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The Second Global Cooperation Framework (GCF-II) was approved in 2001 against a backdrop of significant change within UNDP. As such, it became a mechanism for supporting the programme countries to access global knowledge as well as a vehicle for UNDP to transform itself into a globally networked and knowledge based organization.

This independent evaluation has focused on assessing the development results as well as the effectiveness of the strategies of GCF-II to support this transformation and achieve its goals. The evaluation also focused on defining possible future directions for the next global cooperation framework.

Given the importance of global programmes in promoting UNDP's role and leadership in global debates and cutting-edge thinking on human development, this evaluation is both pertinent and timely. Its findings will be of critical importance to the organization as it defines the nature and scope of future programmes.

In general, the findings point to some encouraging and promising trends which have led the evaluation team to make a number of useful recommendations on areas that will need attention. The global cooperation framework's most notable contribution has been in the transformation of UNDP as a knowledge based organization. Knowledge networks across practice areas have increased knowledge sharing, and the decentralisation of policy advice to sub-regional resource facilities (SURFS) has considerably strengthened capacity at country level. Building substantive capacity at country level where the need is greatest was the centre piece of UNDP strategy to transform the organization into a globally networked and cutting-edge upstream policy adviser. The progress achieved under GCF-II towards this end is thus a welcome development.

However, the evaluation recommends that UNDP reviews its approach to policy advice and adopts a mix of strategies to reflect the unique needs of each programme country and region. As the organization embarks on establishing regional centres, we hope that the findings and recommendations of this evaluation and lessons learnt will significantly influence corporate decision making and the strategies for the third global cooperation framework.

To be sure, there are a number of challenges. The report is critical of the oversight and performance management of GCF-II projects and has found the system of monitoring and reporting weak and variable. Finding optimal
ways of providing policy support while building upon UNDP's strengths, maintaining the edge UNDP has developed through its flagship Human Development Report, and ensuring that innovative ideas engendered by the report are harnessed are some of the key issues UNDP will need to address in the next generation of global programmes. In addition, UNDP will need to strengthen the results focus and the oversight and accountability systems of future programmes.

The evaluation required the support and collaboration of many partners and stakeholders within and outside of UNDP. The Evaluation Office is greatly indebted to those who provided inputs to the team and assisted the evaluators in this complex task, especially programme and donor countries and all the country offices and SURFs that were consulted. Shoji Nishimoto, Director of BDP and Walter Franco, Deputy Director of BDP, Tam Pham, the BDP focal point for this evaluation, and the entire BDP staff provided excellent support. Without their interest and full collaboration, this evaluation would not have been possible. Both the UNDP Administrator and the Associate Administrator provided invaluable insights and remained keenly interested in the outcome of the evaluation.

Last but not least, I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks and deep appreciation to the evaluation team: Manfred Kulessa, who skilfully led the evaluation, Anne Forrester, Patricia Alailima, Richard Flaman and Michael Bamberger and Rajiv Sharma all of whom brought their unique knowledge and expertise to the task. Fadzai Gwaradzimba was the task manager and the team was supported by Yasmin Khan, research assistant, Anish Pradhan and Flora Jimenez who provided administrative support. I would like to thank this front line team and the many colleagues in and outside the Evaluation Office whose comments on earlier drafts were invaluable.

I hope UNDP and its partners will find the report useful in charting a new course.

Saraswathi Menon
Director
UNDP Evaluation Office
1.0 CONTEXT

In its decision 2001/7 of 5 February 2001, the Executive Board of UNDP/UNFPA approved the second global cooperation framework (GCF-II) (DP/GCF/2). The purpose of GCF-II is to contribute to UNDP global efforts to reduce poverty and promote sustainable human development (SHD). The development objective of GCF-II is to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends and benefit from global knowledge on critical dimensions of human development in order to reduce poverty and human inequity.

GCF-II was designed as “a critical tool in the transformation of UNDP into a globally networked policy-advice organization focused on global poverty reduction and sustainable human development”, as indicated in document DP/GCF/2. Its main purpose is to move UNDP in the direction outlined in the Administrator’s Business Plans, 2000-2003 (DP/2000/8). A concrete target was “the integration of UNDP global development thinking and advocacy with country-level practices”. To accomplish this, three types of services were planned:

“Global advocacy and analysis to generate knowledge, build alliances, and promote enabling frameworks on key development issues;

“Policy advice, support and alignment across programme, drawing on the global network of policy specialists; and

“Knowledge-networking and the sharing of best practices, drawing on the sub-regional resource facility (SURF) system and communities of practice to support country and regional programming efforts.”

The current phase of GCF-II ended in December 2003, but at its annual session 2003, the Executive Board approved a one-year extension of GCF-II (DP/GCF/2/EXTENSION 1) for the period January to December 2004. The Administrator indicated that the UNDP Evaluation Office would undertake a forward-looking evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the overall approach of GCF-II and the outcomes achieved, with a view to providing strategic input into the preparation of the third GCF. The present report provides a summary of the findings of the independent evaluation carried out by a team of five international consultants from December 2003 to June 2004.
OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

In accordance with the terms of reference for the evaluation, the main objectives are to: (a) assess the overall performance and degree to which the intended organizational goals and development results have been achieved; (b) ascertain how GCF-II has contributed strategically to positioning UNDP as a major upstream policy adviser for poverty reduction and sustainable human development, and as a knowledge-based organization; and (c) develop recommendations for the design of the third phase of the GCF.

APPROACH AND METHOD

The scope of the evaluation is broad and complex, encompassing issues at both the global and country office levels. The main emphasis has been placed on the ‘substantive’ aspects of GCF-II, covering the complex set and interplay of policy analysis, advocacy and advisory services, and the practice and cross-cutting areas. Equally important were how and by which means GCF-II has been implemented and managed. This second area covers the management of GCF-II per se: oversight, monitoring and reporting, financial and human resources management.

GCF-II is managed centrally by the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP), and global resources form a major part of the overall BDP budget. While the link between GCF-II and BDP is integral, it is important to note that this evaluation is not an assessment of BDP. It does, however, touch on several BDP organizational, institutional and management dimensions relevant to its implementation of GCF-II. The key elements of the methodology are given below.

Desk/documentation reviews. The evaluation was preceded by a preparatory phase, during which the Evaluation Office identified and assembled key reports and reference documents associated with GCF-II and mapped the GCF-II project and programme portfolio (see annex B).

Interviews and consultations. The data to support the analysis was provided through structured and unstructured interviews, focus group discussions, and consultations with some 350 officials from a wide variety of organizations. The team conducted initial interviews with UNDP key stakeholders in New York, followed by field visits. The main stakeholder communities interviewed included UNDP, selected United Nations organizations in New York, and at the country level, selected programme and donor country governments (through their United Nations missions in New York and in some capitals), Executive Board members, and other entities, for example, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and civil society organizations, as determined through each country visit (see annex A).

Surveys and data collection. As the GCF-II ‘stakeholder community’ is large and widespread, a series of surveys was designed and executed to collect additional information and validate perceptions and viewpoints. The main surveys included:

(a) A self-assessment survey of selected GCF project managers (all in BDP), as well as other selected practice/thematic focal points. This survey was executed at the start of the evaluation and approximately two-thirds of those surveyed responded.

(b) Survey of policy specialists. Given the large number of policy specialists (75), a special web-based survey was designed and executed after the first round of field visits.

(c) Survey of resident representatives. Similar to the preceding, a survey was also carried out for the resident representatives to obtain their views on GCF issues and priorities.

Sample of global projects. From the portfolio of more than 150 global projects, BDP provided to the team a sample of 10 projects covering all of the practice areas (see annex C). A general review of these projects was carried out, through interviews with their project managers and different stakeholders and a review of some of the associated documentation. In the course of its work, the team also had the chance to study other global projects.

(d) Review of the thematic trust funds (TTFs). All TTFs were subject to a general review through interviews with their managers and desk reviews of available reports and documentation.

(e) Visits to country offices and SURFs. During the inception phase, a sample of country offices and SURF sites was selected jointly by BDP and the Evaluation Office with input from the regional bureaux (see table 1). In addition, two GCF-funded centres were visited: the Poverty Centre in Brasilia and the Oslo Governance Centre. During country visits, structured interviews and focus group discussions were used as the prime method of data gathering. Separate mission reports were prepared for each visit and these served as a main input to the preparation of the main report.
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

While the methods and techniques used for data gathering and analysis generally conform to industry standards for evaluations, and results are considered as fairly representative of GCF-II performance, there are some caveats. The design and implementation of GCF-II presents a wide, complex universe from which a small number of components were selected for review. As with any highly complex initiative, not all GCF components could be individually assessed. This evaluation presents a snapshot of performance for key GCF-II components and others based on representative sampling. The team did, however, expend considerable effort in interviewing key stakeholders and policy specialists, especially those out-posted to the SURFs, to gain an understanding of how GCF-II has operated, particularly at subregional and country levels.

MAIN FINDINGS

A. Policy analysis and advocacy

Contribution to global policy analysis and advocacy

GCF-II was found to have supported global advocacy and research through the development of the Human Development Report, the carrying out of development studies such as those on global public goods and trade, and through the production of a number of publications, policy notes and reports in all practice and cross-cutting areas. The production of the Human Development Report and reports on trade and global public goods, in particular, were seen as reaffirming UNDP role as global leader in development thinking.

GCF-II is a main but not the sole contributor to UNDP’s role in global advocacy, policy advisory services and knowledge networking. In the area of global advocacy, as compared to the national context, it is relatively easy for UNDP to set the terms of the global debate on a given issue. Under GCF-II, advocacy at the global level was pursued primarily by headquarters’ units through the Human Development Report, development research and studies, and global conferences and workshops.

However, the findings suggest that UNDP has failed to internalize key advocacy instruments (i.e., the Human Development Report and publications on global public goods) and build on their added value in its own internal programming and operational dynamics. The question of impact and ‘leadership’ of other advocacy and research carried out by BDP through GCF-II remains open. In the opinion of the team and many stakeholders consulted, it would take considerable time and resources for UNDP to build up the sort of credibility in research that might match that of better resourced organizations.

In addition, the subject of policy advocacy was found to be more sensitive at the country level than at the global level, particularly in governance, human rights, corruption and gender, where there is political and/or social sensitivity – which is not surprising. Most respondents felt that UNDP should not confuse helping governments to identify and assess alternative strategies with the promotion (advocacy) of one particular line of action. Where UNDP endeavoured to advocate a particular position, such advocacy was seen by some to contradict or undermine the oft-cited UNDP strength of neutrality. UNDP is facing the challenge of balancing the roles of champion of normative United Nations standards and broker of policy options acceptable in a specific country context.

Contribution to policy advice

No other component of GCF-II generated as much discussion or debate as that of ‘policy advice’, the second service type designed to support the achievement of GCF-II objectives. To be sure, policy advice and related services are provided by UNDP through a wide range of means by all the bureaus and country offices, and the team viewed GCF as but one part of the multi-faceted UNDP role in the policy domain.

The evaluation findings suggest that when too much emphasis was given to the term ‘upstream policy advice’, expectations were found to grow as to what value UNDP could add to ‘upstream’ national development policy, and what UNDP could expect from itself and its staff. The GCF-II role in this area was seen more in terms of its contribution to the broader policy domain through a combination of dialogue, analysis, process facilitation, advocacy and other inputs.
and strategies. Overall, the value of UNDP GCF contributions was enhanced when driven by programme country needs, when grounded in operational experience, and when delivered by or through quality expertise.

The main instrument through which policy advisory services were provided was the separate global project Global Programme Policy Support Services (project number GLO/01/001), by far the largest of all core-funded global projects. The project’s main thrust was the recruitment and funding of 75 policy specialists – 50 based at the field level and 25 at headquarters. Based on the findings, the team concludes that the role of policy specialists as policy ‘advisers’ was not generally effective, nor was there too much demand from UNDP country offices or programme countries for such ‘policy advice’ services. Rather, the greater value of the policy specialists was generated through the delivery of a range of technical and specialized services and support to activities seen as inputs to policy development and policy implementation. Furthermore, the out-posting of policy specialists was a positive move in backstopping and enhancing country office capacities and in strengthening the community and/or practice of learning.

Through discussions with country offices and programme countries, the team learned that quality policy expertise could be delivered through a range of modalities – contracting out, outsourcing, partnerships and retainers – and the input cost dynamic varied significantly by region and country. The evaluation findings indicate that the delivery of such expertise through relatively high-cost fixed salaries of policy specialist staff may not be the most cost-effective modality in all cases.

B. Support to the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-based organization

GCF-II has contributed to the transformation of UNDP into a globally networked, knowledge-based organization through the decentralization of policy support capacity, the building and maintenance of communities of practice, and the creation and nurturing of practice networks. It is in this area that most of the core global resources were allocated. The greatest impact of these services has been felt at the country office level, where internal capacities have been expanded and country offices have improved the quality and quantity of their programming.

Among the wide range of stakeholders consulted within and outside UNDP, the team found a high degree of receptivity and support for GCF-II objectives to strengthen UNDP as a knowledge-based, knowledge-networked organization. However, the team also noted a lack of common understanding, as the vast majority of interviewees found great difficulty with the term ‘knowledge management’ because it generated widely varying interpretations. Most felt that knowledge simply could not be ‘managed’ and that UNDP should not purport to do so. The team concluded that the emphasis should be on the sharing of knowledge and information and the task of enabling access to it.

C. Practice areas and cross-cutting themes

GCF-II was designed to contribute to poverty reduction and overall human development at the country level. While a number of activities and outputs from the various practice and cross-cutting areas point to promising outcomes, it is still too early to make informed judgments regarding the ultimate impact of GCF-II projects and programmes in the long term. It is not that GCF-II–funded initiatives are not working towards such objectives; it is a question of the level or degree of impact that remains open. The following presents a small sampling of the many such contributions that have been made through GCF-II. Section 4 of the main report provides a more complete presentation of findings on practice areas and cross-cutting themes.

Contribution to the policy debate on poverty reduction

There is strong evidence to indicate that the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are emerging as UNDP’s niche market. In many regions, the MDGs and the preparation of national MDG reports has become one of UNDP’s signature products. MDG monitoring and reporting were considered by many to be perhaps the single most important BDP contribution during the period under consideration. The Poverty Practice Group provided leadership, took charge of inter-agency coordination and established and managed the MDG-Net.i To date, over 70 country reports have been issued, together with five regional reports. During country visits, the team was able to confirm the high level of interest in UNDP support on the design and implementation of MDG programmes at the national and local level.

While advisory services provided by SURF specialists were often observed in technical backstopping or project formulation, the team also noted examples

---

i. The MDG e-network had the highest rating in the 2003 Global Staff Survey, and was the only e-network to include external members from CSOs, governments, donors and United Nations organizations.
where the main areas of country office demand concerned macroeconomic policies in trade, employment or even budget formulation. However, the demand for SURF services in macroeconomics and poverty varied according to the characteristics of each country and the nature of participation of major donor agencies. In the area of poverty and social development, the picture was mixed, with a range of ad hoc activities undertaken in response to requests from country offices in less developed countries (LDCs) and middle-income countries. GCF-supported initiatives have produced material in areas such as the social dimensions of poverty reduction, trade and export strategies for small countries (the Djibouti model), gender budgeting and mainstreaming gender in poverty reduction, although no reports were available on the overall reaction to and demand for such studies and services.

In all countries visited, the team found that UNDP had created a high level of trust because of what was seen as its impartiality and willingness to understand and represent the interests of government and civil society in the area of poverty reduction. Consequently it was able to play a brokerage role that made it possible to involve a wide range of actors in policy dialogue and programme implementation.

**Contribution to sustainable development**

Through support from GCF-II, UNDP was successful in developing partnerships in energy and environment, as agreed at the 1992 Earth Summit and reaffirmed at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development a decade later. The global environment programme supported activities on integrating environment in national development frameworks, strengthening local environmental governance, and addressing global and regional environmental challenges. The East Africa cross-border biodiversity conservation project that ended in June 2004 is a good example of effective UNDP–Global Environment Facility (GEF) collaboration.

The global energy programme encompassed activities to enhance access to energy for sustainable development, provided access to rural energy services to reduce poverty, promoted sustainable energy technologies to lower greenhouse emissions and helped to mobilize access to new financing modalities.

The UNDP global staff survey rated the energy and environment practice as the second highest practice group in providing services. At the global level, the energy and environment practice area pushed the UNDP policy envelope to a considerable level through preparation of a number of knowledge products, such as the Clean Development Mechanism User’s Guide that received peer review for publication.

**Contribution to democratic governance**

The global democratic governance programme supported the underlying principles of assistance to democratic governance and conflict resolution, participation in political and civic life, inclusion of the poor in matters of public policy development and accountability. Democratic governance covers many areas of UNDP traditional strengths, such as decentralization, political participation, social equity, giving voice to poor and vulnerable groups, and promoting equitable access to public goods and services. This practice area has also been on the cutting edge of emerging areas such as e-governance, promoting political and democratic processes in post-conflict societies, anti-corruption and equal access to justice. Many of these draw on main UNDP assets: the trust all major development actors have in UNDP, thanks to its mandate and neutrality and what is seen as the organization’s deep understanding of local and national culture and political processes. At a time of constrained financial resources, democratic governance is also a sector that many donors have continued to support. Consequently, it is likely to be one of the central pillars of the future GCF strategy.

The team found widespread recognition that UNDP enjoys a comparative advantage in many democratic governance areas. Indicative of the support enjoyed by this practice area, in 2001-2003 the democratic governance programme was able to mobilize a significant level of TTF and project cost-sharing support amounting to $33 million and $3.7 million, respectively – more than the poverty, information and communication technology (ICT), energy and HIV/AIDS trust funds combined.

In addition, the democratic governance practice area has developed an extensive network of partner institutions at the international, regional and national levels. The Urban Management Programme alone has developed partnerships with more than 20 institutions in all regions. The progress towards the United Nations-wide rollout of Huritalk as the network on human rights is considered a good example of where governance products are being promoted to a much broader audience.

**Contribution to the global fight against HIV/AIDS**

The HIV/AIDS practice facilitated implementation of a broad spectrum of support under UNDP corporate
strategy, which in tandem with three service lines appeared to have brought coherence to the HIV/AIDS practice area. These service lines have led to breakthrough initiatives that addressed stigma and discrimination, gender-related aspects of the epidemic, institutional inertia, multi-sectoral partnerships and community decisions. Another key feature was the capacity development process for each of the service lines.

The policy note prepared in August 2002 provided policy guidance on HIV/AIDS and poverty reduction strategies. Work has been done at the country level regarding this issue, most notably in Botswana, but also in Armenia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia and Madagascar, among others, including in national and regional human development reports. Work on HIV/AIDS and poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) continues in many countries, and is a key concern for UNDP. Currently, the HIV/AIDS practice group focus is on generating an effective response, addressing underlying causes that fuel the epidemic, building multi-sector and multi-level partnerships with a focus on results, facilitating community decision-making and access, and involving people living with HIV/AIDS in the response.

**Contribution to other cross-cutting areas**

**Gender.** The team found that one area in which most progress had been made was mainstreaming gender in the MDGs. Many countries now produce national MDG reports and even more have committees working on particular MDGs or groups of MDGs. Engendering national budgets was found to have become an increasingly important area of support to incorporate gender into development financing and national budgets, and also as a potential entry point to the PRSP process. Investing in Women was another of the 10 global projects selected for assessment. This showed how, when working in partnership (in this case with the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO), a small financial contribution ($50,000) could be leveraged to make an important contribution in a major international policy forum (the International Conference on Financing for Development).

**Information and communication technology for development (ICTD).** In ICTD, the team found that GCF-II had contributed across a number of its planned service lines; the largest area was in helping (through the country offices) to design and implement national and regional ICTD strategies (e-strategies). The inconsistent UNDP ICTD policy was an issue because there was a mismatch between its visibility as a practice and its absence in the structure of GCF and the strategic results framework (SRF). The closing of the practice and its integration as a service line into the poverty and governance practices in the context of the multi-year funding framework (MYFF) 2004-2007 caused some concerns, particularly in countries that had begun to focus on ICTD as a priority with UNDP support. Changes were sometimes perceived as a retreat rather than as an effort to refocus on synergies. The team draws a clear lesson from the ICTD experience – which could probably be generalized to other areas: if UNDP moves into a new area, builds programming and relationships, it must either be prepared to make a long-term commitment or present a carefully planned, widely understood strategy of exit or change.

**Capacity development.** In the newly articulated cross-cutting area of capacity development, three books have been published, drawing conclusions and formulating advice and advocacy from a rich pool of experience.ii

**D. Institutional arrangements and instruments**

The team found that, through GCF-II support mechanisms, UNDP programmes were more vertically integrated, linking country, regional and global programmes. This was achieved primarily through communities of practice and practice networks, the SURFs and role of policy specialists, and collaboration between BDP and regional bureaux. However, it did not appear that GCF-II had achieved any closer geographic integration by promoting South-South exchange and cooperation across regions. Finally, there was a closer thematic integration at the SURF level by linking relevant practices and themes, teamwork and mutual support initiatives, for example.

GCF-II initiatives sought out a wider range of partnerships and cooperative arrangements with national and international public, private sector, academic/research and civil society organizations. GCF-II initiatives have also been strengthened through more formal internal partnerships (e.g., inter-bureau memoranda of understanding on services) and with other United Nations organizations. This dimension of networking and sharing through formal and informal partnership arrangements was seen to both broaden UNDP global reach and open up the organization to outside influences and knowledge. While the quantity

---

of partnerships has increased, their quality appeared uneven.

