were unable to deliver on time. Many staff interviewed indicated that in essence what is required is an accountability structure that makes agencies accountable to one another, which to date has not been possible on account of equity concerns whereby no single agency can be hierarchically placed above another. Others consider that this particular issue is more a technical issue and can be resolved by making it mandatory for Joint Programmes to appoint a coordinator with the necessary skills to perform this type of analysis.

There has been a discussion about the appropriateness of making agencies accountable for reporting to a lead agency when that lead agency is also a participating agency. However, there is a general consensus that in the long term, and if UNDAF is to be seriously applied, a move from the equity culture to accountability culture will be inevitable and that the Resident Coordinator function and role of PMT will need to be strengthened to reflect this. It is noted that the Troika model may prove some useful elements.

It is noted that UNDAF has created horizontal integration but agencies remain tied to the vertical decision making structures linking HQ to Country Offices, especially regarding the selection and funding of projects. Some concerns were raised about the fact that such centralization at HQ level may not be appropriate in relation to UNDAF, One UN and Delivering As One where priorities and funding are dealt with at country level and a significant degree of flexibility is required to ensure that UN programming responds accurately and adequately to national development concerns. In some cases this will require a measure of decentralization or devolution of decision-making to the Country Offices.

At country level, the UNCT approved the PMT as management structure to ensure the overall management and monitoring of joint programmes. It is composed of a Chair, Vice Chair, and Pillar leads, and its main role is to advise the UNCT, identify emerging issues that should be integrated in UNDAF, and report to UNCT on the implementation of the Joint Programmes and their performance towards meeting the results agreed in UNDAF. In the past, PMT and criteria for participation in PMT have not always been clear and this has undermined some agencies' participation in PMT.

In the Joint Programmes visited, the integrated approach enables agencies to gain access to infrastructure and resources of other agencies (e.g. warehouses, field offices, volunteers/local staff, implementing partners etc.) that can be leveraged to increase common impact. However, this is not an automatic process and it is noted that letters of agreement and Memorandums of Understanding differ from one agency to another, making collaboration a complex procedure.

Field work has shown that at implementation level staff has very little information about UNDAF. Coordination mechanisms at implementation level are limited to operational issues related to the Joint Programme or joint programming in question and this means that field staffs of different agencies have no incentive to proactively and collectively identify areas of joint concern and potential collaboration. In the field the significance of UNDAF as a framework for collaboration and partnership is very limited.

Duplication in the delivery of services and implementation of activities by Joint Programmes is avoided through quarterly Programme Management Committee meetings and joint planning,

---

<sup>7</sup> Measuring the gains of joint delivery becomes even more daunting when reports focus on activities more than on results, as is often the case, due to lack of appropriate joint indicators and targets.

resulting in annual work plans. Other management mechanisms to ensure jointness are joint monitoring, joint decision making, and joint reporting. All these require effective knowledge management and information exchange, which, generally speaking, is an area that needs improvement. In that respect, convening agencies must design more robust information exchange mechanisms and assist agencies in compiling information and guidance in ensuring a collective analysis.

Field work also showed that decisions taken at Country Office level do not quickly flow to the field level and this has led to some concern about the ability of agencies to speak with one voice. Information flows from the PMT to UNCT but the challenge is to ensure that information goes down to programme officers at the technical level. In this respect it is noted that the uploading of all UNCT and PMT decisions on the One UN Intranet will be useful.

For each Joint Programme, the lead agency has several responsibilities, ranging from the coordination of joint planning, periodic review of implementation, organization of joint monitoring missions, ensuring that RBM and HR are adequately mainstreamed, to reporting to the UNCT on progress and performance issues. Although the role of the Joint Programme lead agency is critical, like the Pillar lead agency, it lacks a clear mandate and accountability mechanisms over the other agencies, suggesting that the existing ToR should be reviewed. Time management is problematic without an effective mechanism to ensure that agencies meet deadlines as agencies that do not comply affect the joint process. It falls to the lead agency to facilitate consultations on the involvement of national counterparts, but often each agency goes the direct route based on its own long term relationships with government and partners.

Currently agencies participating in Joint Programmes prepare individual reports that are circulated by email and compiled into a consolidated report by the convening agency. The report is then discussed by the Joint Programme team before it is sent to the UNCT through the PMT. Some Joint Programme teams indicated that the lack of clear reporting guidelines created unnecessary transaction costs, and thus they suggested that standardized reporting periods and formats be developed. In many cases reporting formats do exist (e.g. those developed by UNDG and UNDOCO) but there is no accountability mechanism to ensure compliance. Urgent action is required by agency HQs because if they do not define what reporting formats should be used they run the risk that each country will develop its own formats.