Reformed use of the TTF mechanism contributed to the mobilization of non-core resources and their concentration on UNDP programming priority (practice) areas. However, two TTFs received the bulk of funds, and the transaction costs associated with the proposal submission process and TTF management indicate a major need for streamlining and perhaps the consolidation of some TTFs.

The design of global projects was seen to be highly variable, sometimes with unclear objectives and measures of performance. Furthermore, decision-making was insufficiently transparent, with limited consultation and participation. Clearly, there are major opportunities for strengthening the corporate governance of global projects and broadening participation in design and decision-making.

The execution of GCF-II projects was seen as generally weak, with BDP appearing to have insufficient execution capacities, despite the fact that significant extra-budgetary income was generated through the collection of extra-budgetary resources earned through the project management. While they are compelling reasons for UNDP to continue to execute its own projects, there are equally compelling reasons to find alternative implementation modalities that make the most sense, such as through operational partnerships and implementing agencies.

In terms of GCF-II programming, the criteria are too broad and do not address the need of global initiatives to support the transformation of UNDP. Furthermore, there are no clear guidelines on the allocation of GCF-II resources or how priorities are set. There is an opportunity to define UNDP programming principles as they might apply to the future GCF.

E. Management of GCF-II

The team found that the greatest weakness of GCF-II was in management, and not simply weaknesses in management processes. The issues imply the need for a major rethinking of the overall management strategy for GCF-II.

Oversight of GCF-II was found for the most part to be unsatisfactory. There should be a stronger, more regular corporate role in monitoring performance and providing direction on at least an annual basis, providing the opportunity formally to adapt design to changing circumstances. Furthermore, GCF-II accountability appeared diffuse and unclear, with no clear link between the expected results, decision-making authorities, requisite resources and monitoring and control systems. It would seem that accountability structures would need to be developed at different levels for the different components of the GCF: at the macro-level for overall GCF-II performance, and at the component level for individual projects and TTFs, for example.

The reporting of GCF-II performance was piece-meal and highly variable, with some components strong (e.g., TTFs, SURFs) and others weak (e.g., global projects). With combined weaknesses in financial information, monitoring was suboptimal. While the new Atlas system and other planned improvements in BDP may redress this system, there is a need to devise a monitoring and reporting system that can be rolled up from the component level to provide aggregate GCF performance information.

The GCF resource allocation model allows for limited flexibility for the pursuit of global issues at the country level by country offices. The bulk of resources are controlled by BDP, and the logic of global resources controlled by a single central bureau is not fully consistent with the design logic of the GCF – which seeks to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends and benefit from global knowledge. There are opportunities to increase the GCF flexibility to allow country offices and other UNDP units greater and more direct access.

III. LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING ISSUES

GCF design. Based on the evidence, it would appear that GCF-II never truly articulated the space or the niche areas that it intended to fill or address. GCF-II became more of a conglomerate of projects, funding mechanisms and other instruments that did not gel into a cohesive framework nor fit a broader strategy. A global programme as envisaged in the GCF is neither a support service to the country office nor a series of global, regional and country-level projects. Global programmes should by their very nature address truly global issues that go beyond country-specific or regional dimensions. When they focus on the UNDP mandate and practice areas, global programmes are likely to enhance organizational effectiveness, promote its normative values, support all programming through innovation and research and expand the body of knowledge.

The complexity in the design of the GCF through its
overlay of multiple dimensions, practice and cross-cutting areas, service lines and use of numerous instruments tend to generate unrealistically high or mixed expectations. This can quickly become a formula for disappointment when objectives are not reached or performance cannot be measured. The mixing of programme development objectives and internal organizational objectives complicates allocation of resources, budgeting and performance management. Simplicity of design is best achieved by focusing on a few main corporate goals linked to the MYFF.

Finally, effective design is conveyed through the use of effective language. The use of hyperbole and inflated language do not add much to the development debate nor UNDP’s role in it. As elsewhere, objectives and expected results of official development assistance tend to be overly ambitious. A modest, factual and therefore more realistic use of plain language in GCF design, programming and project documents would generate greater awareness, understanding and ultimately acceptance of the programme.

**Policy analysis and advice.** Lack of clarity in the definition of policy advice can lead to confusion of mission, mandate and role of UNDP and the GCF in the policy domain. When too much emphasis is given to the term ‘policy advice’, expectations grow as to what value UNDP can add to ‘upstream’ national development policy, and what UNDP can expect from itself and its staff. The contribution of global programmes to the policy domain generates greater, measurable results when they are seen as contributions to policy development through a combination of dialogue, analysis, process facilitation, advocacy and other strategies. The value of UNDP GCF contributions is enhanced when driven by programme country needs, grounded in operational experience and delivered through access to credible expertise.

The role of policy specialists as policy advisers has not been measurably effective, nor is there much demand from country offices or programme countries for such services. Rather, policy specialists’ greater value is generated through their delivery of a range of technical, specialized services and support to activities seen as inputs to policy development and implementation. The out-posting of policy specialists is a positive move in backstopping and enhancing country office capacities and in strengthening the community of learning.

GCF resources might be more cost-effective through optional approaches to securing policy expertise: e.g., staffing of policy specialists, contracting out or outsourcing, operational partnerships and retainers, among other options. If policy specialists are used primarily for internal country office support, then global core funds may not be the appropriate funding source. However, where the role of such specialists can be clearly linked to global programming and priorities, the use of global core resources would be appropriate.

GCF global aims are best realized through strong links with regional cooperation frameworks (RCFs) and country cooperation frameworks (CCFs), but particularly in the RCF connection. Building on SURF experiences, the new regional centres can strengthen these links and ensure that GCF-funded policy specialist resources are optimally managed close to the source of demand. Inter-bureau cooperation in the guidance and supervision of regional centres enhances performance and cost-effective utilization of GCF resources.

**Knowledge networking/sharing.** The diverse quality and overwhelming quantity of ‘knowledge’ products and services of UNDP can saturate the organization, erode its capacity to pursue quality work, and divert it from real development priorities. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of the portfolio of ‘knowledge services’ will provide assurance that value remains closely aligned to UNDP needs. Sharing knowledge and information rather than managing it is valued more by both UNDP and its development partners. Greater impacts are generated by a limited number of materials and channels for the exchange of information. More does not equal better. Practice networks and other channels for the sharing of knowledge that are user-friendly and attractive find greater usage even for overworked staff members. The amount of knowledge that is generated and shared is directly related to individual and institutional learning capacity; and if learning capacity is limited, then no amount of knowledge over and above what can be absorbed will be used.

**Programming and management.** Unlike with other UNDP programmes, programme countries have little if any direct say in the GCF. Other bureaux within UNDP often feel left out of decision-making processes. Direct, exclusive control of programme funds can generate the perception of discretionary funding for headquarters groups, and in some cases questionable use of resources. Such perceptions can take greater root in the absence of documentation, proper systems for reporting and financial accountability. A proper oversight system ensures that decisions made within one unit are in line with GCF and corporate strategy.

Accountability for the management of GCF resources cannot be delegated to BDP or any other organizational unit without adequate execution or implementation.
capacity, decision-making authority, and a proper system for reporting, monitoring and resource management. UNDP, as a main advocate for governance – transparency, openness, accountability – should be an example and provide exceptional assurances that its handling of GCF-II meets all standards of good management.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this evaluation, it is recommended that the next phase of UNDP GCF-III feature the main strategic components given below. Section 7 of the report presents more technical recommendations dealing with performance, institutional arrangements and management.

Strategic direction

Greater focus. GCF-III should continue to provide a two-way window for programme countries – the ultimate beneficiaries – to influence and be influenced by global trends, and benefit from global knowledge in the pursuit of their national development priorities and the MDGs. The MDGs might be considered one of the organizing principles (linked to the MYFF) in GCF-III. Under GCF-III, UNDP should continue to narrow the focus on one or two practice areas plus a complementary but small set of secondary practice, thematic and cross-cutting areas. A more formalized, consultative method for programming, programme design and allocation of resources should reflect the variable demand for services by region, sub-region and country. No less important, in order to link the intended objectives to measurable results, the language of the GCF should be clear, concise and meaningful, not bound by rhetoric and platitudes.

Refining the framework for global cooperation. The term ‘global’ needs refinement and put into practical and operational contexts – not to be used simply as a broad rationalization for any type of programming and funding of initiatives. This means that the criteria for the use of global resources must be clear and applied consistently, and sufficiently distinct from regional or country-level programming. More attention should be given to ‘cooperation’ through use of operational partnerships and closer collaboration with other United Nations organizations. The ‘framework’ itself should be simplified by narrowing the aspirations, scope and anticipated achievements of GCF. Development and transformation-related objectives must be measurable, have baselines, be easily programmed and linked to the MYFF.

Design and funding flexibility. The design of the third phase of GCF should be sufficiently flexible to respond to major changes in external and internal environments. GCF design should be formally reviewed and amended, if needed, on an annual basis. Country offices in particular should have greater flexibility in directly accessing GCF core resources to operate the two-way global windows at the local level, and to pursue sensitive global priorities that would otherwise be difficult to pursue from existing funding sources. One option might be to structure and fund a global ‘sub-programme’ that could be accessed directly by resident representatives, similar to the budget line to support the resident coordinator system or target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC) line 3.1 in programming arrangements. Such an arrangement would allow country offices to pursue sensitive global issues at the country level. Decentralization of human and financial resources, including GCF resources (as in the case of the out-posted policy specialists), is the direction in which UNDP is moving.

Change and transformation strategy. The next GCF phase should continue to be applied to the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-sharing, globally networked development agency. The programming of GCF resources should be based on clearly set aims and criteria. It is important to strengthen efforts to share experiences with the international community and carefully select issues for advocacy. More effort should be devoted to developing a culture of learning in UNDP. Change should be managed strategically – seen over the long term and be incremental, multi-dimensional (i.e., people, organizational structures, systems and processes), measurable, phased, linked to other change initiatives in UNDP and to United Nations simplification and harmonization processes. Special attention should be given to identifying and managing resistance to change and, equally important, to taking into account the real cost of change if the organization is to reap long-term benefits. UNDP is urged to pay greater attention to the human costs of organizational changes. Management is also urged to recognize and address the negative image of UNDP that constant reorganization creates among partners if it results in disruption or confusion of ongoing programmes.

Policy advice and policy specialists. In terms of UNDP transformation to an upstream policy advisory organization, it is recommended that the comprehension of policy advice be modified or adjusted to reality – and what many consider to be a main strength of UNDP – the provision of a range of both upstream and downstream technical assistance and professional services in the policy domain. If the notion of ‘upstream policy advice’ is to be continued, then it
should be explicitly defined, in practical terms. The multi-faceted nature of UNDP policy work needs to be taken into account.

Clarification is needed of the role, purpose and funding of policy specialists. All policy specialists and advisers in UNDP – whether funded by core posts, regional or global programmes, or other means should be managed strategically, and not in a piecemeal manner. This GCF component must not be perceived to be merely a strategy to build UNDP staff capacity but to better support programme countries. UNDP should continue to use programme funds for engaging policy specialists at headquarters and in the field. But options should be studied (including cost-benefit) in terms of in-sourcing, outsourcing and/or regionalization of policy specialist resources in order to arrive at a more rational, cost-effective mix, and to optimize both the quantity and quality of service. Consideration should be given to setting up a special fund or internal corporate account for the funding of policy specialists, rather than using a project mechanism such as the Global Programme for the funding of policy specialists, rather than using a project mechanism such as the Global Programme Policy Support Services project, as is presently the case. This assessment cannot comment on the optimal mix, as more study would be needed.

Improving substantive performance

Policy advice and support. As the SURFs are integrated with the new regional centres, a ‘service model’ should be developed for policy-related services, which is linked to current strategies associated with knowledge management. The business model would answer questions on identification of clients, their needs and service expectations; the management of client relationships; measurement of performance; setting of quality standards; and alternative strategies (and associated costs and benefits) for service delivery. The products and services should be clearly identified. This would require supply-demand analyses for each region and not simply presume that the policy specialist or SURF is reactive or proactive, or demand driven or supply driven.

In the new regional centres, serious consideration should be given to deploying policy specialist resources (i.e., in the form of policy specialist UNDP staff and/or budget and contract facility) as close to their client countries as possible, in numbers and practice areas proportionate to demand at the regional and sub-regional levels. For example, there may be sound logic for: (a) the deployment of governance specialists and/or financial resources to both the Kathmandu and Bangkok regional centres; (b) the deployment of ICT specialists and/or financial resources to the SURF in Beirut; (c) the relocation of specialists and/or financial resources in Latin America from Panama to other countries; and (d) the continued deployment of environmental specialists and/or financial resources in Nairobi rather than relocation to the Pretoria regional centre.

SURFs and regional centres. As the SURFs will disappear and their function becomes part of UNDP regional centres, it may be worthwhile to collect and document their achievements and experiences. A review study could also assess which lessons should be drawn for the ongoing change management. Related recommendations on policy services are covered in section 7.2.1-B of the main report. Every effort should be made to minimize the loss in terms of subregional services and to balance carefully services made available to the two main groups of clients – country offices and governments – who have their own close, privileged relationships. While the establishment of regional centres is going through an experiments phase, UNDP is well advised to aim for a somewhat uniform organizational structure and corporate terminology. Regions, such as the Arab States, establishing regional centres at a later date, should actively seek lessons from the establishment of centres in Asia and Africa.

Knowledge-sharing, knowledge management and networking. Insofar as GCF is to be used as an organizational transformation tool, emphasis should be given to strengthening the learning culture of UNDP. Continued emphasis should be on identifying and documenting good, innovative practices that have been used in one location, and to promote their adaptation in other countries or settings. More attention should be given to country offices as the best sources of and application of knowledge and experience, lessons and good practice. UNDP should strengthen its capacities to capture, document and disseminate this information. Knowledge management should not be directed only towards benefiting UNDP staff, but should be clearly linked to the capacity development of host developing countries. (It was noted by BDP that the MDG-Net is inclusive and has members from programme countries – governmental and non-governmental.) The knowledge networks should be made accessible to staff in all United Nations organizations as well as national counterparts in partner countries. There should be a deliberate policy within UNDP to encourage external knowledge-sharing.

Practice and cross-cutting areas

Poverty. While there is a high level of demand for technical assistance and related support services in the poverty area, there are many actors offering financing and technical support to governments and civil society. GCF success will depend in large part on its ability to find niches where it has a comparative advantage and where it can effectively leverage its financial and
A number of advocacy civil society organizations would like to see UNDP help to open up political space for NGOs to have more active participation in national dialogue on poverty reduction, MDGs and related topics. Future GCF strategies should build on MDG momentum and seek ways to translate the high level of interest into a cost-effective development instrument.

**Energy and environment.** A main challenge is how the practice architecture, including matrix management principles, can be mainstreamed throughout UNDP, so that the importance of policy support functions at all levels of the organization will be recognized and inculcated under a GCF-III. The synergies achieved can be consolidated in the MYFF and new regional centre structure by: (a) expanding the resource base through a combined TTF for the practice area; (b) achieving better knowledge extraction, especially through a review of the GEF portfolio for lessons learned from use of GCF core resources for data capture/analysis; (c) establishing a separate fund for sustainable partnerships; and (d) clarifying line authority of BDP regarding core funding of staff and their reporting/accountability with the regional bureaux.

**Democratic governance.** There are many emerging governance issues in the ICT for development field where democratic governance has begun to establish its reputation (e-governance) and where it could make an important contribution. ICT, and particularly e-governance, is a major area of opportunity for democratic governance and it is critical to develop a coherent strategy as quickly as possible in this area.

**HIV/AIDS.** UNDP corporate strategy and service lines are founded on the organization’s strengths and provide a solid foundation for actions to address the current challenges of the epidemic. This strategy must be expanded globally and scaled up within countries; special responses should be implemented for southern Africa and other worst affected countries and regions with high prevalence rates. Development of southern expertise and institutions should be strengthened to support national efforts to implement ‘leadership for results’ initiatives. South-South cooperation should be encouraged and the capacity development component of the trade-related aspects of international property rights (TRIPS) – including civil society analysis and advocacy, regarding best practice trade policy and patent law for accessing low cost antiretroviral treatment – should be expanded. A new approach should be devised to measure the transformative methodologies being used to generate innovations, results, outcomes and impact, including shifts in norms, practices, behaviours and institutional change.

**Gender.** Despite the progress in mainstreaming of gender in MDGs and increasing references to the importance of gender equality in policy documents, evidence suggests that progress towards gender mainstreaming has been disappointing in all practice areas, even in the area of poverty. UNDP and GCF are uniquely placed to make a significant contribution to gender equality through mainstreaming strategies but this will require a much more significant commitment of resources. At this point only three of the eight SURFs have a gender policy adviser.iii BDP does not have a specific allocation for gender programmes in its core budget and the Gender TTF was the only practice or cross-cutting area TTF that was never launched because it failed to attract donor funding. The only source of funding for gender programmes in UNDP is the Japan WID Fund. Democratic governance can also make an important contribution to gender mainstreaming. There are some important opportunities in areas such as political participation and access to justice where democratic governance could be on the cutting edge of gender mainstreaming.

**ICT for development.** Having recently closed the ICTD practice area and turned it into a service line of two practices, new organizational models could be considered for taking advantage of this growth area. ICTD offers some challenging opportunities for partnerships with the private sector, universities, NGOs and other organizations active in the field. There are potentially important windows of opportunity for UNDP which include, but are not limited to: (a) building on the extensive UNDP capacity-building experience to develop distance-learning facilities; (b) working in the governance field (for example, the Interlegis model in Brazil); (c) employment generation, women’s empowerment, health education and formal education; (d) e-commerce; and (e) combating HIV/AIDS.

**Strengthening management**

Managing GCF-II is a daunting task. (Annex H of the report provides a series of detailed technical recommendations). Through audit, performance reviews or some other mechanism, the full costs of providing policy support and related services at the regional level should be determined. This would include all implementation and execution costs recovered by UNDP and country offices in

---

iii Pretoria, Dakar and Kathmandu. A gender adviser is physically located in Port-of-Spain but she reports directly to BDP and provides very limited support to the Caribbean region.
implementing GCF-funded initiatives, and in other costs (such as those charged by country offices for providing space, travel and other services to SURFs/regional centres). Further, systems should be implemented that can capture full costs (cost accounting), which could then support analysis and reporting on the cost-benefit of such services as well as to support financial planning and forecasting.

Along with the organizational changes currently being explored by BDP, a comprehensive capacity assessment of the Bureau should be carried out. This may result in the production of a strategy/capacity development plan for the organization, clearly demonstrating all the capacities (including personnel and financial resources) that would be required for the cost-effective management of GCF.

Greater attention should be given to strengthening UNDP as a learning organization – that is, to invest resources in learning, professional development and allow sufficient time for country office staff to familiarize themselves with ongoing policy debates, research, studies and analysis. A part of this would be to develop a corporate commitment, incentives and means to strengthen the bridge building between its study initiatives and innovation of mainstream, corporate policy.

**Oversight and management.** GCF is large and involves a considerable amount of core, cost-shared and thematic trust funds. In view of the several management issues raised, GCF-III should not be approved without solid assurances that UNDP is installing the proper execution, implementation and performance management capacities (especially in the areas of oversight, accountability, monitoring, reporting and related areas noted in the detailed recommendations in section 7 and annex H of the report). UNDP should double its efforts on sound corporate governance (transparency, openness, accountability) and provide exceptional assurances that the handling of GCF meets all standards of prudent management. The cost effectiveness of future GCF phases can be greatly enhanced through strengthened capacities for execution, implementation and performance management. Selected evaluations of existing global projects, programmes and TTFs should be carried out, and the various global initiatives should be audited. All future global initiatives should be evaluated, if only to extract lessons and knowledge that can be shared globally.

Given GCF complexities, sufficient time will be needed to design a third phase properly. Time should be invested to analyze the noted historic challenges and opportunities and ensure that they are properly factored into a GCF-III design. Time will be needed for meaningful consultation and full participation of key internal UNDP units, external partners and other interested parties. The team was informed that preparations were under way. The UNDP Programming Manual suggests 18 months for this process.

**CONCLUSION**

It is important to remember that GCF-II was implemented in a period of major organizational change not only in BDP; but also in other parts of UNDP; in a way, it became a vehicle for a number of UNDP transformation goals. The strengths and shortcomings of GCF-II should be viewed in this context. The evaluation findings present challenges and opportunities for UNDP and its many partners as it approaches the design of GCF-III. New actors have and will continue to find their way onto the stage of international development cooperation: e.g., European Union accession countries as emerging donors; global players such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa introducing new departures in South-South cooperation; large multinational corporations; global compact partnerships and the local private sector; and an expanding, increasingly active base of national and international civil society organizations.