## 5.2 Efficiency

Regarding efficiency, the question is whether outcomes could have been achieved at a lower cost. In theory UNDAF should reduce transaction costs, by streamlining and harmonizing and cutting out duplication. In practice however, staff point to the fact that horizontal integration carries significant transaction costs in terms of staff attendance in meetings. In cases where an agency has had to assign full time staff to manage the Joint Programme component, there have been increased costs. Most agencies have capacity to deliver on Joint Programmes and UNDAF but there are issues around the agencies' role as lead in their specific sector; almost half of agencies say they currently have capacity limitations to performing that role. Some implementing partners have also faced additional costs: in some cases they have recruited staff to manage the Joint Programme component, especially in start up phase and for reporting. There has therefore perhaps been not so much a reduction in transaction costs as a shift in where these apply. There is a need to balance the advantages (entry points, funding, visibility, and information) with availability of human resources. It is noted that Non-Resident Agencies and Resident Agencies have slightly different views on this: for the former, UNDAF has presented

them with an opportunity to come on board in a number of areas that would not normally have been readily open to them.

Joint Programmes can lessen burdens of staff in different agencies (e.g. some coordination tasks are given to the lead agency) but this only works if there is a clear division of labour and if lead agency has the necessary staff and resources to do it. Of specific concern is the fact that the UNDAF in general and the Joint Programmes in particular lack a clear distribution of roles. This implies a risk that agencies organize their interventions around programmes rather than around outcomes. Also, where agencies have own activities with the same implementing partners outside of the Joint Programme, this requires separate planning and reporting and separate dialogue, leading to increased costs and confusion among partners.

The internal review of the Joint Programmes conducted in 2010 clearly shows that up to now there is inadequate evidence to suggest that there have been any significant reductions in transaction costs. While wastage of resources can be minimized if duplication is avoided, avoiding duplication is only discussed in terms of joint planning. The evaluation team finds that very seldom Joint Programme teams analyse whether an activity costs less to implement through a Joint Programme than if a particular agency were to implement that activity alone. Indeed, agencies continue to implement their activities individually alongside their own annual work plan and this does not seem to be a concern, especially not as agencies have already budgeted their activities and see Joint Programmes as funding opportunities. There may be some economies of scale, but this largely depends on geographical convergence. With regard to HACT, some first indications suggest that this may be beneficial for agencies that can spread the costs associated with risk-assessments and especially training over a larger number of partners; thus it would perhaps not be so advantageous for small agencies unless a systematic pro-rata cost-sharing approach is used. Overall, though, HACT is considered to be an important step in developing a new culture of collaboration.

Some joint initiatives were designed using a holistic approach to increase efficiency, resulting in a complex division of responsibilities. This is not likely to be successful in environment where each agency has own procedures – and in that respect, it is noted that agencies continue to apply different rules, policies, procedures and systems. This results in a loss of focus as results were to be achieved by many UN partners with systematic delays due to highly bureaucratic tender procedures, namely recruitment, procurement and disbursement of funds. There is a need to streamline and harmonize administrative procedures in order to avoid delays.

### **5.3 Lessons learned and recommendations**

In order to be an effective mechanism for coordination and partnership, the Joint Programme design process needs to be more coherent to ensure that the whole programme is more than the sum of the parts contributed by individual agencies. In that sense it is recommended that each joint initiative be required to carry out a mandatory SWOT analysis and mapping exercise to identify the agencies' comparative advantages. Concerns raised in interviews emphasize the need for clear division of labour with real mandates and effective delegation of functions among the agencies (particularly pillar leads and Joint Programme lead agencies).

There is very little reflection on the opportunity cost of going it alone: i.e. the evaluation team found very little evidence to suggest there had been a systematic analysis of the monetary/resource savings that can be achieved by securing the input of other agencies on programmatic issues. On the contrary, joint initiatives and Joint Programmes in particular

appear as important opportunities for resource mobilization. Agencies should therefore be encouraged to bring resources to the joint initiative instead of seeing it as resource mobilization. In other words, jointness should be seen as an investment whereby agencies expect good performance of their money, getting more value for money than if agency implemented alone. At individual agency level the implementation of HACT has contributed to reduced transaction costs of the work with partners.

There are cases in which it is cheaper, easier and faster to deliver alone – joint delivery only makes sense if significant synergies can be deployed. In that sense, staff point to the importance of ensuring that design is based on comparative advantages, complementarity of mandates and technical grounds instead of funding opportunities. Experience has shown that there is a need to match the need for flexibility with the need for structures that optimize management and accountability, to streamline and harmonize decision making both within agencies (vertical integration) and among agencies (horizontal integration), and to standardize administrative procedures.

Until these conditions are met, it may be better to work together on outcomes and not on activity level, suggesting the need for rigorous joint planning focused on outcomes and clear indicators. That is consistent with the UNCT's intention to in future focus on joint programming and to use Joint Programmes selectively as a modality to address specific issues of a limited scope.



## **6 Impact and effectiveness of UNDAF towards achieving MDGs, national development targets and international conventions**

### **6.1 Limitations of impact analysis of UNDAF**

The ToR state that the evaluation should, to the extent possible, assess the medium term impact of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether any major changes in UNDAF indicators can be reasonably attributed to or associated with UNDAF, notably in the realization of MDGs, national development goals and the implementation of internationally agreed commitments and conventions. It should be noted that the impact analysis is constrained by several factors: firstly, the UNDAF still has one more year to go and this means that many results have not yet been fully achieved. Secondly, weaknesses in the M&E framework have resulted in inadequate reporting on results and outcomes. Thirdly, there is the question of attribution and the important fact that UNDAF only captures around 25% of the total support provided by individual agencies. Lastly, there is no counterfactual evidence available that would show what would have happened without the UNDAF. Nonetheless, this chapter attempts, using data from the PARPA evaluation and annual evaluations of the PES, to give a general overview of the main development gains that have been registered in Mozambique in the period covered by the UNDAF, without necessarily drawing direct linkages between UN activities and impacts, before discussing internal aspects of UNDAF impact reporting.

### **6.2 Governance pillar**

The Governance pillar responds to UNDAF Outcome 1 “By 2009, Government and CSO capacity at national, provincial and local level, strengthened to plan, implement and monitor socio-economic development in a transparent, accountable, equitable and participatory way in order to achieve the MDGs”. This was expected to be achieved through the following Country Team Programme Outputs:

- Increased capacity for decentralized planning and monitoring;
- Increased capacity for decentralized delivery of integrated basic services;
- Improved capacity for policy formulation and monitoring of compliance with policies;
- Strengthened democratic governance and legislative reform to enhance human rights based approaches;
- Improved rule of law, access to justice and penal reforms; and
- CSOs strengthened and involved in the development agenda at national and decentralized level.

On the positive side, there has been substantial progress in the capacity building for planning at national and decentralized level, mainly through the successful Joint Programme on Support to Decentralization. The National Policy and Strategy on Decentralization have been developed

and approved; and the Joint Programme has been instrumental in the use of ESDEM (DevInfo) and key social indicators, including child well-being indicators. Overall, the Joint Programme has directly contributed to improvements in the capacity of provincial, district and municipal governments to deliver integrated public services and implement food security and nutrition priorities defined in the National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy (ESAN II). The UN Country Team has also supported innovative forms of capacity building such as mainstreaming of culture.

The main mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of poverty reduction policies is the Development Observatory. Observatories have been convened with the required frequency but there are concerns regarding the nature and quality of CSO participation in the Development Observatories. Although funds were only available in December 2009, the Joint Programme to Build Capacity of CSOs has contributed to institutional capacity building of CSOs, advocacy, reforms to legal framework and social mobilization. The process of law reform is ongoing, including the passing and promulgation of legislation on gender equality and HIV (law on domestic violence and law prohibiting discrimination against PLWHA) – supported by the Joint Programme on Women’s Empowerment and Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS – but the Aide Memoire of 2010 also points to persisting concerns about prison reform, reform of the criminal police, corruption and access to justice.

### 6.3 Human Capital

The Human Capital pillar was designed to meet UNDAF Outcome 2 “Increased access to and use of quality basic services and social protection for the most disadvantaged populations, particularly children, youth and women, to reduce their vulnerability by 2009”. The Country Team Programme Outcomes are:

- Increased net enrolment in primary education and improved learning environment;
- Increased access to and use of quality health services;
- Improved access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation (rural and urban);
- Improved capacity to implement the National Strategy on Food Security and Nutrition; and
- Strengthened and expanded social protection safety nets.

Recent data collected for PARPA II shows that access to primary education has steadily improved over recent years, reaching a net enrolment rate of over 90% which means that almost all children aged 6-12 are in school, including girls. UN Country Team efforts have contributed to this through the minimum quality education package, School Led Total Sanitation initiative, and school-based food and nutrition programmes. The drop-out rate in assisted primary schools decreased from 7% to 5.4% from 2008 to 2009. However, teacher/pupil ratios remain low and this is one of the factors leading to persisting concerns about the quality of education. MINED has developed a zero tolerance policy towards sexual abuse in schools, but enforcement is weak. Girls’ participation in secondary and higher education remains of concern.