In line with the organization’s corporate objectives, in the past four years, GCF-II has contributed to UNDP development and transformation goals, notably in turning UNDP into a learning, knowledge-sharing organization. However, lingering questions on the meaning and quality of upstream policy advice and the noted weaknesses in governance and management may combine to generate a perception that GCF serves as an exclusive facility for internal purposes only. If the next GCF phase is to serve UNDP corporate goals further, changes will be needed in the design, programming and management of the GCF facility. More fundamentally, GCF must define more sharply its niche for addressing truly global development issues of strategic importance to UNDP, and provide a clear strategy for enhancing the quality and effectiveness of UNDP work at the country level through global programmes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALD</td>
<td>Activities of Limited Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPR</td>
<td>Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDP</td>
<td>Bureau for Development Policy (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>Bratislava Regional Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Common Country Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCF</td>
<td>Country Cooperation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG</td>
<td>Capacity Development Group (practice area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR</td>
<td>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee (OECD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>Direct Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP</td>
<td>Democratic Governance Practice (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>Drylands Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGO</td>
<td>Development Group Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Executive Board (of UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
<td>Energy and Environment (UNDP Practice area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Executive Team (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCF</td>
<td>Global Cooperation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environmental Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVEP</td>
<td>Global Village Energy Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>Human Development Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Human Development Report Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTD</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Integrated Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financing Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>International Maritime Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEA</td>
<td>Institute of Applied Economic Research (Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF</td>
<td>Integrated Resources Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IULA</td>
<td>International Union of Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Less Developed Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Middle-income country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memoranda of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Mutual Support Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYFF</td>
<td>Multi-year funding framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>Net Contributor Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEX</td>
<td>National Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHDR</td>
<td>National Human Development Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>Office for Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGC</td>
<td>Oslo Governance Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Project Appraisal Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Poverty Group (UNDP practice area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPD</td>
<td>Policy Support and Programme Development Unit (Bratislava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAP</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAS</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for the Arab States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBEC</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for Eastern Europe and the CIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBLAC</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBx</td>
<td>Regional Bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Results Competency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>Regional Cooperation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAR</td>
<td>Results-oriented annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC</td>
<td>Regional Support Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Resident Representative (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHD</td>
<td>Sustainable human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and medium-sized enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Senior Management Team (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>Strategic results framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Specific Service Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURF</td>
<td>Sub-regional resource facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCDC</td>
<td>Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>Thematic Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMP</td>
<td>Urban Management Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>United Nations Capital Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>UN Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference for Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESA</td>
<td>UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td>United Nations Development Fund for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSG</td>
<td>United Nations Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>United Nations Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRR</td>
<td>World Resource Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSD</td>
<td>World Summit for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB</td>
<td>Extra Budgetary (Income)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 CONTEXT

In its decision 2001/7 of 5 February 2001, the Executive Board (EB) of UNDP approved the Second Global Cooperation Framework (GCF-II). The purpose of GCF-II is to contribute to UNDP’s global efforts to reduce poverty and promote sustainable human development (SHD). The development objective of the GCF-II is to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends and benefit from global knowledge on critical dimensions of human development in order to reduce national poverty and human inequity.

GCF-II was designed as "a critical tool in the transformation of UNDP into a globally networked policy-advice organization focused on global poverty reduction and sustainable human development". Its main purpose was to upgrade UNDP in the direction outlined in the Administrator's Business Plan, 2000-2003. A concrete target was "the integration of UNDP global development thinking and advocacy with country-level practices". To accomplish this, three types of services were planned:

(a) "Global advocacy and analysis to generate knowledge, build alliances, and promote enabling frameworks on key development issues;"

(b) "Policy advice, support and alignment across programmes, drawing on the global network of policy specialists; and"

(c) "Knowledge-networking and the sharing of best practices, drawing on the SURF system and communities of practice to support country and regional programming efforts".1

The current phase of GCF-II ended in December 2003, but the EB of UNDP approved a further extension of GCF-II for the period covering 1 January 2004 through 31 December 2004. At the annual session of the EB in June 2003, the Administrator of UNDP indicated that UNDP would undertake a forward-looking evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the overall approach of GCF-II, the range and quality of policy services provided and programme outcomes achieved, with a view to providing strategic inputs into the preparation of the third GCF. UNDP Evaluation Office conducted an independent evaluation of the GCF-II, the results of which are presented in this report.

1 Extracted from the GCF-II document, DP/GCF/2, paragraph 27.
1.2 OBJECTIVES

In accordance with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, the main objectives are to:

Assess the overall performance and general achievement of the intended organizational goals and development results, highlighting key outputs and outcomes, lessons learnt, degree of innovation and good practices. This covers the main practice and cross-cutting areas of UNDP.

Based on the actual results, ascertain how the GCF-II has contributed to strategically positioning UNDP as a major upstream global policy adviser on poverty reduction and sustainable human development and as a knowledge-based organization.

Develop recommendations for the design of the third phase of the GCF, covering policy and priority areas, plus institutional and implementation aspects.

1.3 APPROACH AND METHOD

The scope of the evaluation is broad and complex, encompassing issues at the global through country office levels. The prime manager of the GCF-II is the Bureau for Development Policy, and GCF-II resources form a major part of the overall BDP budget. While the linkage between GCF-II and BDP is integral, this report does not present an assessment of BDP. It does, however, touch on several of BDP’s organizational, institutional and management dimensions that are relevant to its implementation of GCF-II. The key elements of the methodology are described below.

Desk/Documentation Reviews. The evaluation was preceded by a preparatory phase, during which the Evaluation Office identified and assembled key reports and reference documents associated with GCF-II and mapped the GCFII project and programme portfolio. Other documents also were reviewed during the evaluation (see Annex B).

Interviews and Consultations. The data to support the analysis was provided through structured and unstructured interviews, focus group discussions, and consultations with some 350 officials from a wide variety of organizations. The team conducted initial interviews with UNDP key stakeholders in New York, followed by field visits. The main stakeholder communities interviewed included UNDP, selected United Nations organizations in New York and at the country level, selected programme and donor country governments (through their United Nations missions in New York and in some capitals), Executive Board members, and other entities, for example, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and civil society organizations, as determined through each country visit (see annex A).

Surveys and Data Collection. As the ‘stakeholder community’ of the GCF-II is large and widespread, a series of surveys was designed and executed to collect additional information and validate perceptions and viewpoints. The main surveys included:

A self-assessment survey of selected GCF project managers (all in BDP), as well as other selected practice/thematic focal points. This survey was executed at the start of the evaluation and approximately two-thirds of those surveyed responded.

Survey of Policy Specialists. Given the large number of policy specialists (75), a special web-based survey was designed and executed after the first round of field visits.

Survey of Resident Representatives. Similar to the preceding, a survey was also carried out for the Resident Representatives (RRs) to obtain their views on issues and priorities of the GCF.

Sample of Global Projects. From the portfolio of more than 150 global projects, BDP provided to the team a sample of 10 projects covering all of the practice areas (see Annex C). A general review of these projects was carried out through interviews with their project managers and a review of some of the associated documentation. In the course of their work, the team also had the chance to study other global projects.

Review of the Thematic Trust Funds. All TTFs were subjected to a general review through interviews with their managers and desk reviews of available reports and documentation.
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Visits to Country Offices and SURFs. During the inception phase, a small sample of country offices and SURF sites was selected jointly by BDP and the EO with input from the regional bureaux. (see Box 1.1). In addition, two GCF funded centres were visited : the Poverty Centre in Brasilia and the Governance Centre in Oslo. Structured interview and focus group discussions were used as the prime method of data gathering. Separate mission reports were prepared for each visit, and these served as a main input to the preparation of this report.

1.4 SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

While the methods and techniques used for data gathering and analysis generally conform to industry standards for evaluations, and results are considered as fairly representative of GCF-II performance, there are some caveats. The design and implementation of GCF-II presents a wide, complex universe from which a small number of components were selected for review. As with any highly complex initiative, not all GCF components could be individually assessed. This evaluation presents a snapshot of performance for key GCF-II components and others based on representative sampling. The team did, however, expend considerable effort in interviewing key stakeholders and policy specialists, especially those out-posted to the SURFs, to gain an understanding of how GCF-II has operated, particularly at sub-regional and country levels.

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

The GCF-II is a complex mix of highly inter-related components, instruments, mechanisms and institutional arrangements. The Team has endeavoured to organize its findings and recommendations according to the structure of the GCF.

Section 2 contains a general factual description of GCF-II, its framework and design, concepts and terminology, plus some basic financial information. The description is supported by some analysis and commentary on the design elements.

Sections 3 and 4 present the main findings of the GCF-II in terms of performance of its main components. These are, respectively, the three support services, the four practice areas, and the three cross-cutting or thematic areas. Details are contained in the annexes.

Section 5 looks at the GCF-II institutional arrangements, mechanisms and other organizational strategies used to implement the GCF. This includes the practice communities and sub-regional resource facility partnerships, the thematic trust funds and a sample of global projects. Also included in this section are the findings on project execution and GCF-II programming. Details are contained in the annexes.

Section 6 addresses management issues associated with GCF-II. Here, there is a considerable intersection of the management of the GCF with the overall management of BDP, and it is at times difficult to separate the two. The main areas include oversight and accountability; monitoring, evaluation and reporting; financial and human resources management.

Section 7 presents summary conclusions and recommendations from the assessment. The recommendations are organized according to the structure of the GCF framework and relate back to each section on findings. The assessment's wide coverage is reflected in the large number of recommendations, primarily of a management or technical nature, although some touch upon policy and strategy.
2.1 THE UNDP CHANGE CONTEXT

The development situation has changed dramatically over the past decade, requiring UNDP to not only re-orient its approaches and development delivery model, but also to address issues of an increasingly global nature. This became particularly evident during the 1990s - a period of major change within UNDP and indeed in the international system and the development community - the features of which have been factored into programming at the country, regional and global levels, viz:

- Political re-orientation in the socialist countries of Asia and Europe, resulting in UNDP significantly expanding membership and programme participation;
- Progress in communications technology, international traffic and economic globalization, providing new challenges and opportunities to the international development community, including increased competition;
- Overall declines in official development assistance (ODA) resulting in part in a more competitive aid/international development environment;
- Local and regional conflicts, obliging the UNDP and the international development community to engage more than anticipated in crisis prevention and peace building initiatives;
- Global action programmes, agreed at world development conferences, and growing consensus on international development targets and strategies for promoting development effectiveness, notably the Monterrey Conference and the Millennium Development Summit of 2000, which resulted in the adoption of the Millennium Declaration, subsequently captured in the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that have became the main focus for development efforts and a key agenda for the UN system; and
- Cooperation and coordination within the UN development system were progressively strengthened, while UN specialized agencies ceased executing most of the projects funded by UNDP and national execution became the preferred cooperation modality for promoting national ownership.

In addition to its stronger involvement in global advocacy and policy dialogue, UNDP decided to launch and implement a number of...
organizational changes that GCF-II was intended to help implement. According to the Administrator’s Business Plan, 2000-2003, a key thrust was to transform UNDP into a knowledge-based and knowledge networked organization. Under the Business Plans, UNDP further narrowed its programme focus to a few major practice and thematic areas and gave priority to upstream policy advice. A support structure of policy advisory services was to be created at the sub-regional and central levels.

Many of these changes were to be supported by GCF-II. But concurrent to the rollout of GCF-II, UNDP had been undergoing and continues to undergo a series of other major changes: reprofiling of the Country Offices and HQ units; implementation of the new corporate Atlas systems; since 2003, merger of the regional programmes and SURFs into the new Regional Centres, as of 2003 reorganization of BDP; the introduction of new corporate performance management systems in 1999, significantly, the adoption of results-based management (RBM) and the strategic results framework (SRF) for results-based performance measurement; and the setting up of new organizational structures such as the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) and the Oslo Governance Centre and the Brasilia Poverty Centres.

The First Global Cooperation Framework (GCF-I). The first GCF of the late 1990s responded to the above-noted global changes and related issues by further refocusing UNDP’s portfolio of development assistance and by expanding capacity for technical guidance in a few areas of concentration (what are now referred to as practice areas): poverty eradication, gender equality, environmental sustainability, governance, and certain cross-cutting issues such as information technology, advocacy, linkages, partnerships and resource mobilization. The first GCF also brought greater concentration and integration to previous global programming that was typified by many disparate projects spread over a wide spectrum of sectors. In effect, the first GCF began the process of reform to global programming.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Since late 2000 when GCF-II was drafted, the MDGs have moved into the forefront of anti-poverty strategies and human development paradigms, precipitating another wave of major change in how UNDP and the UN system approach their mandates. The MDG reporting initiative was developed and actively promoted by UNDP in response to the Millennium Declaration. Although it could be argued that MDG reporting was introduced in a top-down manner, it has captured the interest of governments and civil society (as well as donor agencies) throughout the world.

Perhaps the magnitude and frequency of this change is aptly captured by Joan Anstee, who in 2003 commented that “UNDP has spent years, desperately seeking a role by jumping on every fashionable development or humanitarian bandwagon.”

If the comment has any value at all in respect to the post-1990 period, including the years of GCF-II, it could probably be said to be true of the international Official Development Assistance (ODA) community. After the Cold War, donor motivation ebbed, leading to stagnation in aid flows such that the peace dividend became a mere illusion. At the same time, new horizons and venues opened up for consensus in the international community with a stronger focus on common goals and targets in global governance. A series of UN conferences was the logical consequence, culminating in the Millennium Summit of 2000 and its consensus declaration.

UND P is now recognized as a champion of the MDGs, which have arguably become one of the most effective new development instruments for mobilizing support for poverty reduction and human development. The MDGs are promoted and incorporated into the practice areas and have proved an effective means for programme countries to focus on issues as diverse as poverty reduction, social justice, access to basic services, combating HIV/AIDS, and environmental protection. GCF-II has increasingly been re-oriented to play an

---

2. Extracted from GCF-II document, DP/GCF/2, paragraph 27
3. Margaret Joan Anstee, “Never Learn to Type,” 2003, page 265, These recent and ongoing changes have been juxtaposed on other changes of the past several years, such as the change 2000 initiative and business re-engineering.
important role in promoting the MDGs and in facilitating their discussion. GCF-II initiatives have also taken advantage of MDGs to build broad coalitions around many of these sectors. Country MDG reports have been prepared in at least 70 countries and GCF-II has likely been involved, directly or indirectly, in the majority of these initiatives.

From the above brief description of the UNDP change context, it can be seen that designing a programme as complex as GCF-II requires flexibility in order to adapt to changing conditions. For any evaluation, it constitutes a moving target. Some of the changes (such as the initial introduction of the SURFs) have not had sufficient time to take shape before another change and redirection was imposed (the new regional centres). With other perceived major changes on the horizon, such as knowledge management, broadening of partnerships, UN harmonization and simplification and so on, the challenge for future GCF design is to construct a framework that (i) does not need to be shackled by traditional programme design methods, (ii) clearly lends itself to some form of performance measurement and results-based management, and (iii) better aligns its results to the MYFF. One of the strategic issues to be addressed in GCF-III is how MDGs might be integrated in the design along with the MYFF.

2.2 DESIGN OF GCF-II

The second phase of the GCF was to build on the work and achievements of the first phase, rather than embarking on any major new directions. The overall development objective of the GCF-II was to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends and benefit from global knowledge. Apart from being managed at the corporate level, there were questions about the factors that made GCF-II uniquely global, and how the GCF-II provided such windows. The criteria for the programming of global resources provide some insight. Other elements of design discussed below also extended the GCF-II global reach.

The framework and design of GCF-II contain a wide array of development aspirations and mandates. By focusing on four development dimensions, GCF-II was to further narrow the focus of global programmes and activities. Three main programme categories were mentioned, for which core and non-core funds were targeted in the ‘resources framework’. In 2001, the sub-categories dealing with the Human Development Report Office and Office for Development Studies (ODS) were moved out of the GCF and the categories dealing with policy advisory services and global programs were organized according to practice and cross-cutting or thematic areas.

### Four dimensions

The initial Executive Board document (DP/GCF/2) defined four 'critical dimensions' for SHD (paragraph 25) and three 'strategic areas of support' (paragraph 27). The four dimensions provide a good example of the fluidity of GCF-II design. The GCF-II document envisaged programme support in the dimensions of globalization, participation, growth and crises. Initially, this perspective was helpful in illustrating the main goals: to strengthen the positions of developing countries, their internal participatory structures, policies aiming at equitable growth, and their capacity to prevent crises. It provided a general pattern of orientation.

The crisis dimension presented a special case. Concerns for about 60 states affected by crises became such a central issue that UNDP decided, as noted above, to create a separate Bureau for Crisis Prevention and

---

4. See [http://www.undp.org/mdg/trackingprogress.html](http://www.undp.org/mdg/trackingprogress.html) for information on progress towards the implementation of the MDGs.

5. DP/GCF/2, paragraph 25.

6. These are: “... (a) The development challenge being addressed must be a shared concern among a significant number of countries in different regions; this will ensure the benefit of cross-regional exchange of experience and good practice while exploiting programmatic economies of scale; (b) The development challenge may be rooted in current global systems and regimes and thus must be addressed through global advocacy and intermediation; and (c) UNDP must have a clear comparative advantage as a development organization in the specific intervention.” See DP/GCF/2, paragraph 29.

7. The three programme categories are (1) policy support services (which includes the field-based policy specialists), (2) other activities (consisting of the HDRO, ODS and contingencies) and (3) global programme.
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Programme countries. These are listed in the EB.

provide required high quality, substantive support to enable the organization to

the approval of the GCF-II, UNDP instituted the first MYFF and the SRF in 1999 and subsequent to the

concept of 'practices' to enable the organization to be valued by UNDP staff who were interviewed. BDP-

BCPR coordination in post-conflict situations was reported to be well managed, and the presence of BCPR specialists at the SURFs/regional centres is expected to further strengthen such cooperation.

Practice and cross-cutting areas. Since the adoption of the first MYFF and the SRF in 1999 and subsequent to the approval of the GCF-II, UNDP instituted the concept of 'practices' to enable the organization to provide high quality support, substantive support to programme countries. These are listed in the EB submission and approval for the GCF-II extension.

When GCF-II was launched in 2001, there were six practice areas: poverty; energy and environment; democratic governance; HIV/AIDS; ICT for development; and crisis prevention and recovery. The second multi-year funding framework for the period 2004-2007 sets out UNDP's strategic programme focus, including alignment among UNDP goals and practice areas and the MDGs. As of January 2004, the number of BDP managed practice areas had been reduced to four with the creation of BCPR as a separate Bureau and the closing of the ICT for Development practice area in December 2003 and integrating it into poverty and governance as a crosscutting theme. In addition, in 2002, a new Capacity Development Group (CDG) was formed to give more importance to this cross-cutting aspect of UNDP's work. Although these major changes in orientation have occurred, there has been no formal adjustment in the GCF-II or its programming (i.e. through a supplementary submission to the Executive Board seeking approval of such changes). Consequently, the design of the GCF-II seems, in 2004, to be partly anachronistic.

GCF-II Objectives. The GCF-II document is partially constructed along the lines of a traditional UNDP programme document. The global cooperation framework contains a development objective supported by a series of immediate objectives, each associated with the four dimensions and priority support areas. In a standard programme evaluation, achievement of the immediate objectives would be measured against some criteria, and resources (inputs) allocated to them. The GCF-II is not designed according to expected results (using the results-based management framework) nor does it contain any criteria or measures against which performance / results can be measured. Even so, the immediate objectives are so broadly stated that just about any GCF-II activity could be argued to have contributed to achievement. Perhaps this is seen to add to the 'flexibility' of the GCF-II. The intended results associated with each dimension do offer some potential for performance evaluation, but since the design thrust has been changed to practices, such an assessment according to the GCF-II defined intended result areas and objectives would not be practical.

2.3 GCF-II FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

Budgets. The total initial budget for the GCF-II for the period 2001-2003, as approved by the Executive Board, was $187.6 million, comprised of $72.6 million core and $115 million non-core funds. With the extension of the GCF-II to include 2004, approved new resources brought the total budget to $246.2 million ($92.9 million core and $153.3 million non-core -- see Tables E.1 and E.2 in Annex E). The approved new resources for 2004 did not include funds for the HDRO or ODS. Table 2.1 presents the GCF-II budget for 2001-2003, as provided by BDP in a separate detailed budget report. It should be noted that GCF resources are only a part of the resources managed by BDP.

As noted elsewhere in the report, a number of sources for financial information were provided to the team, and the information did not reconcile. For example, the total GCF-II budget noted in Table 2.1 is significantly more than the total budget approved initially by the EB for the period 2001-2003 ($187.6 million), but is closer to the 2001-2004 total with the subsequent extension ($246.2 million). Financial information provided as part of the TORs for this assessment show that the total approved over the period 2001-2003 was $57.9 million (presumably core funds). Further, the total number of projects listed in Table 2.1 is considerably higher (147) than the number listed in the Evaluation TORs (43 projects fully or partially funded by the GCF for 2002-


9 For example, for the dimension of Participation (governance and democracy), “The immediate objective is to share knowledge of mechanisms for good governance, democratic practices and participatory processes to enable poverty reduction.” DP/GCF2/paragraph 34. Immediate objectives for the other areas are equally obscure.

10 The information provided in Table 2.1 was extracted from an internal BDP report entitled Annex IV: Budget for the Second Global Cooperation Framework (2001 - 2003), annotated as ‘final’. No source or date for the report was provided. Another report produced by BDP at the request of the Team showed the 2001-2003 GCF2 Practice Group Allocations (presumably of core resources), and had very different breakouts from the first report. For example, the allocations for three practice areas varied significantly from the first report (noted in Table 2.1) and the second report as follows: poverty ($2,396 vs. $6,600 million); governance ($8,866 vs. $4,800 million); and energy & environment ($12,533 vs. 6,645 million). There is likely a rationale explanation for the discrepancies, but the Team has yet to be apprised of it.
2003 - refer also to Table E.4 in Annex E). 11

All of the projects listed by BDP were identified as 'ongoing' as of the end of 2003, with the exception of two listed as 'pipeline' (but with no budget allocations). The total budget for the Knowledge Management area is distorted due to the inclusion of Project GLO/01/001 with a budget of about $1.4 million.

The expenditures profile of these two projects cannot be seen as representative of all global projects. Over the period 2001-2003, a total of 84% of the budget had been expended for the 10 projects (i.e. the delivery rate), with fund for policy specialists, whose total budget was $51.3 million, but for which the expenditure amount is shown as $34.5 million in the above table. Otherwise, the majority of GCF-II resources have been programmed for the democratic governance and energy & environment practice areas (27% and 20%, respectively).