According to the PARPA evaluation studies there have been significant improvements in the access to and use of health services, particularly in the rural areas. Gains have been more pronounced in rural areas, although rural areas are still worse-off than urban areas. Overall the statistics show a decline of mortality rates, although it is unlikely that the MDG targets will be

met by 2015. Child mortality has decreased, primarily due to improved vaccination coverage and improvements in preventing malaria, the prime cause of death, through the use of treated bed nets and spraying of houses. Maternal mortality remains high and it is unlikely that the MDG target will be met, largely due to the limited geographic coverage of adequate emergency obstetrical services. The Joint Programme on Child and Maternal Health & Nutrition and Joint Programme on Child Food Security and Nutrition have contributed to overall reduction in infant and child mortality rates, but in spite of a slight reduction in chronic malnutrition, the malnutrition rate remains high (44%) and even in the wealthiest quintile 26% are chronically malnourished, pointing to the need to improve nutritional education.

According to the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey of 2008 and IOF 2009 there have been moderate improvements in both access to safe water and sanitation, although disparities between urban and rural/peri-urban areas persist. UNDAF interventions contributed to this by supporting the establishment of the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Common Fund, elaboration of a decentralized water supply and sanitation services strategy, development of WES indicators, capacity building in WASH at district level, Community Approach to Total Sanitation and improved sanitation in selected peri-urban areas.

In the area of social protection safety nets, UNDAF targets and indicators were initially set at programmatic level, but in fact the activities of the UN partners have moved to a policy and political level in order to improve advocacy. The Joint Programme on Social Protection has contributed to the recognition of social protection as a national priority. It has provided support for the PARPA Working Group for Social Action, support for the elaboration of the social protection strategy; support to the Food Subsidy Programme implemented by INAS and other social assistance programmes.

Disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness have been mainstreamed in four areas (education, health, water and sanitation and food security). Activities have been clustered in a Joint Programme on Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Preparedness and include interventions such as capacity building and pre-positioning of emergency education and health supplies, support to contain the cholera outbreaks in 2009, water supply drought mitigation, capacity building for district and provincial authorities to design and conduct initial emergency food security assessments following rapid on-set emergencies etc.

## 6.4 HIV/AIDS pillar

For the HIV/AIDS pillar, the UNDAF Outcome 3 is “Individuals, civil society, national and local public and private institutions are empowered to halt the spread of HIV/AIDS among the population at higher risk and to mitigate its impact”. Specifically, this is to be achieved through a comprehensive joint programme dedicated to strengthening the national response to HIV/AIDS in Mozambique, based on the following UN Country Team Programme Outcomes:

- Comprehensive prevention targeting youth and girls, young women and workers;
- Strengthened capacity of Ministry of Health and stakeholders for prevention of mother to child transmission;
- Improved capacity of Ministry of Health and stakeholders to provide standard support packages (ARV, prophylaxis, treatment of opportunistic infections, nutritional support, home based care and counselling);

- Access to basic services and social protection for orphans and vulnerable children and their families;
- HIV and gender mainstreamed into provincial and district plans; and
- One single monitoring and evaluation system and availability of quality data.

The Joint Programme has contributed to the development of several key policy documents such as the National HIV/AIDS Strategy 2010-2014 (PEN III) which was approved by the Council of Ministers in 2010; National Public Sector HIV Strategy and the elaboration of a Multi-Sectoral Action Plan on gender and HIV; as well as national strategic plans for sexual and reproductive health, and the National Monitoring & Evaluation Plan for the Accelerated Prevention Strategy. Guidelines for ARV therapy and opportunistic infections have been developed, as well as new paediatric guidelines for ARV treatment and PMTCT protocols. Capacity building has been strengthened among health care providers, civil society, associations of PLWHA, communities and the private sector. Capacity building has focused on better service delivery, prevention and workplace policies.

At national level, clear progress has been made in expanding access to treatment and prevention of mother to child transmission. Today more people have access to improved integrated services, including mitigation measures. The awareness of HIV and AIDS-related issues is clearly increasing and misconceptions are decreasing but overall, the percentage of population with correct information is still low and there is no indication that this knowledge is translating into significant behaviour change and reduced stigmatization. There is good data available on prevalence but not on new infections.

## 6.5 Economic Development Pillar

The Economic Development pillar has the aim of “promoting equitable economic and social development, reducing disparities, with a focus on poverty reduction”. This includes:

- Promoting support to the creation of a favourable environment for economic development, through the formulation of strategic policies with a view to greater integration in the economy, namely the transition from the informal economy to the formal, greater productivity and availability of food and consumer goods;
- Promoting better management of natural resources and valuing cultural and environmental issues in development; and
- Promotion of jobs, local industries, market access, commerce, financial services and local infrastructure.

This pillar was added to the UNDAF only for the extension period (2010/2011), such that the timeframe for any activities to have fed through into impact on the ground is limited. In terms of national achievements in the area of economic development, the results have been mixed. Despite continued impressive economic growth, and the national economy having weathered the international recession reasonably well, worrying figures from the recent household survey suggest that consumption poverty has not fallen overall during the last five years, and actually got worse in rural areas. This clearly presents a challenge for the stated aim of the Economic Development pillar, with regard to equity and reducing disparities.

The poor performance on poverty reduction has been linked in part to a failure to increase agricultural productivity, which is a key area of focus for the UNDAF pillar. This clearly demonstrates the relevance of the economic development pillar and the need for continued engagement in this area. The agricultural sector has been the focus of a number of initiatives and strategies and the government has responded to criticism of fragmented policy making with the Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development (PESDA) 2010-2019, which unites in one plan all the various strands of agricultural policy.

Regarding management of natural resources and the environment, one of the UNDAF targets is aligned with that of the Annual Review, *viz.* number of district development plans with a land use component, and this target was met for both 2008 and 2009. Sustainable management of natural resources also raises questions about exploitation and reinvestment of Mozambique's considerable natural and mineral resources. Since the economy is politically charged – and the Paris Declaration makes it difficult to directly address this – this has been approached through climate change and environment. However, the joint programme on environment mainstreaming and disaster risk reduction does not specifically address such policy issues.

In terms of business environment, Mozambique's ranking in the "Doing Business" survey has shown modest improvement, increasing from 141/175 in 2008 to 126/183 in 2010. The main driver of recent improvements in this index have been the increased ease of opening a business, which is associated with simplified procedures for registering a business, and simplification of customs procedures. With regard to job creation and reducing informality, the *Aide Memoire* of the Joint Review 2010 (drawing on World Bank research) suggests that levels of informality are increasing, which is a cause for concern. An Employment and Vocational Training Strategy has been developed, but it is still early to measure its results.

Some key results achieved with the support of UNDAF include: formulation of an agricultural marketing strategy and improved livelihoods for small scale fisheries (Joint Programme on Effective Trade Policy Formulation); greater awareness of the importance of the business development services, particularly for youth who wish to start up their own business (Joint Programme on the Promotion of Youth Employment) and overall improvements in the quality and storage of local produce (Joint Programme to Build Commodity value Chains and Market Linkages for Farmers' Associations). The Joint Programme on Environmental Mainstreaming and Adaptation to Climate Change has resulted in greater awareness of techniques to mitigate the effects of drought. The Joint Programme on Cultural and Creative Industries and Inclusive Policies was launched only recently; it is expected to lead to better use and sustainable management of natural resources and Mozambique's cultural heritage and thus create more income generating opportunities.

## 6.6 UNDAF mechanisms to report on impact

Agencies participating in Joint Programmes report mostly on activities and outputs rather than outcomes. Not all joint programmes have a coordinator or convening agency with capacity to carry out a comprehensive analysis of how the outputs contribute towards agreed outcomes. For these reasons, the PMT and UNCT may lack information to assess how individual Joint Programmes and pillars are contributing towards the overall UNDAF outcomes. In addition, the existing reporting formats and requirements are diverse and not always applied, which makes it difficult for the PMT and UNCT to correctly carry out an impact evaluation. The formats that are in use focus neither on whether objectives have been achieved (*i.e.* what were the direct effects for intended beneficiaries), nor do they assess of the full range of impacts at all levels of

the results chain, including ripple effects on families, households and communities, on institutional, technical or social systems, and on the environment.

Not surprisingly, there is a consensus among UN staff interviewed that the M&E system must be improved. Concerns point to the following:

- inadequate formulation of some indicators without reference to baseline data;
- a dependency on administrative data due to the close alignment of UNDAF to PARPA II and concerns regarding the methodology and quality of some such data sets;
- agencies have not yet aligned and harmonized their own M&E systems with the UNDAF M&E framework;
- Joint Programme M&E frameworks are not always aligned to UNDAF M&E systems;
- M&E formats for MDG-F changed throughout the period under review and are not harmonized with other Joint Programme reporting tools making reporting more difficult and time consuming;
- the multitude of indicators discourages the inclusion of new indicators that may be more appropriate or that can capture emerging issues;
- need to balance the need for flexibility with need to avoid changing indicators as this dilutes the focus; and
- lack of systematic follow-up of cross-cutting issues.

Another important issue related to impact evaluation is attribution—that is, determining to what extent UNDAF, rather than other external factors, has contributed to observed impacts. In this regard it is important to note that UNDAF only captures roughly 25% of what agencies do in Mozambique, and in the case of specialized agencies this may be even less as their special mandates require them to work in other areas outside of UNDAF. Nonetheless, their routine work supports the work of other agencies and thus indirectly contributes to the achievement of outcomes. This raises an important question: how inclusive was UNDAF and how well did it capture the diverse forms of support provided to Mozambique by different agencies? Whereas the past UNDAF only reflects the initiatives that involve at least two UN agencies, and each agency has continued to implement its own activities that it implemented alone or with other partners (“business as usual”) this is expected to change as the new UNDAF coincides with agency programming cycles.