The above table presents interesting comparisons across the four practice areas in terms of project averages and size, and the amount of core funds as a percentage of non-core budgets (cost-share plus TTF). As noted in Table 2.2 on the following page, the largest project across the practice groups is in Governance (Urban Management Programme). The smallest project is in the Energy and Environment (E&E) practice area ($55,000; entitled 'Support for a Member of the Technical Advisory Committee'). The smallest project (Democratic Governance Practice) in the governance group has a budget of $193,000. However, there are four such projects with the same title and a combined budget of about $1.4 million.

Expenditures. BDP carried out a general financial expenditure analysis of the 10 selected global projects (see Annex E and Section 5). Two of the projects were of a reasonable size, and expenditure information revealed that close to 75% of the financial resources were spent on personnel, with an average of about 14% spent on sub-contracts, and the rest on training, equipment and miscellaneous expenses. 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th># PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</th>
<th>CORE (GCF)</th>
<th>COST-SHARING</th>
<th>TRUST FUNDS</th>
<th>% OF THE TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Governance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56,265</td>
<td>4,517</td>
<td>14,939</td>
<td>36,809</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Environment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42,057</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>3,874</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18,962</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>8,413</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37,068</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>31,580</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cutting Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,032</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34,502</td>
<td>34,502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgets</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>206,290</td>
<td>54,749</td>
<td>32,405</td>
<td>119,136</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. It should be noted that the financial information presented in this section do not reconcile with the TTF financial summaries presented in Section 6.4. The reason provided by BDP for this is that the TTF reports record all funds flowing through the TTF financial mechanism regardless of whether those funds are administered by BDP. As such there are categories of funds, such as those from the country windows, that are not administered by BDP but which appear in the TTF consolidated reports but not in the summary tables provided by BDP.

12. 2001-2003 Budgets became expenditures. The amounts shown in the column ‘Total Project Budget’ is then the same as total expenditures.

13. Total # of BDP Project Budgets funded by Core and Non-Core Resources for the period 2001-2003.

14. Total Approved Budget/(Expenditures) of projects funded from core (TRAC 1.3) and Non-core (Cost Sharing, Thematic Trust Fund (all windows) and Other Trust Funds) up to December 31 2003.

15. Figures include Thematic Trust Fund (Global and Country Office Allocation) & Other Trust Funds.

16. The Poverty group includes also a total of 10 Gender projects with a total project budget of about $ 4.6 million, or about 19% of the Poverty practice area total.

17. These projects are identified in the BDP report as 'Directorate' projects, but all are classed as 'knowledge'. The main project is GLO/01/001 for the funding of the 75 policy specialists.

18. These projects were classified as ‘unknown’ since there is some question as to which practice or cross-cutting area they belong. Project GLO-H01-IV-D-01 ($1.6 million) is entitled 'Stakeholder Consultations'. Project GLO-02-705-A-08-20 ($160,000) is entitled 'Policy and Strategy Support to WSIS'. The third project GLO-99-H07-IV-G-31 ($2.9 million) was not provided with a title. All three projects are listed as 'ongoing'.

19. These were: GLO/01/115 'Energy for Sustainable Development Global Programme' with a 2001-2003 budget of $2.8 million, and GLO/01/616/C/11/56 'Urban Management Programme (Phase 4)' with a 2001-2003 budget of $4.1 million.
about 86% reported expended for the policy specialists (GLO/01/001) project.

It should be noted that only one project (GLO/01/001) was approved by the Executive Board to fund UNDP staff (i.e. the 75 policy specialists). Other GCF-II resources were to be used to fund programme activities and, as noted, a considerable portion went to the funding of various categories of personnel (short-term consultants, sub-contracts). BDP has maintained that a 'firewall' separated GCF-II into two different funding sources: one for funding the 75 policy specialists as 'staff' of UNDP, and another for programme activities. The Team found one instance where this firewall may have been breached: the budget page of GLO/02/518 (totally funded from GCF resources) contains three posts: two advisers and one specialist. There may be other instances where this firewall may have had a few breaches and audits of all projects and programmes would be in order.

A third dimension of GCF-II is the extra-budgetary (XB) income and expenditures by BDP on the execution and management of GCF-II initiatives. Information provided by BDP shows that approximately $3.9 million of XB income was expended over the period 2001-2003, and most of this on office alterations. Details are discussed in Section 6.

**TABLE 2.2 – SELECTED PROJECT METRICS BY PRACTICE AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Metric</th>
<th>Democratic Governance</th>
<th>Energy &amp; Environment</th>
<th>HIV/AIDS</th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest Project ($’000’s)</td>
<td>18,545</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest project ($’000’s)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Size ($’000’s)</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core as a % of Total Budget</td>
<td>15.1 %</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>17.5 %</td>
<td>26.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Fund: Core Ratio</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GCF-II was designed to respond directly to the United Nations Millennium Declaration and the MDGs and to reaffirm the role of UNDP as a global leader in development through advocacy and innovative research; the integration of UNDP global thinking and advocacy with country level practices; and the promotion of a state-of-the-art knowledge network through decentralization of policy support capacity. How has the GCF-II performed across these three broad goals? In this section, three types of inter-related services provided through GCF-II are identified and each is assessed in terms of its cross-cutting performance and contribution to UNDP's transformational goals.

3.1 GLOBAL ANALYSIS AND ADVOCACY

Overview. One of the main intentions of GCF-II was to allow for "the integration of UNDP global development thinking and advocacy with country-level practices". The focal point for this task is BDP, which supports UNDP leadership in advocating such thinking in international development fora. Global advocacy and analysis are pursued by UNDP through not only GCF-II but also through a wide range of other vehicles and means, at the HQ, regional and country levels, directly and indirectly (e.g. country and regional programmes, publications, workshops and conferences and so on). The GCF-II has an important advantage in that such advocacy is more at the discretion of UNDP and is pursued primarily by HQ units through such means as the Human Development Report, development research, studies and publications, and global conferences and workshops.

Key Findings. At the central level, two examples of performance achievement were the Human Development Report (coordinated and managed by HDRO) and special development studies (managed by the Office of Development Studies). Other examples covered by the Team included recent work done on poverty and trade. Sections 4 and 5 also cover the practice and thematic perspectives of global advocacy.

Human Development Report. According to general opinion, the Human Development Report is one of the best things that ever happened to UNDP. The Team found that this "flagship" product of development advocacy enabled UNDP to reach the media and public on a worldwide scale as well influence the global development discourse. From its first issue in 1990, it has addressed themes of critical relevance to international cooperation for
development (from "Concept and Measurement of Human Development" in 1990 to "Millennium Development Goals" in 2003). It was, therefore, quite surprising to the Team to receive feedback that a direct link between HDR messages and UNDP country programmes is still missing. Suggestions were made to 'operationalize' HDR findings, e.g. in joint policy notes or closer exchanges within a policy group at headquarters. Equally surprising were comments that UNDP staff working in country offices or as regional advisers felt that they had no way of feeding their experience and suggestions into the HDR process.\textsuperscript{21}

The HDR approach as such was adopted in a great number of programme countries where COs were publishing their own National Human Development Reports at least every second year. These NHDRs have become a major instrument for human development advocacy. In some cases, regional or sub-regional HDRs have also been published (e.g. for the Arab States and within the Regional Bureau for Eastern Europe and the CIS (RBEC), whose Regional Centre maintains a regional HDR desk). HDRO offers advice, mainly in terms of maintaining minimum standards and principles, while the thematic orientation is decided at the country level. At the same time, encouragement is provided through a network and an awards programme.

**Development Research and Studies.** The Office of Development Studies aims to provide UNDP with a strong link to the academic community and advance thinking in development. A number of eminent researchers have contributed to its series of publications. In recent years, ODS work has been focused on the concept of global public goods, culminating in the publication "Providing Global Public Goods; Managing Globalization" (2003), containing studies on policy issues and offering advice on international cooperation strategies to implement such policies. The initiative has been well received among a number of scientists, intellectuals and policy makers, of whom (about 10,000) make use of the network, gpgnet.net.\textsuperscript{22} The network's knowledge portal included several thousand entries on related sources. An international task force gave it the backup to create the intended level of familiarity with the concept.

Research and studies carried out by the ODS presented a good argument for direct relevance to GCF-II; however, it appeared somewhat remote to its practice realm. Although ODS was seen as producing top quality work, the Team did not get the impression that the Global Public Goods (GPG) message had reached UNDP staff, which made little use of the network services offered by ODS. While the publications were found in the offices of the RR, most of the people consulted reported that they were not read.\textsuperscript{23} From the visits, only two COs had conducted staff briefings on GPG. Nevertheless, a number of senior officials in the field informed the Team of their appreciation and commitment to the concept that should have become, in their view, part of corporate thinking. The Team is aware, on the other hand, of the fear in some quarters that such advocacy as implied by the GPG could be misused in the service of narrow political ideology (although the Team has no reason to believe that this is actually happening). Some diplomats voiced concern about the lack of agreement on the concept within the international community.

The Team cannot but conclude that GCF-II has not contributed much in creating the envisaged profile for UNDP as an "effective advocate for the provision of global public goods that benefit developing countries". The Team suggests that UNDP examine whether it can afford to conduct a major academic study programme internally, unless it is directly related to and utilized in its regular work. The UNDP Executive Team decision taken on 23 October 2003 appeared to point in the right direction, inviting COs to share their experiences and concerns in taking the GPG concept forward at the country level.

Following a recent decision of the Executive Board, the HDRO and ODS budgets are no longer funded from GCF funds, but from separate annual allocations, commencing in 2004 (reference: Decision 2002/18 on programming arrangements for 2004-2007). One of the main challenges for the UNDP is how to open up internal consultation and participation so that global advocacy thrusts can find practical and implementation potential at the country and regional levels. Another challenge is for UNDP to find the right advocacy balance on issues that may be considered controversial.

**Trade.** The United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and UNDP share common objectives in advocating the position of developing countries in trade negotiations. The UNCTAD Executive Board in 1998 endorsed the idea of providing a forum, advisory role and support to the promotion of a negotiation process that is participatory and equitable at all levels and that contributes to sustainable development. The UNDP Executive Board decision taken on 14 May 2002 on "Trade: a key to human development" adopted this position and launched the Programme of Action for Sustainable Development in the 21st Century reinforcing the need for the UNDP Executive Board to examine the relationship between the role of UNDP in support to the promotion of sustainable development and the role of the UNCTAD in support to the promotion of trade and development.

\textsuperscript{21} It was subsequently pointed out to the Team that staff can participate and feed their views through the networks and in particular the HDR network.

\textsuperscript{22} The observation was subsequently made by ODS management that few UNDP staff participate in the network and its discussions, even though all UNDP discussion groups and networks are typically invited to join.

\textsuperscript{23} In follow-up discussions with ODS and HQ staff, the comment was made that CO staff are simply overloaded with information, that they do not have time to read, and that there was little incentive to 'learn' - i.e. an absence of a learning culture in the organization and/or insufficient corporate attention to research and development.
countries in the field of international trade. They jointly advanced the "UNCTAD-UNDP Global Programme on Globalization, Liberalization and SHD" with support from GCF-II (GLO/98/615 & 01/615) and co-funding from Belgium. While the second phase of this programme clearly emphasized the main issues of international negotiations and discussions on the global scale, its activity was not limited to advocacy and strategy development. It also included services to strengthen the competitiveness of developing countries. Rubens Ricupero expressed primary interest in the technical cooperation objective "to contribute to the utilization and expansion of local capacities".24

A recent UNDP evaluation of the Global Programme prepared by independent consultants, Fuat Andic and A. Benbouali, showed that the two organizations have contributed their respective strengths, advancing the sustainable human development (SHD) paradigm in the field of trade and development. Many useful lessons have been learnt and some of the global programme objectives may still be achieved within the remaining year. On the other hand, it turned out that the programme design was too ambitious to lead to all of the anticipated results within the given framework of available financial and human resources.

Apart from short-term advice, the aforementioned evaluation team also made long-term recommendations concerning substance, assuming that UNDP would consider a new phase of programme activity. Main recommendations were made for a close linkage to UNDP country programmes and a strict concentration on two immediate objectives: (a) to assist World Trade Organization (WTO) candidates in assessing implications of globalization on SHD, and (b) to play a catalytic role in providing technical assistance in negotiations with WTO.

Other instruments to strengthen the capacity of developing countries in trade negotiations were the publication of the 2003 book, "Making Global Trade Work for People", co-sponsored by UNDP and four international foundations--an example for global PPP activity--and the Integrated Framework (IF), which was used as a mechanism for mainstreaming trade into national development plans, including PRSPs in LDCs.25 The key messages of the book, according to BDP, have been translated into operational global and regional projects with practical capacity development implications for developing countries, supporting Regional Bureaus, UNDP COs and developing country governments in 2003. Three such examples include: (a) the Asia Trade, Economic Governance and Human Development Programme, which was largely designed by BDP in cooperation with the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (RBAP); (b) the global South-South TRIPS and Access to HIV/AIDS Drugs Programme, a cross-practice initiative of BDP's Poverty Group and HIV/AIDS Group; and (c) the adaptation of 'Making Global Trade Work for People' to the particular vulnerabilities of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Small and Vulnerable States (SVS).

The policy specialists funded by GCF-II were also reported to have played a role in influencing the design of the new three-year Africa Trade, Poverty and Human Development Programme. It would appear that in the area of trade and human development, GCF-II was used to accomplish what was intended.

As far as books can still have positive impact, it can be assumed that the globally launched and widely translated "Making Global Trade Work for People" will assist the target group of developing countries by providing information on issues and options in trade negotiations and policy debates. Increased donor interest in Integrated Framework has given UNDP and cooperating agencies additional opportunities to provide technical support to a growing number of LDCs. At the same time, UNDP has been an active participant in and contributor to international policy dialogue on capital market liberalization, pro-poor policies and the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative. This was confirmed to the Team by BDP.

The experience from all the GCF-related activities showed that UNDP is playing a supporting role in building capacities in the field of trade and development. UNDP would be well advised not to claim leadership in this field, but rather to focus on its specific mandate and SHD orientation. In line with the recommendations of Andic and Benboualis evaluation cited above in the case of one large-scale project, it is suggested that UNDP continue its involvement in this field, while scaling back its scope.

**Advocacy at the country level.** The subject of policy advocacy was found to be more sensitive at the country
level than at the global level, particularly on issues concerning governance, human rights, corruption and gender where there is political and/or social sensitivity - which is not surprising. Most respondents felt that UNDP should not confuse ‘helping governments to identify and assess alternative strategies with the promotion (advocacy) of one particular line of action. Where UNDP endeavoured to advocate a particular position, such advocacy was seen by some to contradict or undermine the oft-cited UNDP strength of neutrality.

The Team also found that a number of COs reported that they had little latitude or flexibility in pursuing sensitive policy or advocacy issues since all of the GCF funding sources were either tied up in salaries (e.g. the policy specialists) or in projects, programmes and TTF proposals that often required sign-off by governments. In any future GCF, UNDP faces the challenge of balancing the roles of champion of normative United Nations standards and broker of policy options acceptable in a specific country context.

3.2 POLICY ADVICE

Overview. No other component of GCF-II generated as much discussion or debate as that of policy advice, the second service type designed to support the achievement of GCF-II objectives. To be sure, policy advice and related services are provided by UNDP through a wide range of means by all the bureaus and country offices, so the findings here cannot be generalized. GCF-II is but one contributor, but its focus is at the global level, with a corollary objective of alignment across practice areas and alignment from the global to the country levels. The main instrument through which these services have been provided is a separate global project entitled ‘Global Programme Policy Support Services’ (GLO/01/001), by far the largest of all core-funded global projects. The main purpose of this project was the recruitment and funding of 75 policy specialists--50 at the field level and 25 at headquarters. The out-posted policy specialists are deployed to the sub-regional resource facilities where they would "... manage the demand for, and coordinate the provision of, policy support to programme countries and serve as the window for identifying and exchanging experience in good practice worldwide".

Key Findings. The Team found that there was considerable latitude of interpretation in the meaning of ‘policy advice’. Policy advice was seen as ranging from upstream ‘policy’ (at the highest political levels of governments) to downstream technical assistance on the 'implementation' of policy. Most of those consulted tended to see the practical meaning of policy advice as technical assistance, expertise, or process facilitation. There was further confusion over the terms 'upstream' and 'downstream'. While there can be no definitive conclusion of this debate in this report, the following offers some insights on the meaning of policy advice and how UNDP has performed in this domain through GCF-II. A general discussion on the nature of policy advice is followed by the Team's key findings on the policy related role of the GCF-II funded policy specialists.

'Policy Advice' and the Policy Domain

At the outset, it is important to note that there exist different dimensions of support provided in the ‘policy’ arena by UNDP or any other external development partner. It is generally recognized that national development policy per se is normally generated through a variety of forms and series of activities within a programme country. Support to the policy process is generally provided through consultations, mediation, research and analysis, advocacy and so on. UNDP supports the policy process and the many inputs...
EVALUATION OF THE SECOND GLOBAL COOPERATION FRAMEWORK

Advocacy and Support to Policy

1) Programme/Project Formulation:

- Country Programme Action Plans (Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan)
- Formulation of a justice sector programme (Bangladesh)
- Development of trade project (Bangladesh)
- Formulation of the new Atoll Development Programme (Maldives)
- Project implementation of the National HR Action Plan (Nepal)
- Programme of Action for Adaptation to Climate Change (Nepal, Maldives, Bhutan)
- Drafting a project document on pro-poor policy (Bhutan)
- Reformulating and realigning the environment portfolio with emerging country needs and corporate priorities (Sri Lanka).

2) Sharpening of Policy Positions:

- Review of the governance portfolio and formulation of the UNDP policy position on local governance (Bhutan),
- Assistance with preparations for a conference on Trade and Human Development in India (India)
- Conceptualising gender entry points for UNDP (Bangladesh).

3) Strategy Development:

- Strategy for judicial training at provincial and district level (Afghanistan)
- Designing a national strategy on "greater involvement of people living with HIV/AIDS" - GIPA (India).

4) Programme Reviews/Evaluations:

- Outcome evaluation of Iran CC governance portfolio (Iran)
- Review of energy programme (Sri Lanka)
- Outcome evaluation of Energy and Environment project (Nepal).

5) Capacity Development:

- Project cycle management training (Afghanistan)
- Workshop on rights-based approach (Nepal, Sri Lanka)
- Knowledge Management Workshop (Nepal, India).

Nature of Policy-related services provided by the Policy Specialists

The policy domain entered into by the GCF-II-funded policy specialists was found to be complex and highly variable. The performance of the policy specialists was influenced by country demand for policy-related services, the qualifications and expertise of the policy advisers (the supply side), perceived roles and responsibilities, and a range of other factors. The Team found only a few cases where high-level (or upstream) policy advice had been rendered to governments through the COs with support from the SURF-based policy specialists. Most of the advisory services were in fact found to be more of a technical nature. (The specialists' titles for the most part reflected this orientation.) The Team was informed that countries generally did not request policy advice per se, but rather were more open to technical expertise and assistance. For most countries, 'policy' was considered the domain of national governments, and 'advice' was obtained from national sources or from sources selected by the country. From the interviews, the Team was informed that UNDP in most regions was not seen generally as competitive or having any comparative advantage in the area of policy advice. LDCs in Africa and elsewhere may be the general exception.

30. The notion of policy advice also related directly to the role of the 'policy specialist' and supporting human resources management aspects. These issues are discussed in Section 7.4.

31. But, as a number of those interviewed commented, most of the 'policy advice' is delivered through grants without any conditions, and it is difficult for LDC recipient countries to say "no". Also, some observed that while policy advice may be rendered by UNDP, it is another matter as to whether such advice would be accepted or implemented by the recipient government.
A related issue was that governments have a dramatically different demand situation in this regard. In the EU accession countries, for example, the basic policy decision was to join the EU, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and eventually the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This required that these countries implement a large number of basic legal and administrative policies, and UNDP had provided much of the ‘implementation’ advice. In general, the policy needs were reported to vary significantly by country typology (e.g. China and India).

Most staff interviewed, including the field-based policy specialists, were of the opinion that UNDP did not and should not provide policy advice to governments, unless specifically requested.

It was even felt by many that UNDP was not generally credible in the provision of ‘up stream’ policy advice. UNDP could provide some technical advice, or advice and assistance in the ‘implementation’ of policy; e.g. through the sharing of experiences, lessons learnt and capacity building. Implementation experience (and knowledge) could then be used to influence, leverage or inform policy. What then was the real nature of ‘policy advice’? The Nepal SURF was found to have delivered a wide range of policy-related services, and this was seen to be generally applicable to most SURFs and indeed HQ units (see Box 3.1). As can be seen, the services are quite broad and includes more ‘globally related’ activities such as substantive research, analytical work, support to the development of global policy products, participation in and contributions to the networks, facilitating collaboration between country offices, general networking and so on.

In the case of the poverty practice area (discussed in Section 4.1), BDP maintained that a considerable portion of their services were of a ‘policy advisory’ nature. While the lines between operational support, technical backstopping and policy related analysis on the one hand, and policy advice on the other, were often blurred, and the two former could often produce a gradual transition to the latter, the Team received the impression that traditional forms of policy advice represented a relatively small part of the activity of most policy specialists.

The comment was often made that the credibility and influence of advice or assistance was directly linked to resources and substantial experience in ‘downstream’ operational programmes and projects. Thus if UNDP had the resources and operational experience, then its policy services would have more influence. Some CO staff had the perception that UNDP Senior Management and various HQ documents continued to portray UNDP as a major player in up stream policy advice, whereas the reality at the country level as described above seemed to be quite different. However, as noted at the outset of this section, supporting the policy process through a range of activities was found to be a significant component of the policy specialists’ role and performance, as well as to enhance CO’s corresponding capacities.

The entire GCF should be devoted to better serving CO-driven demands, with the RC sensing and then adjusting to the pattern of demand that emerges.

**Survey of RRs**

**Supply and Demand.** The above discussion is closely linked to the supply and demand for policy advice. The GCF-II and various global programs emphasized that the provision of such services was demand driven at the country level, that is, where the UNDP Country Office was the main ‘client’. Most SURFs maintained that their policy-related services were demand driven. However, the Team found that policy-related services were more a case of being supply constrained: "this is the expertise we have, and we can offer it to COs subject to availability, and availability of supply is very limited". The main reasons for this are:

---

32. In the opinion of one senior staff member: "No self-respecting government would admit that its national policies were based on advice from UNDP". Policy is the domain of government, and advice can be sourced nationally (India has more 'policy experts' than total staff in UNDP). Further, "... one of the main reasons that UNDP is a trusted development partner all over the world is because it operates according to the principles and values of the United Nations. That means respecting each country's control over its own future, while bringing countries together to work on shared challenges". (Reference: UNDP web-site at http://www.undp.org/execbrd/index.htm).

33. In the survey of RRs, over 80 % of the respondents indicated that they were not sure they could count on BDP for high-level policy advice or analytical work on programme design.

34. Several of the questions in the survey of Resident Representatives contributed to understanding the role of the policy advice. For example, 54% said that the main reason for obtaining TFF funds was to contribute to their policy work and 60% said the Poverty Practice Area was very relevant to the CO programme priorities. On the other hand, only 29% indicated that they were actively involved in the poverty practice network, compared to 41% for governance and 36% for HIV/AIDS. One interpretation of these preliminary findings could be to suggest that the poverty practice network does make some contribution to the policy work of the Country Offices, but that this is mainly through the Resident Representatives’ direct use of HQ resources, whereas the policy adviser may be used more for operational and technical support.

35. However, as a number of those interviewed commented, UNDP has always provided some upstream policy advice, evident in the many programmes and projects it has delivered over the years, and the ‘new thrust’ is not all that new.
(1) Service supply was restricted by the low number of policy specialists and the limited availability of staff (although the policy specialists were often able to broaden the supply through the use of research assistances, practice networks, rosters and other professional contacts). In the case of the Beirut SURF, a number of the policy specialists’ that had been recruited took on other assignments with the Regional Bureau and at the time of the visit, only one policy specialist remained in the SURF.

(2) Service delivery was modified to a certain extent by the professional and personal attributes of the individual policy specialists; some were more client- and service-oriented than others.

(3) Service delivery was constrained by SURF and BDP backstopping capacity. When there was only one specialist in a practice area, service delivery could be constrained and requests for services deferred or simply not responded to.

(4) The large number of countries that policy specialists must cover also meant that they could only spend a few days in each country. Consequently they could only provide rapid support and could not provide services requiring a visit of several weeks or repeated visits. The Team found that the dynamics of demand/supply were influenced by other factors, other than those implicit in the nature of policy advice discussed above.

(1) Policy advisory services were found to be in greater demand from (or supplied to) LDCs where the COs did not have much internal capacity compared with COs in middle-income countries (MICs).

(2) The COs in MICs maintained that there was a good supply of quality expertise available in their local market areas, invariably at lower cost (and this applied especially to RBLAC, RBEC and RBAS, and several countries in RBAP).36

(3) The needs from countries by practice area were seen to vary by region and country (e.g. a greater relative need for support to HIV/AIDS in RBA, or for support to governance in most regions relative to the other practice areas).

(4) In some cases there was resistance from countries to any form of policy advice from UNDP, especially in politically sensitive areas (e.g. governance or corruption) and/or in certain MICs (e.g. India, Thailand).

(5) As in the case of the Panama SURF, many of the policy specialists themselves felt that they were not qualified to provide high-level policy advice but rather were more suited to a range of technical backstopping and related services and process facilitation (as defined by the Nepal SURF model). The comment was made that it takes a long time to develop an understanding of the local situation, and to be able to render advice in the local context. Advice can only be rendered once the relationships, credibility and trust are built up. New, and relatively young policy specialists for the most part were not able to do this, but could help the CO in providing specialist or technical advice, assistance and backup.

(6) Some staff perceived the policy specialist role a tough sell in some regions and/or practice areas. In some case, COs were not receptive to policy advice, or to policy advice from someone outside of the RBx structure, or from someone based with BDP. This may be a function of perception, weak internal communication or other organizational factors.

(7) In some MICs with access to highly qualified national consultants in traditional development areas such as poverty research, there was often a certain demand for support in some of the newer ‘social’ areas, such as access to justice or community mobilization to combat urban violence. Brazil, for example, recognized its lack of experience in these areas and its interest in working with SURF. Access to justice was the only area in which SURF was providing support in Brazil.

Concern was expressed in one country visited that UNDP (and other donors) may have been involved in creating artificial capacities in government and supporting artificial priorities for development.37 For example, UNDP and the Government continued to develop economic and pro-poor poverty reduction strategies at a time when the government was broadly seen as dysfunctional, had little control or influence in the rural areas, and was in a crisis/conflict situation. The development ‘policy dialogue’ seemed, in that context, to be bound up in tired rhetoric that had little or no bearing on the current reality of the country. There was concern among staff members that UNDP was favouring a government (or officials) that thought and talked like UNDP/BDP (or said things that UNDP and donors wanted to hear), thus limiting the potential for an honest dialogue.38 Some of this was seen as a

36. As noted by BDP, this does not exclude the role of UNDP through its practice areas to guide, steer and provide intellectual leadership to such work as is done through such regional programmes as ‘Macro-economics & Poverty Reduction’, which is now starting in RBAS & RBA.

37. Even though such a finding may be anecdotal, it nonetheless points to either problems of perception and/or of delivery and should be addressed by the organization.

38. In fact, this reminded one team member of a high-level governance reform policy document developed by (or for) the government, many sections of which read like a UNDP governance document (UNDP and donor-speak), rather than a government document (government-speak).
consequence of UNDP defining, pushing and funding a global practice priority that had little relevance at the country level.

If UNDP was to be demand driven and responsive to priorities at the country level, and the country level practice priorities were not in all cases consistent with UNDP global practice priorities, this should be reflected not only in the CCF but also in any GCF initiative at the country level, including the recruitment and deployment of policy advice and support services.

### 3.3 KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND NETWORKING

**Overview.** From a design standpoint, the knowledge-based components of the GCF-II might be seen as a separate dimension in the multi-dimensional matrix of the GCF design. Knowledge sharing and networking are certainly not new to UNDP as these have been practiced in one form or another for as long as the organization has existed. The advent and expansion of information technologies gave great impetus to information sharing and management - as it has to most organizations. GCF-II has capitalized on UNDP’s expanding information management base by promoting the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-based and knowledge sharing organization. The Team sees this simply as another step in the organizational and management evolution of UNDP common to most information or knowledge-based organizations.

There is no thematic/practice area in UNDP or defined by the GCF-II that addresses the knowledge-related objectives of the GCF-II, despite the fact that four directorate projects were classed as 'knowledge' (as presented earlier in Table 2.1). Rather, GCF-II funded knowledge-related initiatives for the most part fund the policy specialists and SURFs, and these are grouped and managed by a sub-unit under the BDP ‘Directorate’. A total of four knowledge-related projects have been funded under the GCF-II, all of which are funded by core funds and executed directly by BDP: (1) Improving the delivery of knowledge-based management ($1 million); (2) Knowledge-sharing MDGs ($4 million); (3) Policy expert on extended retainer, or PEER, ($2.14 million); and (4) Global policy support services ($51.3 million). The last project is, of course, the funding mechanism for the 75 policy specialists and this is discussed in Section 3.2.

**Key Findings.** The Team found that various measures applied by GCF-II have contributed to the goal of transforming UNDP into a knowledge-based and knowledge sharing organization. The implementation and management of the practice networks as an institutional means to this end was perhaps the most significant of these. These networks were considered a good practice and are discussed separately in Section 5. Other GCF-II-funded achievements in promoting knowledge networking and sharing were found at the field level (the SURFs) and could also be seen as good practices. Some of these practices linked knowledge sharing with incentives. The following examples demonstrate the diversity of knowledge and how it could be networked and shared.

- **Mutual Support Initiative (MSI).** The MSI was piloted by the Bangkok SURF in late-2000 and other SURFs have since advanced the initiative. The Travel Cost Equalization Scheme was also piloted by the Bangkok SURF. The approach was to systematize the sharing of staff (and their knowledge and capacities) across COs and it was linked to the practice development and networking strategy of the GCF. An important dimension of change sought by this practice was a change in culture and attitude of both management and staff. Some SURFs have

---

39. It is further stated that as part of the transformation goal of UNDP, the GCF-II is to promote a ‘… state-of-the-art knowledge network by moving UNDP policy support capacity out of headquarters to the sub-regional level to ensure that the best available advice can be given when and where it is most needed - at the country level.’ (paragraph 1(c)). Further references to knowledge networking and knowledge sharing are contained in paragraphs 1(c), 11, 17 and 36. The GCF-II document does not use the term ‘knowledge management’.

40. The Team has limited its review of the knowledge-related services area (or ‘knowledge management’ - KM) because: UNDP is currently in the process of developing implementation strategies for KM, and the Evaluation Office has planned an evaluation of KM later in 2004. Three topics are covered in this sub-section: (1) findings on selected GCF-II supported knowledge networking and sharing initiatives; (2) perceptions on knowledge management; and (3) a commentary on the emerging UNDP KM strategy and potential impacts on future GCF directions.

41. There are numerous other initiatives in UNDP that promote the knowledge-related organizational transformation, but are not funded by GCF-II and not obviously linked or integrated with the GCF. These include the design and maintenance of the many web sites, training, the UNDP ICT network, document repositories, production and codification of knowledge products, change in organizational culture (e.g. practice groups, teams), and so on.
developed a skills database of CO staff through the competency mapping process. As an incentive, the SURF pays 50% of the mission cost (up to a maximum of $1,000) and the supplying CO pays the other 50% of mission costs. In the case of the RBAP SURF’s, once people learn, the MSI will evolve from 'learning missions' to 'consulting missions' where staff provide technical assistance and the receiving CO has to pay for it through the travel cost equalization scheme.42

- **Personnel/Staff Competency Mapping.** This initiative has taken on a local dimension, and has been carried out in collaboration between the Beirut and the Kathmandu SURFs. The initiative identified the competencies of UNDP CO staff, who would then be selected to support missions and other policy service initiatives. This was a case of documenting and managing information on who has specific knowledge and skills and where they are located.

- **Local Expert Rosters.** CVs were maintained on most of the SURFs Rosters of Experts, which in turn were linked to a corporate or global roster maintained by BDP. Experts were divided into practice and thematic areas. The Theme Groups were at times contacted as a mail group or list-serve in order to inquire about the location and availability of expertise, if it could be found through a direct search on the roster. The Beirut SURF has a roster of about 500 experts, most with Arabic language skills. Another example of a good local roster model was the Caribbean SURF located in Trinidad and Tobago.

- **Knowledge Maps.** Some of the SURFs have developed what are referred to as 'knowledge maps'. For example, the 'Access to Justice' practice development joint initiative of the Kathmandu and Bangkok SURFs has produced such a map, and maps have been developed for environment and gender. These are simply one-page graphics that identify the main sources of information on a particular practice or thematic area. Other SURFs including the Beirut SURF have followed suit and begun to map knowledge in specific areas in this way.

**Perceptions of Knowledge Management (KM).** The Team found a high degree of receptivity and support to the GCF-II objectives to strengthen UNDP as a knowledge-based and knowledge-networked organization. However, the vast majority of those interviewed at both the field and HQ levels (as well as outsiders) had a great deal of difficulty with the term knowledge management due to widely differing interpretations. Most of those consulted (including some of the major players in HQ) felt that knowledge simply could not be managed and that UNDP should not purport to do so.

Several objections to KM were prompted by perceived implementation implications of KM as a concept that was not well defined or understood - that KM was a risky and uncertain track for UNDP. First, KM would set UNDP on yet another track with an unknown target of change. Second, the notion of UNDP as 'knowledge manager' could generate the appearance of UNDP or donor arrogance (i.e. "we have the knowledge, and with our knowledge, we can support development"). The fact that most of the useful knowledge in many fields is possessed by other organizations means that UNDP would more likely be an a conduit for knowledge from all sources, rather than transferring its own expertise. The Team heard from a number of sources that UNDP was not very good at looking outside and learning from others. Third, the notion of UNDP as 'knowledge manager' would diminish the view that most development knowledge was not within UNDP, but rather that such knowledge was within programme countries themselves and many other organizations. Fourth, the notion that massive amounts of knowledge and information could be distilled by UNDP into small bits of policy advice that could then be used by a CO as entry points into governments was considered unworkable.43

Another concern raised during the interviews was that KM did not appear to have much direct relevance to poverty reduction or to the poor. The main users or clients of KM were seen to be UNDP staff, other development agencies and governments, and perhaps some global institutions - but not the poor themselves. Most staff perceived that knowledge exists mostly in the soft skills of people, and in

42. The concern was expressed that it is nice to go on missions and collect the DSA. In theory the beneficiaries of the missions can learn - it is a motivational tool, but it is hard to measure any impact. The MSI missions would also. There is a need also clear TORs and outputs, lest they become internal study tours and junkets.

43. It is interesting to note that the UNDP review of the SURF system in 2000 developed a strategy for knowledge management and might in fact be seen as the genesis for KM in UNDP. In that report, knowledge is defined as "understanding gained from experience" and presents one definition of KM as "...the management of knowledge processes of knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, and the transfer/integration of validated knowledge throughout the rest of the organization". (page 6). This definition is not seen particularly helpful - perhaps the term being defined is 'knowledge management systems' or 'knowledge management processes'. See: Weidner, D. and Rahman, S., Review of Surf System: Way Forward for Knowledge Management in UNDP, Report Prepared for Evaluation Office, UNDP New York, July 2000.
the way of working (culture), of sharing information, of collaborating. Few saw the UNDP knowledge-based organization as one focusing on the production, dissemination or sharing of codified products.

Setting semantics aside, GCFII and other UNDP initiatives in strengthening UNDP as a knowledge-based and knowledge-networked organization were well received. Many felt that the emphasis should be on the sharing of information and enabling access to it, from all sources and all people. Further, there was a need for a strong link between the knowledge-related initiatives and UNDP’s human development role. Some were concerned that knowledge-related initiatives -- as a means to an end -- would become a self-serving end in itself, i.e. a technocratic tail wagging the dog. Many of those interviewed do not expect knowledge-based initiatives to be a panacea for lightening workloads, and in fact some were concerned that these initiatives would add to workloads (e.g. the e-mail burden of the practice networks). Various SURF Teams are currently working with the HQ units to define, in a practical sense, what KM might mean at the local level, and to demystify the concept.

UNDP has been in a continuous process of business transformation and organizational change in the past few years. The findings of this evaluation suggest that the main challenge for UNDP currently might be an organizational one - how to continue and sustain the changes that are being made. While knowledge networking or knowledge management in the broader sense could be used as an organizational transformation tool, the organization itself must change in order to realize the benefits of the transformation. Many felt that identifying and documenting good and innovative practices and other lessons sounded easy in principle, but in practice it was quite another matter.

**Commentary on UNDP’s KM Strategy.** Much has been written recently on the evolution of strategies for knowledge management in UNDP. The most recent document is the KM 'roadmap' that outlines a strategy for implementing the KM concept within UNDP. The document and its supporting annexes describe in detail how the KM concept is to be implemented. The Team was unable to find a definition of the KM concept itself - what it means -- or what specific needs were to be met by the strategy. Perhaps the meaning of KM is self-evident, but not to the Team. Mention was made of a knowledge management function, the core purpose of which is to "...equip staff members with an arsenal of reusable knowledge, lessons learnt and tested methods that they can apply when serving clients."

The proponents of the KM concept point to the examples of the World Bank and large global consultancy firms. Traditionally, these role models started from the assumption that they collect and own knowledge that their clients need to buy from them for their own advancement. As a public-sector development organization, the World Bank is close enough to offer comparable experience: in 1996, when announcing the knowledge bank concept, it committed itself "... to develop a world-class knowledge management system and to improve and expand the sharing of development knowledge with clients and partners". In the following six years, over $280 million was reportedly spent by the World Bank on these activities. Though the recent World Bank evaluation study considers the KM initiative timely, appropriate and to a great extent successful, (e.g. by enabling faster access to Bank knowledge and expertise), it also notes weak links to Bank operations and inadequate oversight: "As a result, the strategic intent of making knowledge sharing a way of doing business has been only partly realized."

The experiences of other development agencies suggest that UNDP will need to carefully study the lessons they of its counterparts. There is a danger of being seduced by hype and promise of knowledge management without understanding the implementation and organizational ramifications, the
impact on UNDP’s relationships with programme countries and other development partners. What is needed is a corporate culture of learning, including the lessons from analytical work, networks of learning and sharing the experience of capacity building efforts in programme countries.

### 3.4 Conclusion

The following conclusions can be made about GCF-II’s contributions to UNDP’s role in global advocacy for human development and to transforming the organization into a globally networked and knowledge-based learning organization:

First, GCF-II was found to have supported global advocacy and research through the development of the HDR, the carrying out of development studies such as those on global public goods and trade, and through the production of a number of publications, policy notes and reports across all of the practice and cross-cutting areas. The production of the HDR and the reports on trade and global public goods in particular were seen as reaffirming UNDP’s role as a global leader in development thinking. However, UNDP has failed to internalize key advocacy instruments and to build the added value of products into its own internal programming and operational dynamics. The question of impact and ‘leadership’ of other advocacy and research carried out by BDP through GCF-II remains open.

Second, GCF-II has contributed marginally to the integration of global advocacy and research with country-level practice. Neither the SURFs nor the COs that were visited appeared to have integrated much of the aforementioned advocacy/research work into their country programmes. Most of those consulted at the field level did not feel that country level issues were adequately factored into global thinking. The two-way flow of information, consultation and participation was seen as sub-optimal. Further, some COs did not have appropriate tools or facilities to pursue local advocacy issues of a global nature (e.g. corruption) that were considered politically sensitive at the local level.

Third, GCF-II has contributed to the transformation of UNDP as a globally networked and knowledge-based organization through the decentralization of policy support capacity, through the building and maintenance of the communities of practice and through the practice networks. It is in this area that most of the core global resources have been allocated - i.e. the out-posted policy specialists and related support to the SURFs. The greatest impact of these services has been felt at the country office level, where internal capacities have been expanded, and where the COs have improved the quality and quantity of their programming.

Fourth, GCF-II’s contribution to the area of policy advice was mixed. The role of the policy specialists as policy advisers has not been measurably effective, nor is there much demand from the COs or programme countries for such services. Rather, greater value of the policy specialists is generated through their delivery of a range of technical and specialized services and support to activities that are seen as inputs to policy development and policy implementation. The out-posting of policy specialist resources is a positive move in backstopping and enhancing the capacities of the COs and in strengthening the community of learning.

48. The Team was informed that UNDP staff has visited the WB to study its approach to knowledge sharing or knowledge management, and that a case study was prepared as a result of those visits.
GCF-II resources have been allocated to four practice areas (poverty, energy & environment, democratic governance and HIV/AIDS) and three cross-cutting areas (gender, information and communications technology for development, and capacity development). The Team's findings in each of these areas are presented in the following sections, with relatively more emphasis given to the poverty and gender areas. As capacity development is a recently introduced area, only a brief description of it is provided in Annex F. The reader is referred to Annex F for relevant descriptive information, plus metrics or quantitative information on human resources, budgeting and funding.

4.1 POVERTY REDUCTION

Overview. GCF-II responds directly to the United Nations Millennium Declaration commitment to halve the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015 and reaffirms the role of UNDP as a global leader to achieve this end.49 UNDP considers poverty reduction as its central goal, and has used a multi-pronged approach to deal with the diverse dimensions of human poverty, while introducing an operational focus on upstream policy advice and building its institutional capacity to provide these services. Given the relatively low level of GCF-II resources UNDP is able to commit to the poverty reduction area, it has been suggested that attention must be given to ‘contribution’ rather than ‘attribution’: that is, UNDP’s role and performance in the policy domain, in raising issues that would not otherwise be raised, and through other means that advance the human development agenda in poverty reduction.

As of November 2003, the Poverty Group (PG) had 16 poverty advisers and one vacant position funded under GLO/01/001 (Table 4.1). Five poverty specialists were located in New York and the others were out-posted to the SURFs. In addition, five gender and development advisers were also working within the PG, (one in New York and four in the field).

During 2001-3 the Poverty Practice Area had a total budget50 of $24,558,765 of which $6,515,693 was core funding, $3,722,607 cost sharing, and $14,320,465 from Trust

---


50. GCF-II budget information is taken from the Budget for the Second GCF 2001-2003 provided in the Briefing Book prepared for the Team by the Evaluation Office. However, these figures are often inconsistent with information provided by BDP staff, suggesting there may have been significant modifications in the budget as the programme progressed.
In addition, more than 20 policy advisers are funded under GLO/01/001.

Global Projects: The Poverty Practice Area obtained $7.3 million in funding from 11 Global Projects (see Table 4.2). These permitted the PG to conduct research, prepare publications and support conferences, workshops and other networking activities in the areas of globalization, trade, gender, support to poverty reduction, social development and micro-finance.