The question of attribution is also related to the interventions of other donors, particularly through SWAPs. Clearly, the country’s gains in reducing malaria, expanding access to ARVs, improved PMTCT and so forth are the result of the collective support given by UN agencies and other donors. The specialized agencies have a much stronger sectoral focus than the ExCom agencies that have broader mandates. In Mozambique, where there are many SWAPs and many partners, the UN has played an important role by being co-focal partners with the bilateral (focal partners) to provide technical support, develop strategic long term plans, M&E of the performance of the sector etc. While the other partners bring large amounts of financial aid, much of the key technical support for the sector is UN-driven and much of this sectoral support provided by UN agencies – and specialized agencies in particular - is not reflected in the UNDAF outputs.

Impact assessments also raise questions with regard to the effectiveness of the partnership strategy in achieving outcomes. The partnership strategy adopted in the UNDAF under review is twofold: pillars 1,2, and 4 use a cluster approach, while pillar 3 takes a different form. While this has been a useful approach, it is imperative to build clusters on a solid capacity assessment. Participation in clusters – and selection of a lead agency - can be approached from two angles: by identifying what agency already has the required capacity or by analyzing what agency has the most greatest comparative advantage and if necessary investing in any additional capacity that may be required to participate in or lead the cluster. To date, most joint programmes have followed the former scenario, in keeping with the agencies' mandates and programming decisions defined in their respective country programmes.

The HIV pillar has its own specific structure that is based on a prior institutional mechanism, namely UNTAM that leads the pillar with the support of UNAIDS that plays the role of secretariat. Experience has shown that the diversity of partnership strategies for UNDAF can lead to lack of clarity regarding the decision-making and autonomy of the pillar (e.g. in order to re-appropriate the decision making and oversight function of UNCT, the UNTAM was renamed UNTTAM, highlighting its technical and advisory roles.)

## 6.7 Lessons learned and recommendations

To ensure appropriate reporting on the impact of future UNDAFs on the country's development, urgent action is required from the agencies' headquarters or RCO to negotiate appropriate reporting formats that require a systematic impact analysis. These formats can be negotiated at HQ level, thus ensuring that all countries use similar formats, or they can be agreed upon through consensus among the agencies at country level. One single format developed at country level may be more appropriate in terms of linking reporting formats to existing national M&E frameworks such as the PARPA II M&E Matrix. Within the RCO the M&E function should also be strengthened to ensure that impact of UNDAF in relation to MDGs, national development priorities and international conventions is regularly monitored by the UN system, and to ensure a harmonized approach to M&E of UNDAF. In sum, the RCO should ensure that agencies will provide information and that M&E is done in a comprehensive, UN-wide manner

At implementation level, there is a need to better plan, and to report on activities in terms of specific targets and indicators, thus providing additional information with which to monitor progress. That can be done in several complementary ways: by recruiting coordinators for all joint interventions and by improving planning and monitoring tools. The responsibility of coordinators should go beyond convening and management of the joint programme, i.e. they should be responsible for close monitoring of the activities' impact and they should provide the necessary technical support to ensure that impact can be achieved. If full time coordinators are not appointed, then there should be greater recognition of the need to free up staff who take on this role, to give them significant time to carry out the role, rather than it being additional to existing duties. Indicators should be designed to show the linkages to UNDAF outcomes, MDGs, and PARPA outcomes), baseline data should be integrated in the start-up procedures for joint intervention, and planning and reporting instruments should be built around targets and expected results instead of outputs. This will facilitate progress monitoring at mid-year and annual reviews, while the use of one single reporting format to be used by all agencies will help convening agencies to consolidate reporting.

The fact that UNDAF only captures that which two or more agencies do together raises questions for future UNDAFs: if the idea is to have one single Country Programme that will

coincide with UNDAF, then how much of the agencies' core business can be integrated in the UNDAF? This implies that in future programming decisions will have to be based primarily on what strategic contribution an agency can make rather than its mandate (i.e. agencies should be less concerned with working in all relevant areas covered by its mandate). A logical consequence is that it may perhaps not be possible for every agency to develop activities in all areas of its mandate and areas in which it has no comparative advantage may have to be left out. Of equal importance is the need to build clusters on an adequate capacity assessment.



## **7 Sustainability of UNDAF process and outcomes**

While it is premature to make any statements about the sustainability of an UNDAF that hasn't ended yet (UNDAF will end in 2011), the evaluation team would like to raise a few observations.

Firstly, the UNDAF document itself does not explicitly analyse risks and assumptions, strategies for sustainability and exit strategies from particular activities and Joint Programmes. There appears to be an assumption that results will be sustainable where activities and outputs are aligned with national priorities and where a counterpart is present. However, experience in at least some Joint Programmes has shown that this does not automatically lead to strong government ownership and leadership, particularly at local/implementation level. A specific lesson learned is that it may be difficult to try to engage a partner who has not been fully involved in the design and joint planning from the beginning. It is recommended that future UNDAF matrices include a more rigorous discussion of risks that can impact on future sustainability and exit strategies, and greater consultation at both central and decentralized levels with counterparts.

In terms of process, UN staff interviewed described UNDAF as sustainable: specific structures were created, and there is an enduring commitment to continuing and improving UNDAF. It will be important to streamline existing processes because many of these processes and mechanisms are heavy, the reduction of transaction costs is not wholly clear, and accountability and management structures can still be improved, including mandates of lead agencies and definition of RCO functions. It is also important to document key aspects of the UNDAF process to retain institutional memory about the rationale behind the elaboration of the UNDAF and formulation of Joint Programmes and joint programming and indicators. This is particularly important given that the timeframe of the UNDAF is generally longer than the contracts of many of those involved, with the implication that each UNDAF will have a largely new group of participants.

The results and strategies of UNDAF are also expected to be sustainable in so far as they are aligned to national policies and strategies, and in so far as these policies and strategies are themselves sustainable. This is particularly the case for UNDAF strategies that are based on support for national capacity development. However, the sustainability of other UN comparative advantages such as providing input to the policy dialogue and advocacy for human rights and attainment of MDGs is linked to the UN's ability to be more strategic in developing the capacity of civil society organizations so that they can carry forward the country's development agenda, monitor and consolidate gains achieved under the UNDAF.

## 8 Conclusions and way forward

Considering that each chapter already contains a specific section on lessons learned and future UNDAF, this chapter is limited to some overall concluding remarks about the UNDAF, highlighting some general issues for consideration in the elaboration of the next UNDAF.

In general, it can be said that the UNDAF for the period 2007-2011 truly represents a framework for the UN's joint activities and Delivering As One in Mozambique. The formulation of the UNDAF was an inclusive process, enabling all UN agencies and partners to contribute to the contents. It was closely aligned to PARPA II, making it relevant to national development priorities – even if in future the role of CSOs should be strengthened. In seeking to be inclusive, and due to the fact that many agencies had already outlined their country programmes, the main weakness of the UNDAF was the results chain and cumbersome M&E matrix.

Throughout the UNDAF narrative and matrix, the focus was primarily on outputs rather than outcomes and this weakness was reflected to a large extent in the Joint Programme planning, monitoring and reporting instruments. Overall, the UNDAF reflects the comparative advantages of the UN system as a whole but more can be done to make the UN's advocacy and normative roles on the protection of human rights a systematic concern (e.g. cross-cutting issue). The competitive advantage or leverage of each agency's contribution to a pillar should be more clearly articulated in terms of outcomes to be achieved.

There is no doubt that it is seen by the UNCT, UN technical staff and their partners as an effective partnership strategy and thus as the way forward. UNDAF is recognized as the best way in which the UN system can successfully respond to the challenges posed by the Millennium Declaration of the General Assembly and support national goals for poverty reduction. Although the benefits are not readily quantifiable, UNDAF has no doubt contributed to giving the UN leverage and a visibility in the development process at the country level.

UNDAF has benefited Mozambique in several ways, including the following: (i) by providing relevant experience; (ii) by identifying capacity gaps; (iii) as a mechanism for capacity building for UNCT and national partners; (iv) by facilitating local consideration of global goals and concomitant progress reporting; (v) by providing opportunities for thematic groups to address cross cutting issues (e.g. gender, environment) and cross-sectoral matters (e.g. HIV/AIDS); (vi) by providing opportunities to address multi-dimensional and sensitive issues such as human rights and alternative development strategies, etc.

The added value of UNDAF for UN agencies and their partners includes: (i) a stronger sense of the collective identity of the UN agencies as part of the One UN; (ii) greater sense of agencies' complementarity, particularly when agencies are involved in the actual preparation of the UNDAF and Joint Programmes instead of contracting these tasks to outsiders; (iii) enhanced information sharing.

Although some weaknesses of UNDAF as a management tool have come to light during implementation, UNDAF is widely seen as a learning experience. Consequently, this learning will form the basis for the design of the next UNDAF.