Thematic Trust Funds: In 2002 a total of $11,124,195 of TTF financing was approved for four service lines (Table 4.3). This enabled the PG to support a total of 73 activities in the four service lines given in the table. The funds were allocated among the regions as follows: Africa: 39.2%, Arab States: 7.6%, Asia and the Pacific: 19.6%, Latin America and the Caribbean: 11.7%, Europe and the CIS: 11.7%, with the remaining 10.2% allocated to global projects. The two main donors were the Netherlands ($7.1 million) and Germany ($3.4 million).

Major Findings: There is usually a high demand for SURF services in the area of poverty reduction and MDGs, and much of it is in the previously mentioned areas that are emerging as UNDP's niche market. While advisory services provided by the SURF specialists were often observed to be in the area of technical backstopping or project formulation, the Poverty Practice Group cited many examples where the main areas of demand from country offices concern macroeconomic policies, trade policies, employment policies and budget formulation. The PRSP process also generated a demand for SURF services, although in many cases the demand would be limited by the fact that the donors, e.g. World Bank, or in some cases Governments, often preferred to identify their own consultants.

The demand for SURF services in the field of macroeconomics and poverty varied according to the characteristics of each country and to the nature of participation of major donor agencies. The services required in very poor countries were quite different from the kinds of support required in middle-income countries. In the area of poverty and social development, the picture was mixed, with a range of ad hoc activities being undertaken in response to requests from country offices in less developed countries (LDCs) and middle-income countries. The Team was informed that by the Poverty Practice Group that the GCF-supported initiatives are now producing material in areas such as the social dimensions of poverty reduction, trade and export strategies for small countries (the Djibouti model), gender budgeting, and mainstreaming gender in poverty reduction, which increased demand for UNDP services in poverty reduction programmes in middle-income as well as poorer countries. The Team was given a number of specific examples of donor and government interest in these studies and publications, but no BDP evaluation reports were available on the

---

**Table 4.2 FUNDING FROM GLOBAL PROJECTS FOR THE POVERTY PROGRAMME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/615</td>
<td>Globalization, Liberalization and SHD</td>
<td>309,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/00/516</td>
<td>Trade and SHD</td>
<td>579,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/318</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>862,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/319</td>
<td>Investing in Women: Linking FFD with WSSD*</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/615</td>
<td>Globalization, Liberalization and SHD</td>
<td>1,179,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/007</td>
<td>Integrated Framework – Djibouti*</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/515</td>
<td>Global Poverty Centre (Rio Centre)</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/518</td>
<td>Support to Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>324,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/703</td>
<td>Policy Dialogue and Social Development*</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/513</td>
<td>Policy Advice for Economic Alternatives</td>
<td>485,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/517</td>
<td>Improving the Quality for UNDP Micro-finance Programmes</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,320,010</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Separate reports have been prepared on each of these 3 GLOs (see Section 4.3.2)

**Table 4.3 THEMATIC TRUST FUND SUPPORT FOR POVERTY BY SERVICE LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1: Benchmarking and Monitoring Poverty</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7,571,957</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2: Participatory Processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>560,200</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3: Pro-Poor Policies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,027,618</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4: Piloting and Innovation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>964,420</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,124,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Poverty Thematic Trust Fund Report March 2003

---

52. These figures, taken from the list of GLO projects provided by the Evaluation Office
There is strong evidence to indicate that the MDGs are emerging as the UNDP’s niche market. In many regions, the MDGs and the preparation of national MDG reports have become one of UNDP’s signature products. MDG monitoring and reporting were considered by many to be perhaps BDP’s single most important contribution over the period under consideration. The Poverty Practice Group provided leadership, took charge of UN inter-agency coordination and established and managed the MDG-Net. Over 70 country reports have been issued to date, together with five regional reports. This Practice Group has also set up a project with other United Nations Development Group (UNDG) members for statistical literacy at country level, using DevInfo. The development and launch of the Arab MDG report was considered to be an example of a good collaborative effort between BDP and the regional programme and an effective use of the Poverty Practice Area TTF. The SURFs have also provided support to national MDG programmes in Latin America, Africa, the Caribbean and Asia. During the country visits, the Team was able to confirm the high level of interest in UNDP support on the design and implementation of MDG programmes at the national and local levels.

The SURFs were found to be very supportive of the Regional Bureaus and the COs in the preparation and promotion of the regional HDR and NHDR. However, in at least one country (Panama), the national MDG and HDR reports were published more or less at the same time, and there was some confusion between the two, due to some overlapping coverage.

The SURFs have also participated in two regional research programmes in Asia and the Arab states that highlighted practical policy options and institutional means to foster pro-poor stabilization and growth. In Cambodia, the study led national authorities to insist that the World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) include UNDP in the ongoing mission on fiscal policy - a traditional domain of international financing institutions (IFIs). An important question now is the extent to which the findings of these studies can influence the global debate and even complement or broaden the assumptions of World Bank models.

In Latin America, the Team was informed by the CO and SURF staff that the demand for SURF policy advisers was limited by the fact that the cost to the CO of contracting SURF policy advisers is approximately twice the market rate for equally well-qualified national consultants. Countries such as Brazil were of the opinion that SURF staff could not compete with the professional qualifications of internationally recognized Brazilian economists.

There is a supply-side constraint in terms of the availability of specialists to respond to the needs of about 15 countries covered by each SURF, especially in view of the increasingly specialized nature of the demand from country offices. COs stated that what they needed was more assistance with innovative poverty reduction project development and in building up a pipeline of projects with the participation of SURF specialists and knowledge of best practices in other countries. In some instances, a substantive contribution was made to developing project documents. However, more attention seemed to have been paid by BDP, in general, to developing the concepts and theoretical basis for projects rather than the projects themselves. In some cases, this was due to a deliberate decision taken by the SURFs to provide technical backstopping, but...
not substantive assistance. Areas in which important innovative work was found included pro-poor economic policies, trade policies, fiscal policies and economic policy.

Country offices confirmed that the SURFs generally provided good links to publications and resource persons; this service was provided in many SURFs by research assistants. There was a preference for accessing the SURF for referrals rather than the practice networks because the candidates on their roster knew the region and the languages required. Responses to such requests were very few from the networks. The networks were considered useful for sharing experiences and obtaining comments on papers and so on.55

During country visits, and meetings in New York, the Team discussed the UNDP poverty practice area with SURF advisers, UNDP CO staff, government agencies, donors and civil society. There was considerable discussion on the role UNDP could or should play in this area. While some thought that UNDP should develop alternative approaches to development assistance to demonstrate how social and equity concerns and poverty reduction could be integrated into economic growth models, others felt that UNDP did not have the resources to become involved in macroeconomic modeling. On the other end, many believed that UNDP should accept a much more modest role consistent with its limited resources, and capitalize on its areas of comparative advantage, e.g. providing space for civil society, developing linkages between macro policies and micro-level interventions, using MDGs as a focusing principle in poverty reduction activities, etc. UNDP and various donor agencies57 observed that one of UNDP's comparative advantages resulted from its detailed knowledge of the local and national political context and its highly practical approach to project design and implementation. For example: UNDP can give voice to a wider range of stakeholders, including poor and vulnerable groups, thus ensuring that the poverty programmes respond to the needs and priorities of the poor.58 UNDP has the capacity to work with municipalities and other local agencies to put in place effective structures for the implementation of poverty reduction programmes. Although the comment was made that UNDP has the country presence, but not necessarily the capacity to help implement poverty reduction programmes, a significant number of examples were found where UNDP was successful.59

Key Findings. As in other practice areas, BDP's Poverty Group was able to provide many examples of the demand for publications and the high level of interest in conferences, workshops and training. They were also able to suggest many cases in which they believed that government or donor policy and planning had been positively influenced by the GCF products. However, as in other practice areas there was an important distinction between identifying the contribution that a GCF product made to policy dialogue or future programme design and attributing the extent of a product's impact on observed policy changes or programme design. For example, the World Bank now pays more attention to many of the social dimensions of poverty addressed in BDP publications, and although there is convincing evidence that UNDP workshops, publications and ongoing interactions with programme countries and donor agencies have contributed to this policy dialogue, the Team did not find any evidence establishing that the increased attention was directly due in part to GCF activities and publications as such.

While it is rarely possible to conduct a rigorous attribution analysis, and certainly not within the framework of the current evaluation, it is still important to evaluate the significance of GCF-II's contribution on important policy issues. Which of the Poverty Group's products have had an important influence and which were the ones whose influence was marginal? The degree of influence of different products is an important factor in determining which product lines should continue and which should be revised or perhaps terminated. In the opinion of the Team, all of the

55. At the time of the field visit to Brazil in January 2004, the International Poverty Centre in Brasilia was still being established and the Director had just been appointed, so it was too early to make a judgment on the Centre's potential contribution to GCF policy work on poverty.
56. The term poverty reduction, rather than poverty alleviation, is used to be consistent with UNDP usage.
57. For example, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.
58. Based on a review of reports and a meeting with the Task Manager, it would seem that the Policy Dialogue and Social Development Programme of the Poverty Group has had some success in working with donors such as the World Bank to involve poor and vulnerable groups in the PRSP process (e.g. Cambodia, Vietnam, Ghana and Zambia). See also next footnote for a description of the "City Consultation" methodology developed in the Urban Management Programme.
59. The Urban Management Programme appears to have had some success in doing this in at least some of the 40 cities where a participatory action plan has evolved from the City Consultations (e.g. Tunis, Colombo and Johannesburg). Several donors confirmed that UNDP had been effective in this area, for example in Southern Africa.

“The global campaign against poverty needs reinforcement and a more focused and effective strategy.”
Mark Malloch Brown, 2000
practice areas could have made more effort to systematically document and assess their potential contributions.

Despite widespread efforts to disseminate the findings and recommendations of these global studies, Policy Advisers reported that most of their requests from Country Offices continued to be for operational support and technical backstopping and the existence of BDP policy-related publications did not appear to have increased demand for more support in areas that could be considered policy analysis. While the lines between operational support and technical backstopping on the one hand, and policy advice on the other, were often not clear, and the former two could often produce a gradual transition to the latter; the Team is of the opinion that traditional forms of policy advice represent a relatively small part of the activity of most policy advisers in the poverty practice area.

Several questions in the survey of Resident Representatives contributed to an understanding of the role of the policy advice. For example, 54% said that the main reason for obtaining TTF funds was to contribute to their policy work, and 60% said the Poverty Practice Area was very relevant to the CO programme priorities. On the other hand, only 29% indicated that they were actively involved in the poverty practice network, compared to 41% for governance and 36% for HIV/AIDS. One interpretation of these preliminary findings is that the poverty practice network does make some contribution to the policy work of Country Offices, but that this is achieved mainly through the Resident Representatives' direct use of HQ resources, whereas policy advisers may be used more for operational and technical support. However, the responses could also be interpreted to show the potential demand for policy advice.

At the same time, a number of constraints on the use of poverty and MDG practice networks were identified. First, for many country office project officers responsible for poverty reduction, this may be one of 10 or more areas for which they were responsible. Consequently, country office staff simply did not have time to participate in the network discussions. Second, there were frequent complaints that there was too much material on the networks, not all of it of very high quality. Consequently, there was a frequently heard request for SURFs to provide a filter or to produce summaries of the discussions (the latter is now often done). A third major issue was the question of language. Network communications normally had to be in English but many UNDP staff did not feel sufficiently fluent or comfortable communicating in English.

The vertical links between global, sub-regional and country levels have been established through the practice networks and the operations of the SURFs, but the flow of knowledge (and other incentives) seemed to be insufficient to bring about the transformation in attitudes and practices required for UNDP to do frontline work at the policy level. Some capacity building was taking place at the country office level through these mechanisms, but it was not the translation of cutting-edge global thinking into operational terms. Based on the Team's meetings in the different countries, it seemed that even concepts like 'global public goods' and those in the HDRs, which were developed within UNDP, have not been fully integrated in the operations of the organization. Neither was there sufficient upward flow of experience on the dimensions/successes/failures of poverty reduction activities, to enable BDP to effectively participate in the global dialogue. However, the Poverty Practice Team identified a number of examples where they believed that GCF-II outputs in this domain have had an important influence. For example, when the Secretary General's office prepares the annual report on Implementation of the Millennium Declaration and when IMF/WB staff prepare the Global Monitoring Report for their Development Committee, they both invite BDP comments and inputs. There were also a number of global and regional events where Poverty Practice Group members were invited as keynote speakers.

While some UNDP staff interviewed in the field felt that UNDP was at a considerable disadvantage vis-à-vis the large donor agencies, others felt that having limited resources is not always a handicap. Out of necessity, smaller organizations tend to be more innovative and learn to think outside the box. UNDP emphasizes the multi-dimensional perspective of human poverty, and the importance of equity, the role of the public sector, etc. The goal is not to win the argument but to ensure that a genuine debate on policy alternatives takes place at the national level before important decisions are made on economic and social policies. The goal is to open the policy space for key stakeholders to express their views, and promote diversity of analysis and plurality of views on relevant and credible pro-poor policy choices. UNDP's comparative advantage in the area of pro-poor policies is in its ability to stimulate national dialogue that fosters national ownership.

In all of the countries visited, the Team found that there was a high level of trust in UNDP because of its impartiality and willingness to understand and

---

60. The Team was informed by BDP that the 2003 Global Staff Survey does not corroborate this.
represent the interests of government and civil society. Consequently, UNDP was able to play a vital role in drawing a wide range of actors in policy dialogue and programme implementation. UNDP was also seen by many donors as having an in-depth understanding of the national and local political and cultural realities and an ability to adapt policies and programmes to these realities. This was highly valued by development partners, and this asset became increasingly important in countries moving towards decentralization and participatory planning.

On the other hand, meetings with some of its partners suggested that UNDP was often seen as having less comparative advantage in macroeconomic policies and macroeconomic research, and some did not see a major role for UNDP at the macroeconomic policy level. The Team acknowledges that the sample was relatively small, and not necessarily representative so this may not be a generally held view.

The evaluation of UNDP's role in the PRSP process, illustrates current thinking on the above issues. The evaluation recommends that UNDP should play a more substantial and substantive role in the PRSP process. The recommended roles combine UNDP's role in the UN Resident Coordinator system, promoting wider participation and giving voice to poor and vulnerable groups, and capacity building support for analytically sound macroeconomic and other policies. The focus is on promoting 'home-grown' pro-poor policies. This report does not advocate UNDP becoming involved in macroeconomic research but suggests that UNDP has an important role in working with a wide range of national partners to ensure conventional macroeconomic policies are adapted to the country context and the needs of the poor. PRSP and the MDGs are clearly critical future areas for UNDP's poverty reduction work. The Team did not have many opportunities to discuss PRSPs and MDGs in the field, but a recent reading of UNDP publications and meeting with HQ staff indicate that this is an area in which considerable progress has been made - and this is an area where many opportunities exist.

The point was often made that the MDGs potentially provide a broader framework for identifying intersectoral linkages and overcoming some of the sector-specific approaches of many PRSPs. An important contribution could be a framework for estimating the cost and length of time in achieving different development goals; this could, in turn, become an important tool for preparation of the PRSP. Other issues that need to be addressed include: the absorptive capacity of countries, implications for economic policies, for employment generation, budget expenditures, and tax policies? Will additional donor resources, for example, ruin the macroeconomic framework, by causing high inflation? In countries that have been relatively successful in reaching MDG targets (e.g. Sri Lanka), the increasing marginal costs of further reducing infant or maternal mortality, for instance, has become an issue.

**Note on the International Poverty Centre in Brasilia**

The International Poverty Center in Brasilia was created in August 2002 under GLO/02/515 "Establishment of UNDP Global Thematic Facility for Poverty Reduction". The center was planned as a partnership with support from the Government of Brazil and IPEA (The Institute of Applied Economic Research) to develop twinning arrangements with institutions for joint training and capacity development and hosting resident fellows and researchers from developing countries. One of the goals will be to use regional programmes as vehicles to translate general approaches to particular country contexts.

One of the challenges for the Centre, which has relatively modest budget and human resources, will be to decide on how it can make an impact in a field where an enormous amount of research has been conducted and where there are many extremely well-qualified specialists. Many in UNDP hope the Centre will develop a high-profile approach to pro-poor economic growth that would eventually have the same prestige as the Human Development Report. This would complement (or in some areas challenge) the conventional economic growth models, and would provide the intellectual and macroeconomic underpinning for countries seeking to convince donors to support more socially- and equity-oriented growth strategies. However, many, inside and outside UNDP feel that UNDP must recognize its resource limitations and identify a number of niches where it can use its comparative advantages to make a meaningful contribution.

A second challenge for the Centre is to decide how to position itself with respect to the opportunities provided by its location in Brazil. There is a potential danger that the Centre could find itself devoting a high proportion of its time and resources to working with its Brazilian counterparts on sophisticated, challenging and cutting-edge research on poverty in Brazil. While such work could garner prestige in academic circles, it could run
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the risk of rapidly isolating the Centre from poverty researchers in Africa and Asia, for example, who are focused on much more basic issues of human survival - and working with very limited data and resources. Using its resources to contribute to the poverty research needs of multiple regions, including different development concerns and research capabilities, will be a daunting challenge for the Centre.

4.2 ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

Overview. The aim of UNDP in the Energy and Environment (E&E) practice area is to support countries and develop partnerships in promoting sustainable development as agreed at the Earth Summit (1992) and re-affirmed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) a decade later. Efforts to conserve and renew natural resources and energy through sustainable consumption and production initiatives are linked to the attainment of the MDG targets, especially 1 and 7. EEG support therefore is targeted to help reduce poverty and to ensure environmental sustainability.

UNDP has supported the development of environment and energy strategies through policy initiatives since the implementation of Agenda 21 began in 1993. In particular, its leadership on Capacity 21 efforts placed the first Sustainable Development Advisers (SDAs) in COs to provide technical backstopping and policy guidance. Formerly under the EEG, BDP has now created a separate Capacity 2015 unit in order to address general capacity development policy. UNDP, as implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Multilateral Fund (for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol), has played a major role in developing countries seeking to address greenhouse gas emissions and climate change options and the transfer of ozone-friendly technologies.

From 1992 through 2000, over $1 billion in GEF, MLF and non-core funding was generated to support a wide variety of GEF and Montreal Protocol activities that clearly fuelled UNDP participation in the environment sector. EEG's niche within the 2001 re-organization of BDP towards upstream policy support services rested on the need to catalyze policy frameworks, capacity building and other development considerations that could not be funded under strict GEF financial guidelines.

The EEG practice area was extensively restructured in 2002 to combine energy and environment components. A practice manager was introduced to provide oversight of the process. Seven field and three HQs policy specialist posts were established. A year-long recruitment process resulted in numerous delays to the start up of program activities. A prolonged two-year conflict between BDP and UNOPS over an administrative fee structure for GLO/01/001 [Policy Support Services] also led to delays in implementation.

Impact. Over the GCF-II funding period, EEG activities have influenced the international energy and environment policy agendas in all of UNDP’s major sub-practice areas of Water, Energy, Land and Biodiversity. EEG has demonstrated leadership in a variety of GEF and Montreal Protocol activities that support UNDP’s commitment to the Millennium Development Goals. For example, EEG policy advisers co-authored the Secretary General’s WEHAB (Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity) ‘frameworks for action’ which shaped the issues and outcomes of the WSSD political deliberations. EEG advisers also actively participate in four UN Millennium Project Task Forces on Hunger, Gender, Environment and Water and Sanitation and have been successful in ensuring that UNDP’s country experience informs these global MDG strategies.

In the area of energy, UNDP-led advocacy and dialogue processes, using its flagship publication, the World Energy Assessment, before and during WSSD, have made a significant contribution to achieving political consensus at CSD-9 (2001) and WSSD on the importance of energy services for poverty reduction and meeting the MDGs. Since WSSD the Energy sub-practice has continued to impact the international agenda through its active role in several important energy information dissemination networks, partnerships, publications and project activities. In particular, the Global Village Energy Partnership and the LPG Challenge, and supporting publications, have contributed to rural energy and gender/energy policy frameworks. UNDP’s role in the inter-agency publication "Poverty and Climate Change: Reducing Vulnerability of the Poor through Adaptation" strengthened awareness of links between poverty and climate change in developing countries.

While EEG’s sub-practice areas have shown significant leadership in tackling post-WSSD policy and advocacy challenges, country level policy work could benefit more from this global level leadership. There have been a range of activities implemented over the period to disseminate policy outcomes to COs and SURFS, through workshops and advisory discussions, but in future more resources and attention need to be given to
actively engaging country level staff and influencing national policy positions.

**Results in Knowledge Networking and Products:**
During the GCF-II funding period EEG has been successful in producing and disseminating a wide range of knowledge management products. Over the period the group has produced 15 major publications, 9 policy position papers, 58 case studies and established and maintained 5 websites. EEG uses its networks effectively to distribute information to a broader audience and has convened several major conferences and workshops over the period to ensure relevant stakeholders are kept abreast of the work of the sub-practices and to provide an effective forum for further discussion and analysis of the knowledge products.

To ensure that the results of EEG's growing knowledge management activities fully benefit country office staff and other constituents, efforts should be taken to further solicit and incorporate their feedback into program design and delivery.

The Energy and Environment Practice Network now consists of 700 members. Likewise, the Effective Water Governance group has established effective regional networks in 12 regions and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Network has engaged a broad range of international organizations and private sector partners.

**Partnerships and Resource Leveraging:** During the GCF funding period EEG has been successful in establishing a range of important global partnerships and leveraging significant additional funds for programme activities. EEG has been able to use the $4.6 million from the Energy and Environment Global Programmes to leverage an additional $70 million in funding from donors, foundations, NGOs and the private sector. This leveraging ratio of more than $15 for every $1 of GCF-II funding should be viewed as an effective outcome - the highest among all of UNDP's practice areas. These additional funds should play an important role in delivering a wide range of effective project outcomes over the next few years.

**Key Findings.** Most energy and environment global programmes activities got under way during 2002 but have yielded some significant outputs by mid 2004. In global environmental fora, UNDP appears to have played a pro-active role that has generated positive support, for example, as a leader in key partnerships such as the Community Water Initiative, Poverty-Environment Initiative, the Equator Initiative Global Village Energy Partnership, Liquid Petroleum Gas, and partner in the World Resources Report, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and Cap-Net and as co-partner with the WB in the ESMAP. UNDP's neutrality and flexibility of governance arrangements was reported to have led to greater credibility in the ESMAP programme. UNDP participation on the technical secretariat and standing committee as well as establishment of a coordination mechanism to avoid duplication has prompted donors to give more resources to the general programme. There were two interesting initiatives in the Caribbean and LAC as well. The Debt for Nature swap programmes appeared to be going well in the Caribbean (Guyana among others) and were also reported to have leveraged resources. The Virtual Environment Fair in Costa Rica created a lot of interest and helped develop several follow-up agreements between different countries. It has also proved an interesting strategy to locate the environmental team in Costa Rica rather than in Panama as Costa Rica is recognized as a continental leader in eco-tourism and other environmental matters.

During the Team's visits, mention was made by one or two COs that EEG was able to deliver global experiences in the sector in real time through HQs staff participation at global and regional conferences and meetings. The Global Survey of HQs Goods & Services also showed high volume in utilizing the 700 person EEG network.

In assessing opportunities and challenges for the EEG in the future, note should be made of a leading bilateral partner's comments concerning UNDP potential in the sector. A DFID/UK environment program respondent informed the Team that over the past 3-4 years, UNDP research publications have improved considerably as has collaboration with other partners. At the global level, UNDP is seen as playing a leading role in the preparation of the World Resources Report and its Disaster Management paper. The World Energy Assessment, established by UNDP in collaboration with UNDESA and the World Energy Council, is regarded as the single most authoritative resource on energy for sustainable development. Its lead on the Poverty-Environment Partnership (PEP) was also cited as a positive contribution.

Regionally, UNDP's advisory capacity was reported as being helpful in various fora and especially in supporting preparation of Strategic Environment Assessments throughout Africa. E&E policy advisers at HQ and SURFs have contributed to country/regional initiatives such as RBAP's regional energy programme and the regional environmental governance programmes in RBAP, RBEC and RBAS. UNDP
support for environmental links to the MDGs was another important initiative. UNDP's commitment to upstream work in Kenya, for example, has allowed for policy influence at the most senior levels of government.

Another promising area for development is the emerging energy/environment and poverty nexus in the context of PRSP strategies. Whether a significant macro-policy impact on rural energy and the informal economy can materialize is an open question and there would need to be documented evidence on energy as a catalyst to economic activities and their cross-sectoral effects (e.g., health, education etc.) in order to convincingly attribute UNDP support towards those outcomes. As noted by one EEG practice respondent, it is essential to know who is 'buying and selling' knowledge products from UNDP and results attained in order to achieve a greater balance in GCF-III.

It appears that BDP's allocation of policy specialists to EEG, only seven out of the initial 50 SURF posts (14% of the total for one of UNDP's 3 major practices), was insufficient from the outset, especially since two Bureaus, RBAS and RBEC opted not to have any energy and environment staff among the 50 posts in their regional SURFs. This lack of coverage in two regions and low level of coverage in the remaining three regions was particularly problematical for EEG in light of the severe downsizing of headquarters environmental staff that was underway in 2001. EEG's staff capacity has been even further constrained in 2003 and 2004 because even after a severe reduction of EEG staff down to a total of 9 approved EEG headquarters posts during the 2001 restructuring, 3 of those 9 posts (33%) have been retracted. This is challenging for EEG at a time of opportunity after WSSD when UNDP is exhibiting global leadership in its energy and environment areas and there are opportunities to expand this leadership. The Team received validation of this perception during its field visits. For example, the three out-posted policy specialists based in Nairobi are required to cover 56 countries in Africa and the Middle East and strongly voiced their concern that there are not enough specialists to service UNDP's global presence. To address the fact that COs need more implementation capacity than is available from the SURF policy specialists, RBAS, for example, is to be serviced on a 50/50% basis by the Drylands Development Centre (DDC) policy specialist based in Beirut and by GLO/01/001. RBEC will now benefit by the transfer of one Environmental policy specialist from Nairobi to Bratislava. It was noted that the transaction costs (e.g., communication) to achieve integration between HQs and field-based policy specialists are very high.

Organizational, the introduction of the matrix management model has caused some problems. Line authority of BDP remains unclear on reporting and accountability of policy specialists with other Bureaus. Another perception is that policy specialists have been misused in support of corporate goals that have little relevance to their specific terms of reference resulting in loss of the best use of skills sets.

A number of policy specialists did not feel that they were included in the global fabric of the policy mainstream and expressed discontent with often-unclear mandates and little funding to back up their work. They especially felt a need for clarity regarding their functional roles as SURF specialists and BDP technical experts. It was acknowledged by BDP practice managers that SURF policy specialists in Africa, Asia and Latin America have been important for backstopping in-country delivery and follow up. GCF-II by design provided limited financial resources to policy specialists. Reverting to BDP for travel and other administrative funding, they believe, has impeded their efficiency and effectiveness in responding to CO demands for policy support services.

GCF-II introduced thematic coherence between core and non-core sources as an attempt to rationalize funding and eliminate donor fatigue. GCF core funding of $2.3 million was allocated for each of the two programs (Energy and Environment) and was viewed as catalytic resources to initiate and build global partnerships (e.g. Global Water Partnership, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research ( CGIAR), Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Energy Sector Management Assistance Programme (ESMAP), Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF), etc.) in UNDP's areas of focus in Energy and Environment and to maintain its global leadership in key negotiations and policy fora like the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the global environmental conventions on biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), World Water Forum etc., Two TTFs were set up for each sub-practice area. The Energy TTF successfully raised $12.5 million from five donors, a figure equivalent to resources secured by the Poverty practice area.

To avoid duplication of TTF administration structures, it has been decided to merge the two TTFs under the 2005-2007 MYFF and to focus on the six E&E service lines of the MYFF I.

As assessed by one of the EEG TTF managers, UNDP should address whether or not the TTF mechanism is
**TABLE 4.4** ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT GROUP - RESOURCE MOBILIZATION POST-WSSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>0.03 (CWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.2 (TF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.2 (TF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>6.4 (TF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty &amp; Environment Initiative</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Level</td>
<td>5 (UNDP TRAC and bilaterals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>WB (WRR)</td>
<td>0.4 (parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNEP (WRR)</td>
<td>0.4 (parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swiss (two programs)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equator Partners</td>
<td>4.61 in cash (6 million in parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>NOK 6.5 million = 0.919 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Euro 1.01 million = 1.154 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>250,376.46 (euro) = 0.286 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50,000 (CS) = 0.37 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>US$ 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNF-CDM</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNF-CDM</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>FOCADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>EU (GEF/SGP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the most appropriate mechanism. It was opined that the experience with TTFs did not meet expectations of either COs or BDP and that supply and demand could not be balanced despite the focus achieved in aligning funding to practice areas.

As evident from the Table below, under the Energy TTF, every dollar of core leveraged four dollars of non-core (4:1), which exceeded the envisaged 2 to 1 target set by BDP. The Environment TTF, on the other hand, was not operational in 2002-03.

### 4.3 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

**Overview.** The goal of the Democratic Governance Practice Area is to contribute to GCF’s global objectives by supporting the underlying principles of assistance to democratic governance and conflict resolution, participation in political and civic life, inclusion of the poor in matters of public policy development and accountability, especially of public office holders to the demands and priorities of the poor. The goal is to be achieved by promoting and strengthening democratic governance in the areas of: strengthening legislatures, electoral systems and processes, local governance and decentralization, access to information, access to justice and human rights, and public administration reform; as well as through global practice management and agenda-setting at the level of the overall governance practice. The strategic results framework identifies seven main outputs: (i) Practice leadership and agenda setting; (ii) Advocacy and communication;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>2002 (US$)</th>
<th>2003 (US$)</th>
<th>TOTAL IN US$</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUNDs RECEIVED</td>
<td>COMMITMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,824,708</td>
<td>1,824,708</td>
<td>Earmarked for Pacific Island Countries on regional and national energy policies and planning over 2004-2007 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>418,328</td>
<td>418,328</td>
<td>Allocated for GVEP activities with regional focus in West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,847</td>
<td>1,187,649</td>
<td>$ 220,847 (received in 2003) are for GVEP activities globally; $ 1,187,649 (committed) are for a project on renewable energy for rural areas in India over 2004-2007 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Unearmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,187,649</td>
<td>1,243,781</td>
<td>Earmarked for GVEP activities globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2,275,313</td>
<td>4,135,517</td>
<td>6,410,830</td>
<td>$1,414,428 of the amount received in 2003 is earmarked for 2004 activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>Total contribution from USAID (1.2 million) over 2004-2006 is for GVEP activities with a global focus. $ 400,000 was received in 2003 with annual installments of $ 400,000 expected in 2004 and 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>6,367,341</td>
<td>3,812,357</td>
<td>12,180,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,285,313</td>
<td>10,179,698</td>
<td>12,465,011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2003 Report on TTF on Energy for Sustainable Development*

---

63: The Global Village Energy Partnership (GVEP) is a post-WSSD multi-stakeholder effort on expanding access to rural energy services as a means to support poverty reduction.
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$8,886,000 in core funding. Some service lines were through cost sharing. These were complemented by projects and also leveraged significant additional funds. The Thematic Trust Fund, $3.5 million from seven global sources, has brought in approximately $33 million through the Governance Practice Area mobilization, in three phases. The TTF is intended to fund shorter-term innovative and catalytic activities while the Global Programme for Civil Society (GPCS) focuses on development through longer-term processes. The TTF also enabled GCF-II to mobilize other donor resources and create new partnerships.

Seven global projects received a total of $3,516,993 (Table 4.6) with the two largest being the Democratic Governance Practice Area (GLO/02/618) that received $1,429,920 and the Urban Management Program (UMP) Phase 4 (GLO/01/616) which received $900,000.

As of April 2003, the Governance Practice group had 14 professionals and three support staff based in HQ, 15 SURF-based professionals, eight professionals and three support staff in the Oslo Centre. During 2001-03, the Democratic Governance Programme mobilized approximately $33 million through the Governance Practice Area, $3.5 million from seven global projects and also leveraged significant additional funds through cost sharing. These were complemented by $8,886,000 in core funding. Some service lines were funded exclusively from TTFs or global projects, while others, such as Electoral Systems received funding from both sources. The TTF is intended to fund shorter-term innovative and catalytic activities while the Global Projects are intended to support longer-term processes. The evaluation found that the two sources of funding were combined in a clear and logical way to support a coherent development strategy for the practice area.

As of April 2003, the Governance Practice group had 14 professionals and three support staff based in HQ, 15 SURF-based professionals, eight professionals and three support staff in the Oslo Centre. During 2001-03, the Democratic Governance Programme mobilized approximately $33 million through the Governance Practice Area, $3.5 million from seven global projects and also leveraged significant additional funds through cost sharing. These were complemented by $8,886,000 in core funding. Some service lines were funded exclusively from TTFs or global projects, while others, such as Electoral Systems received funding from both sources. The TTF is intended to fund shorter-term innovative and catalytic activities while the Global Projects are intended to support longer-term processes. The evaluation found that the two sources of funding were combined in a clear and logical way to support a coherent development strategy for the practice area.

The Democratic Governance practice area mobilized $33 million, inclusive of costs in trust funds. This was more than all the poverty, ICT, energy and HIV/AIDS trust funds combined. The funds were allocated among six service lines: decentralization, local governance and urban/rural development (30.8%); access to justice and human rights (26.4%); public administration reform and anti-corruption (13%); parliamentary development (12.8%); access to information (9.5%); and electoral systems and processes (7.5%). Some $4.7 million was allocated to global programmes to activate service lines, developed partnerships with more than 20 institutions at the international, regional and national levels. The UMP (discussed in Annex C) was able to leverage an additional $6.5 million from the U.K., Switzerland and Sweden. The UMP also coordinates closely with the Public-Private Partnership for Urban Environment (PPPUE) based in Pretoria, and many of the participating cities have also been able to access PPPUE grant funding.

Key Findings. The Democratic Practice Area has developed a very extensive network of partner institutions at the international, regional and national levels. The Urban Management Programme alone has developed partnerships with more than 20 institutions worldwide. The DG Practice attaches high priority to the promotion of cross-practice activity, as democratic governance is a basic development approach equally applicable in all sectors. The Governance team considers that the electronic networks have been one of their success stories in terms of cross-practice activity. During 2003, a total of 122 queries were posted on the DGPNet. Of these, approximately 20% were cross-posted with one or more of the other networks and the percentage is expected to be even higher for 2004. A number of cross-practice meetings were also held.

The tendency of BDP staff to only concentrate on their own service line was counterbalanced by the matrixing and the programme review team methodologies employed by the DG practice. The team has been proactively, and they believe successfully, promoting cross-practice exchanges in all aspects of their work. The progress towards the UN-wide rollout of Huritalk as the network on human rights, is considered another example of where governance products are being promoted to a much broader audience. They acknowledge, however, that cross-practice activities are made more difficult by the current senior management focus on specialization.

64. Source: BDP organizational chart April 2003.
An effective and well-received planning tool was the survey of Resident Representatives in Asia that mapped their attitudes to the six service lines and to the overall design of the Governance Practice Area. Most Resident Representatives consulted with government and partners before responding. Many indicated that they found the instrument very useful and they planned to replicate it for other service lines.

The following initial indicators of outcomes and impacts of the programme/project were proposed by the Practice Team:

a) The project has helped to establish the democratic governance practice. The knowledge codification and networking, policy development, policy advisory and alignment aspects of UNDP in this area were all largely supported by this project. In the opinion of the Team this is confirmed by the fact that Governance is now a dynamic practice area.

b) The programme has helped to shape the more assertive stance that UNDP is taking as an advocate for democratic governance, particularly as a key means to achieve the MDGs. For example, the project has helped to leverage partnerships so as to extend its reach and access to a wider pool of expertise, and in developing practice notes for each service line that have reached CO staff as well as external audiences.

c) The project has helped leverage global funding for cost-sharing programmes that advance the same aims.

---

Table 4.6: TTF Support for Democratic Governance by Service Line 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>% of Projects</th>
<th>Total Allocated (US$)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1 Parliamentary Development</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3,719,000</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2 Electoral Systems and Processes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,172,000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3 Access to Justice and Human Rights</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7,681,000</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4 Access to Information and E-Governance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,751,000</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5 Decentralization, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8,940,000</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6 Public Administration Reform and anti-Corruption</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3,772,000</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,035,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Funds approved for the period 2001-03 but only allocated for 2002 and 2003.
2. The new names for the service lines are used.
3. This figure is taken from the May 2003 report as the updated total allocation of $31,780,000 is not broken down by service line in the May 2004 report.
4. This figures is taken from the 2003 TTF report (May 2004). It is not disaggregated by service line in the report. This is less than the reported $33 million as costs are not included.

d) The practice area has also been successful in promoting cross-practice and cross-network cooperation.72

e) Democratic governance is probably the practice area with most success in developing external partnerships that have involved both significant cost-sharing and collaborative development of programmes.73

f) All of the service lines have contributed to the promotion of the MDGs by raising awareness and creating conditions for the conducting and dissemination of national, and increasingly sub-national, MDG programmes.

In contrast to poverty, where other agencies, such as multilateral development banks, have been entering many of UNDP’s traditional areas of activity and investing levels of financial and technical resources that UNDP cannot match, the Team found widespread recognition that UNDP enjoys a comparative advantage in many of the areas of democratic governance. Consequently, the DG practice area was reported to have more flexibility for selecting among strategic options, as compared to poverty where the challenge is to find a niche where UNDP, with its more modest resources and technical expertise, can make a significant contribution.

The Results Framework presents a clear definition of intended outputs and activity that in their totality propose a comprehensive strategy for covering the objectives of the six service lines. The framework does not, however, identify their impacts or outcomes. The identification of six clearly defined service areas, each with a set of products and areas proved a useful planning tool, both to define the often nebulous concept of governance and also to indicate what services were and were not provided. This helped give the programme a sharper focus.

No systematic evaluation studies have yet been conducted to assess programme impacts and to determine the extent to which observed changes could be attributed to the effects of the projects. However, a number of documents such as the Governance TTF Reports for May 2003 and May 2004 provide specific examples of the contributions the different service lines can make. It seems very probable that such areas of support, as that to legislatures in East Timor or Paraguay, or the support for development of electoral systems in Lesotho, Cambodia, Mali and Kenya, have been extremely useful; but the challenge is to isolate the contribution of these specific types of support from all of the other concurrent activities and to assess their long-term impact.

Note on the Oslo Governance Center

The Oslo Governance Centre (OGC) was established as part of UNDP’s global policy support network for democratic governance in March 2002. The Center exists institutionally as part of the Democratic Governance Group of the Bureau for Development Policy and financially within the framework of the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund or DGTTF (which is funded by Netherlands, Norway, Germany, and Finland). The OGC provides policy support services to the entire DG practice of UNDP, by developing policy support tools, knowledge and good practice. The Centre hosts several annual strategic initiatives of the Democratic Governance practice such as the Bergen Seminar Series and the UNDP Democratic Governance Fellowship Programme.74[1]

In addition to developing professional support functions, the main activities of the OGC according to the 2003 work plan are cast into a results framework. The first main area is to evolve into a Center of excellence in democratic governance by generating innovative and practical knowledge and policy advice to UNDP. The second and third areas are to establish and strengthen partnerships with governments and research institutions and to advocate priority global issues respectively. Of note was the hosting of a series of annual high profile Bergen Seminar Series in partnership and external research linkages with the Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI). [2] Also held was an ‘Access to Justice’ workshop with various international participants and, in March 2003, the OGC collaborated with the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) to host a workshop on ‘Justice and Security Sector Reform’.

4.4 HIV/AIDS

Overview. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is recognized as one of the world’s greatest development challenges. As the Regional Director of UNAIDS in Southern Africa has stated, one of the biggest challenges for the UN system is to move from focusing on analysis and

72. As indicated earlier, an analysis of the DGPNet over the last 12 months found that of the 122 queries posted on the DGPNet from 1 January–30 December 2003, 25 or approximately 20% were cross-posted with one or more other networks and the figures are trending higher so far for the DGPNet for 2004.

73. See Annex C-3 for a discussion of the partnerships developed by the Urban Management Programme.

UNDP has a specific convening role within the UN system in addressing the governance and development planning challenges of the epidemic. As a co-sponsor of UNAIDS, UNDP's mandate is to ensure that national planning and associated delivery systems for the HIV/AIDS response address implementation gaps and capacity requirements, bring in the required policy shifts and use knowledge and best practices that produce results. In a crowded field of providers, UNDP has distinguished its role through innovative strategies that address individual attitudes and behaviours, societal norms and values, and systems and structures that contribute to the spread of the epidemic.

In 2003, HIV/AIDS became a separate goal under the MYFF with three service lines. Consequently, the group missed the initial allocation of 75 policy specialists under GLO/01/001. However, in recognition of the fact that nine of the 10 highest HIV prevalence countries are in southern and eastern Africa, one policy specialist was out-posted to Pretoria to cover all of Africa, and a second policy specialist was placed in Asia. In addition, in 2004, two regional policy specialists were placed in Bratislava and Egypt, jointly funded by the regional bureaus and BDP from other resources. The staffing base has expanded (four policy specialists at HQs but not funded under GCF-II core resources) sparingly in 2004. But, as the practice manager points out, the limited number of staff in the SURFs and at HQs cannot fully address the practice area's range of substantive issues. The HIV/AIDS Group appeared to be one of the few areas that organized its structure and support in terms of GCF-II dimensions and to have actively promoted and catalogued goal setting around globalization, participation, growth and crises. HIV/AIDS policy specialists/advisers are jointly funded by BDP and Regional Bureaus and are responsible for both regional projects as well as BDP services in RBAP, RBEC and RBAS.

The HIV Practice Group received $800,000 in core GCF resources in 2003 and has had limited success in mobilizing donor funds under the global HIV/AIDS TTF set up in 2002 to support the then five service lines, now three (as codified in the 2004-07 MYFF). Allocations are based on criteria that track the geographical prevalence of the disease and LDC status, with priority given to sub-Saharan Africa (60%). Some $2 million was allocated to the Leadership project in 2003 but due to BDP hitting its cash-flow ceiling, about $1.1 million was released and approximately $830,000 of that amount spent.

Dutch funding to the HIV/AIDS TTF (2001-2003) amounted to close to $8.9 million. No new TTF funding has been identified for 2004. While COs generate some direct funding by donors, the significant cutback by the Netherlands demonstrates the dangers of dependency on a single donor and the potential jeopardy to sustaining service delivery. It should also be noted that tranche one proposals were funded at a low level, indicative of their demonstration or pilot nature. UNDP co-sponsorship of UNAIDS is another source of funding ($7.4 million for 2002-03 to support the three service lines). However, UNAIDS Secretariat is expanding its implementation role and appointing country coordinators, which could confuse and complicate UNDP negotiations with donors for new resources. UNDP is Principal Recipient for GFATM resources in 20
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support to funding one professional post, to $9.3 million over the current biennium.