By focusing on each agency's comparative advantage for synergies and leverage of support in Joint Programmes, the UNDAF has created opportunities for the Non Resident Agencies to participate in a wider range of activities and thematic areas than would normally be the case. However, the Joint Programmes only represent 25 % of UN delivery, raising concerns about the

extent to which the forthcoming UNDAF can fully capture the wide range of support given by the UN agencies. Clearly a balance will have to be found between the need to prioritize joint programming – through a single Country Programme – and the need to maintain some space for specific mandates of each agency, particularly the specialized agencies and those working in humanitarian emergencies.

Key to this is the harmonization of the agencies' planning cycles. In the past, UNDAF was developed before the Delivering As One initiative was started in Mozambique and some agencies already had developed their Country Programmes. These specific circumstances resulted in a situation whereby Joint Programmes were developed based on a specific set of pre-defined elements. In practice, agencies often first designed projects and then sought an appropriate outcome category in the UNDAF for that particular project – although this runs counter to the idea of an UNDAF. Such a pragmatic approach will no longer be necessary if all agencies jointly develop One Programme which simultaneously forms the basis for their internal programming.

In the reviewed UNDAF, the division of labour among the agencies was mostly based on agency mandates. However, implementing the UNDAF has shown that this is only one criterion and that decisions about who does what should in the context of a future UNDAF should also consider technical competencies and the ability to mobilize resources, including funding, for joint activities. Instead of basing the decision to participate in a specific joint activity solely on mandate, agencies should base these decisions on capacity assessments and make the necessary investments to secure additional capacity if required. This will also render reporting – in particular impact reporting – less difficult in future.

This UNDAF has also shown the importance of leadership: although the management structure is often referred to as a “cabinet model”, decisions appear to be based mostly on consensus and in practice consensus seeking is a lengthy process. Things could perhaps be speeded up in the future through a clearer delegation of decision-making power by the agencies to the RC. Although the UNCT and PMT members are in frequent contact with each other, facilitating their ability to speak with one voice, this can be improved at implementation level where UN agency staff have very limited knowledge of each other's activities. The UNDAF has been a very top-down process and there is a need to ensure more buy-in at field level (i.e. more consultation and allowing the field level a greater say in decision-making) and this should be budgeted for in future UNDAFs.

This could perhaps be achieved by ensuring that all forms of joint programming have a full-time coordinator. It is important that the role of the coordinator not be limited to convening meetings, but that s/he should also manage the joint activities, provide the necessary technical input, circulate the information flows and that s/he be given the mandate by the participating agencies to fulfil these roles. If a full-time coordinator is not considered feasible, there should at least be greater recognition of the transaction costs involved in an effective coordination, and therefore staff tasked with this should be relieved of other work.

The 10 Joint Programmes that constituted the Delivering As One/One Programme pilot in Mozambique and 3 MDGF Joint Programmes operate primarily at the output level instead of outcome level. Experience has shown that a considerable degree of flexibility is required and therefore the UNCT has reached a decision to move in the next UNDAF cycle from Joint Programmes to joint programming. Whatever the modality for joint delivery, it would seem that many issues can be solved by improved results-based management skills and through harmonized planning and reporting instruments. This will be an important step towards

improving the horizontal integration and enhancing autonomy of agencies at country level. In that respect, the role of RCO should also be clarified and strengthened, particularly with regard to reporting on results.

One area that requires clear improvement is reporting. The M&E framework of the next UNDAF should be simplified and focus on outcomes rather than outputs. In addition, agencies have not yet aligned their internal M&E systems to the UNDAF M&E framework. Due to the close alignment with the PARPA, many indicators rely on administrative data sets. Increasing national capacity for producing high quality data may perhaps be mainstreamed into the future UNDAF document itself or in future joint programming.

The key cross-cutting issues of HIV/AIDS and gender equality have been addressed in different ways: through mainstreaming in joint activities, through specific Joint Programmes targeting women's empowerment, and through a Pillar that delivered as one team through a single Joint Programme. Each has specific benefits, but the challenge of integrating these cross-cutting issues in the M&E matrixes remains. In addition, additional issues such as capacity building to enable national partners to produce quality data required for reporting or strengthening the capacity of CSOs to participate in joint activities are relevant to all joint programming and may be considered as cross-cutting issues in future UNDAFs.

The unpredictability and late disbursement of funds for Joint Programmes carry the risk that agencies cannot implement the agreed work plans which jeopardizes the achievement of results and credibility towards partners. Thus, a suitable mechanism for the replenishment of the One Fund needs to be defined. The UNDAF provides opportunities for enhanced advocacy and fund raising at the country level, although more thought has to be given as to whether this function is a proper one for the UNDAF instrument itself. There is considerable competition at country level between agencies to raise funds and if the UNDAF is to coordinate better and win the support of those donors that are also trying to coordinate funding initiatives, then UNDAF outcomes must be costed and presented as such.