**Key Findings.** The corporate strategy and three service lines were found to have brought coherence to the HIV/AIDS practice area. These have led to breakthrough initiatives that addressed stigma and discrimination, gender-related aspects of the epidemic, institutional inertia, multi-sectoral partnerships, and community decisions. The activities lead to both immediate and longer-term actions, originating in each country with a three-year strategy.

Another key feature was the capacity development process for each of the service lines. Under the 'Leadership for Results' strategy, the service lines were interlinked to create synergy and maximize impact. A collective appraisal of their development effectiveness was not possible during the present assessment but it can be acknowledged that policy support services, including advice, have been driven largely by BDP HQs, and a growing network of highly-skilled experts who have been trained and oriented by the HIV/AIDS Group, are being drawn on by the regions. Much of the practice work was made possible in partnership with country offices and is supported by external consultants. The Group has also developed an NHDR Guidance Note on HIV/AIDS with HDRO.

The Policy Note prepared in August 2002 provided policy guidance on HIV/AIDS and poverty reduction strategies. Work has been done at the country level regarding this issue, most notably in Botswana, Armenia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Madagascar, among others, including in National and Regional HDRs. Work on HIV/AIDS and PRSPs continues in many countries, and is a key concern for UNDP. Currently, the Group’s focus is on generating an effective response, addressing underlying causes that fuel the epidemic, building multi-sector and multi-level partnerships with a focus on results, facilitating community decision-making and access, and involving people living with HIV/AIDS in the response.

### 4.5 GENDER

**Overview.** In the past, gender was one of UNDP core practices. Gender was subsequently moved to the former SEPED and then classified as a sub-practice area under the Poverty Group. Although it is structurally under the Poverty Group, in reality the Gender Group operates in a cross-practice mode providing services to all practice areas, regional bureaus, and all other central units of UNDP. There are three full-time professional
BDP. In fact GCF-II is the only financial resource allocated specifically to the BDP Gender Team, and there is no BDP core funding for Gender. During 2001-3, GCF allocation for Gender was set at US$500,000 per year for three years. A total of 10 projects with a total value of $4,451,985 were approved for gender activities (Table 5.1). Approximately one-third of the funding came from Japan and a further 16% from Sweden.

Table 5.1 summarizes the activities supported under the largest GCF global gender project GLO/03/318 "Mainstreaming Gender". The strategy was to allocate the funds in relatively small amounts to support a significant number of activities in as many regions as possible. Annex E contains a more in-depth analysis of project GLO/01/319 "Investing in Women".

During 2001-2003, UNDP supported 30 projects under the UNDP/Japan Women in Development Fund, which gender programme to be achieved through the cumulative effect of all the different gender activities. However, in common with most development agencies, there is a continuing debate in UNDP as to whether Gender should be considered as a separate topic (in the case of UNDP a Practice Area), or whether the objective should be to promote the mainstreaming of gender into all development activities. The intention is that mainstreaming should mean more resources allocated to gender by all practices - not less attention to specific gender issues. BDP's performance on gender should be measured against the corporate policy on gender equality that emphasizes a dual approach: specific programmes for the promotion of women and mainstreaming gender as part of all major policies and
programmes. The two are intended to be complementary until gender gaps are fully addressed.

Key Findings. The Team found that one of the areas in which most progress had been made was mainstreaming gender in the MDGs. Many countries now produce national MDG reports and even more have committees working on particular MDGs or groups of MDGs. DGF cooperated closely with UNIFEM on this but, despite the positive interest from many countries, the impact had often been limited due to the limited resources of both organizations. UNDP published a review of MDG reports with a gender lens which will be updated with the full review of 70 report for the 2005 Beijing +10 and MDG-related events. This is a joint effort of the Gender and MDG teams in BDP and an important contribution with voices from different stakeholders on issues of gender in MDG implementation. Despite the strong potential of MDGs as a gender entry point, it is pointed out below that progress had been "patchy, with discussion around gender issues restricted primarily to the obvious sectors of women’s empowerment and maternal mortality".

Engendering national budgets was also found to have become an increasingly important intervention point as a way to incorporate gender into development financing and national budgets, and also as a potential entry point to the PRSP process. BDP published a Gender Policy Briefing Kit on major issues of macroeconomic policies, in partnership with UNIFEM and WEDO. The Kit was reported to be very popular and has been translated into French, Russian, French and Arabic, and has supported participation in various conferences. The visit to the Dakar SURF also found a high demand for gender budgeting support in West Africa.

Experience in this cross-cutting area revealed considerable demand for advice on gender mainstreaming in most if not all regions, and showed that even a single gender adviser can have significant influence. In West Africa, for example, the gender adviser was found to have contributed to the following areas: creating a local electronic network for knowledge sharing among UNDP and UN Country Team (UNCT) gender specialists, focal points and local experts, planning regional activities on gender and the MDGs, strategic policy advice and technical backstopping on gender to at least eight country offices, cooperation in the preparation of the UNDP gender note, assistance in the organization of gender workshops, support for integrating gender into the PRSP, help in coordinating the gender programme with the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD).

Although several CO staff mentioned gender as an area in which they should work, in most COs gender was one of up to 10 areas that a programme officer must address. Given the very small amounts of funding, gender tended to receive low priority. Several of the UNDP country gender focal points felt that gender was a very technical area, requiring knowledge of gender issues and approaches in many different sectors, and consequently they felt that little could be achieved with the limited amount of time they for the work. It should be emphasized that GCF was fully aware of the need for user-friendly material to assist overworked CO staff in acquiring basic knowledge and reference material on gender. The Gender Team has been instrumental in the production of tools, manuals, training and referral services, reading materials and cutting-edge packs on different topics based on areas of common interest to most country offices. These were published or on CD-ROM for learning/consultation/briefing pack; cutting-edge pack on gender budgeting and a course for staff in the Virtual Development Academy, designed and managed by the Gender Team.

It would seem that the GCF is caught in a vicious circle. The low priority attached by many governments (and even some UNDP country offices) to gender means that regions are reluctant to allocate scarce policy specialist positions to gender (except SURF/Lebanon). Consequently the SURFs do not have a critical mass of expertise to provide technical support for gender mainstreaming in different sectors. This points to the need for some policy rethinking in UNDP. If an area such as gender is considered a UNDP priority, should the goal be to assign a policy specialist to each region, or is it an acceptable strategy to focus on countries where there is a demand?

One promising resource that the Gender Team is seeking to exploit is innovative country level initiatives, such as 'gender mainstreaming strategies' in four countries and four regions. GCF funds are used to compile this knowledge and develop a generic tool for other country offices. It has also developed the establishment of a local support service in LAC - a region where there is demand from several country offices - and a potential for linking up with other regional centres. It is very likely that more such initiatives will begin to emerge once Country Offices become aware of the critical role of gender mainstreaming in many development areas. The country MDG initiatives have the potential to raise gender awareness to levels where these local initiatives will begin to multiply.

The GCF-II Advisory Committee (AC), in its meeting on 28 April 2003, expressed serious concern about the way in which gender is addressed. The AC wondered if this critical issue did not require a separate practice area.
At least, concrete emphasis was to be given to it in each of the practice areas, including the allocation of resources. The Team found that there is indeed a continuing debate as to whether the limited WID/gender resources should be focused on programmes directly targeted at women (health, girls’ education, micro-credit programmes for women, women-staffed police posts and child-friendly law courts, etc) or whether a greater impact could be achieved promoting the "mainstreaming" of gender in sector programmes and policies. While most, but not all, gender specialists consider that mainstreaming should be the long-term goal, there is a very real concern that mainstreaming is often used as an excuse for ignoring women’s concerns. This is a critical issue and the UNDP Gender Policy is very clear about the need for both and indeed, until gender is taken seriously in mainstream development, there will be a need for some specialized resources.

The Team found that the main challenge for GCF is how to strategically select entry points where it can maximize the utility of its limited resources. Examples of three potential entry points are poverty reduction, ICTD and MDGs. There are, however, many other entry points, some relating to specific issues within a practice area and others opening up opportunities for cross-practice initiatives. In most low-income countries, the PRSP has become the framework for development financing and planning. The limited attention to gender in most PRSPs, combined with the potential high returns to carefully targeted gender sensitive interventions, suggests that this can be a strategic entry point for mainstreaming gender. ICTDs are another potential entry point. Given the limited mobility of many, particularly rural women, and their lack of access to markets and information, well-designed ICT interventions can have potentially important economic benefits for women. The impacts on women’s political empowerment and access to public services are further reasons why ICT is another potential gender entry point for GCF.

4.6 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (ICTD)

Overview. In the context of the MYFF 2004-2007, in late 2003 a decision was made through the Executive Board to convert ICTD from a Special Initiative/Practice Area - which it had been since the launch of GCF-II - to a cross cutting theme relevant to all practices and integrate it into the poverty reduction and democratic governance practices with clearly defined areas of support. UNDP's objective in this area has been to help countries put in place the necessary policy, human and physical infrastructure to take advantage of the new information technologies, and to help them adopt measures to ensure equitable access and widespread capacity to make use of ICTD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount USD</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/318/B/11/31</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>1,450,400</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/319/A/11/31</td>
<td>Investing in Women: Linking FFD with WSSD</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/316/B/11/40</td>
<td>LDC Pre-Conference on Gender</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNDESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/317/B/11/01</td>
<td>Africa/Asia Women’s Forum</td>
<td>397,776</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNDESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/317/11/A/77</td>
<td>Gender and the Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/315/B/11/31</td>
<td>Japan Women in Development Fund</td>
<td>187,700</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/09/M09/PG/A/77</td>
<td>Gender and Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/23/F/3W/31</td>
<td>Energy and Gender Opportunities</td>
<td>706,203</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/316/B/11/31</td>
<td>Gender Sensitive Budgets</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/315/F/11/31</td>
<td>Japan Women in Development Fund</td>
<td>202,406</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,451,985</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Findings.** The Team found that the ICTD area had performed well across a number of its planned service lines. The largest area was in helping (through the COs) design and implement national and regional ICT for Development strategies (e-strategies) that lay out a framework to more effectively harness ICT for development and to make access to ICT and its use more viable in developing countries. The e-strategies service line received 56% of the first two tranches, and supported ICTD strategy development in over 15 countries. There was also a focus through the other service lines on deploying ICT to strengthen the effectiveness of small and medium-scale enterprises, cooperatives, and local communities. A number of projects - in addition to those supported directly by the Japan Women in Development Fund for which the BDP advisors provided advice and technical inputs - focused on strengthening women’s access to ICTD, particularly in the context of their economic and social empowerment. In Senegal, the SURF has been assisting the President’s Office in the development of a regional ICTD strategy that includes advice on the role of the private sector and the development of national and regional policies for governance of electronic communication. The West Africa based programme advisor was also assisting NEPAD in the development of an Africa-wide e-governance strategy.

ICTD is a rapidly growing field and the Team found that there is strong demand for UNDP support in most if not all regions. Despite the limited number of specialists, their technical quality is considered by government agents interviewed during the country visits to be good. This was also considered to be an area in which UNDP had a natural niche, as many of the growing areas concern strengthening democracy (e-governance) and sensitive areas of national and regional governance of the ICTD systems, both fields in which UNDP is trusted. An emerging field concerns the use of ICTD to strengthen local governments and to promote citizens’ political participation - also areas in which UNDP was reported to be strong.

ICTD was considered an important activity by many of the COs visited, including the Jordan, Lebanon, Azerbaijan, Barbados and Brazil offices. In the survey of Resident Representatives, 41% responded that ICTD activities under GCF were very relevant (the second-highest rating of the nine areas in the survey).

In the West Africa SURF as well as the country levels, ICTD programming was based on an innovative framework developed at the global level by BDP in public-private partnership with Accenture and the Merkle Foundation in the context of the Digital Opportunity Initiative. There is a high demand for ICTD support and the SURF is beginning to establish its reputation in this field. Senegal was selected as the focal point for the NEPAD ICTD strategy for Africa and the SURF has been actively involved. The SURF has also been able to assist in developing national ICTD policies in Mozambique and Benin as well as Senegal. Progress has also been made in developing e-governance systems at the national and regional levels. ICTD is a rapidly growing field in Latin America but despite positive feedback for its support to e-governance in Panama and other countries, the SURF felt that uncertainty concerning the status of its ICTD specialist meant it may not be able to respond to the demand.

The Team also found that progress had been made in securing partnerships with the private sector. The ICTD programmes of the two African SURFs had developed cooperative relations with a number of private-sector companies such as Cisco Systems Inc., Microsoft Corp. and Hewlett-Packard Co. The SURF has also developed good relations with regional agencies such as NEPAD and with national parliaments interested in e-governance.

The ICTD theme is also high on the agenda of RBEC countries where the Bratislava Centre (SURF) has done a good job in backstopping COs. In Azerbaijan, the CO wants to assist in making the country the hub of ICTD development for Central Asia and is considering South-South cooperation with India. Several countries expressed interest in returning ICTD to the status of practice area.

Despite the high level of interest from COs and governments, the ICTD programme faced a number of constraints. The very small number of staff means that BDP/SURF specialists must be generalists and inevitably cannot compete in highly specialized fields. Nor are they able to participate in large-scale projects. Consequently it is not yet clear whether UNDP will be in a position to include ICTD-related projects in the repertoire of government projects it can implement, and as a result CO demand for GCF support in the ICTD field may remain limited.

The Team found that BDP’s policy on refocusing and restructuring ICTD is also likely to be a constraint and to slow down programming in the interim. The unexpected closing of the practice area, in the context of the decision taken by the Executive Board apparently without consultation, has left some of the staff.

---

83. ICTD Thematic Trust Fund note pp. 1-2.
disheartened and confused about the future of ICTD in UNDP. In Beirut the search for a replacement ICTD adviser was cancelled on receiving the news that the practice area had been closed despite the fact that ICTD had been considered one of the most successful service lines. The availability of funds for 2004 has not yet been clarified (as of April) and apparently the credibility of the programme has been affected in the eyes of some partners who were not fully aware that UNDP had not abandoned ICTD but sought to strengthen the strategies and enhance synergies with interventions to reduce poverty, achieve the MDGs and enhance democratic governance.

It can also be argued that GCF's goals for the programme are overly ambitious and that it does not have the staff, technical expertise or financial resources to make a sustained contribution. It must identify a clearly defined and much more modest niche. As in other areas, the Team was not able to locate any systematic assessments of progress or potential impacts.

"People all over the world have high hopes that these new technologies will lead to healthier lives, greater social freedoms, increased knowledge and more productive livelihoods"

UNDP Human Development Report 2001

so the assessment had to be based on the opinions of project staff and the small number of partners met with during the country visits.

The clear lesson from the ICTD experience - and one that could be generalized to other areas as well - is that if UNDP gets into a new area, builds programmes and relationships, it must either be prepared to make a long-term commitment or present a carefully planned and widely understood communication strategy of exit or change.

4.7 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Overview. As an indication of the continuing evolution of the global programme, capacity development was lately classified as a 'cross-cutting' theme and a separate Capacity Development Group (CDG) was recently set up in BDP. That capacity development is now given recognition as a cross cutting area is a recognition of that it has always been one of the main - if not the main - businesses or services of UNDP in supporting programme countries.85

The only GCF project managed by the CDG and funded with support from the Netherlands is devoted to reforming technical cooperation, by drawing conclusions and formulating advice and advocacy from a rich pool of knowledge. Based on figures provided by BDP, the CDG has 27 professional posts, 11 of which are based at headquarters and the other16 at the SURFs.86 The GCF also approved support for PPPUE in the amount of $750,000 in 2003, and for C2015 in 2004($ 1.5 million) as well as the continuation of the RTC project mentioned above (called the Capacity Development Innovation Facility, CDIF, $0.5 million in 2004).

Four functions of the CDG include: (1) capacity development R&D, reports, publications, tools, methods and to tap into international trends on capacity development; (2) operations and procedures (manuals) linked to UN harmonization and simplification initiatives, as well as OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC), plus some training; (3) PPP for urban environment (which is a carry-in from an existing programme); and (4) Capacity 2015 (previously called capacity 21).

Key Findings. The Team did not conduct a review of the capacity development area or CDG performance; however, the perceptions of many UNDP staff interviewed showed appreciation for the work done in these areas. It is the view of CDG management that the professional staff should be classified as policy specialists87 and should be funded from the GCF (currently they are funded by a variety of sources including GCF and two separate TTFs). Capacity development was noted as a major global issue (e.g. under OECD-DAC, other donors) and hence might merit more formal consideration in GCF design and programming. The greatest challenges in capacity development continue to be at the programme country level, particularly in sustaining development changes. The general view is that there is no particular need to have a separate fund for capacity development (as is the

85. One major issue is that although capacity development is still high on the UNDP agenda, there has been a shift, perceived by some programme countries, from capacity development for the host country to capacity development for the staff within UNDP (and this is indeed reflected in the shift of more GCF programme funds to building internal UNDP capacities). This is seen by some as a blow to developing countries, because other donors generally do not support in-country capacity development. Developing countries relied on UNDP support in this area and appreciated it. They are now concerned about the change in UNDP's target group for capacity development and would like to see a return to the earlier emphasis on in-country capacity development.

86. The head of the CDG is also funded by the GCF as a 'policy specialist' through GLO/01/001.

87. The term 'knowledge workers' was mentioned on only a couple of occasions throughout the review. To some, the term is a misnomer, as it would imply that anyone who is not officially seen as a 'knowledge worker' would be viewed as somehow inferior. As a term describing a position or class of positions or workers, it should in any event be avoided.
case for practice areas), but capacity development could be funded as 'sub-programmes' or classified as 'sub-service' lines in the practice areas.

4.8 CONCLUSION

GCF-II was to contribute to or generate an impact on poverty reduction and overall human development at the country level. While a number of activities and outputs from the various practice and cross-cutting areas point to promising outcomes, it is still too early to make informed judgments regarding the ultimate impact of GCFII projects and programmes in the long term. This applies to achievement or impacts associated with the four dimensions (e.g. globalization, etc), as well as to the practice and cross-cutting areas. This is not to say that GCF-II-funded initiatives are not working towards such objectives, but rather the question of the level of impact remains open. It is recognized that the GCF is not a programme per se, and consequently special performance measures will need to be developed to focus more on UNDP contribution and performance through its global activities.

With respect to strategically positioning UNDP as a major upstream global policy adviser for poverty reduction and sustainable human development, the GCF-II was not noticeably effective. The reality of policy-related services provided by policy specialists at the country level did not match the GCF-II intent of transforming UNDP into a 'major upstream policy advisor'. Further, there appeared to be little demand from programme countries for policy advisory services; rather, demand was for technical assistance, inputs to the policy process and capacity development in the implementation of government policy, and insofar as these services were delivered, they were well received by the country offices and programme countries. Accordingly, the objectives of UNDP in the area of 'policy advice' and the corresponding role of the policy specialists should be oriented to the realities of demand and services delivered.

With respect to narrowing UNDP’s programme focus, GCF-II resources have been programmed across UNDP’s selected practice and cross-cutting areas, and are increasingly linked to the MYFF. However, it is the considered opinion of the Team that GCF-II is still spread across too many activities and projects as well as across an unbalanced set of TTFs, all of which are supported by obscure programming and resource allocation mechanisms. There is clearly an opportunity to further narrow the focus and concentrate limited GCF resources on fewer practice and cross-cutting areas.
A number of institutional, funding and delivery mechanisms were used to implement GCF-II. These include SURFs and Regional Centres, partnerships and Thematic Trust Funds. Conventional mechanisms have also been used by the GCF-II: the design of programme and project documents, and the execution or implementation of these projects both internally by UNDP and externally through UN agencies such as UNOPS and UNIFEM. Each of these mechanisms was assessed in terms of their overall effectiveness in implementing GCF-II.

5.1 PRACTICE COMMUNITIES

Overview. The Practice Community is one of the basic organizational mechanisms for the implementation of GCF-II and for positioning UNDP as a leading networked and knowledge-based organization. The basic concept is to bring together all those working in a particular practice (or thematic) area, breaking down hierarchical structures and facilitating sharing of experiences and knowledge among all members of the area. The knowledge network, which combines electronic and face-to-face communications, is the mechanism for sharing knowledge among group members.

At present, there are 12 global practice and/or knowledge networks receiving financial support under GLO/02/661. In addition, the Practice groups operate several sub-thematic networks and most of the SURFs operate several regional networks (see Table 5.1).

While most of the networks are located in BDP, several, such as management practice, evaluation and Crisis Prevention and Recovery (CPR), involve other parts of UNDP. In most cases membership is restricted to UNDP staff, but several such as MDGs, NHDRs and gender are open to outside participants. In order to receive GCF funding each network must organize at least one of the following activities, and the practice area networks would normally be active in all four areas:

---

88. It is estimated that there are over 300 electronic networks in UNDP but almost all of these are informally organized and do not have a paid facilitator.

89. In July 2003 it was estimated that 500 of the 4,700 members of the proactive networks were not located in UNDP. There has been some discussion as to whether more of the networks should be open to outside participants. In addition to strengthening contacts with partner organizations, this would permit UNDP to benefit from the extensive knowledge and experience available outside the organization. In many areas, such as micro finance, gender and HIV/AIDS (among others), most of the development experience is probably located in other organizations.
Group events: meetings convened for practice or network members to brainstorm on practice products and services, and to help set practice/network priorities.

Network discussions: resource persons to moderate group discussions on specific topics of interest to the network.

Knowledge building: scholarships, training opportunities, staff exchanges, research assignments, etc.

Community building: visits by the facilitators, SURF CU staff or designated specialists to country offices or events for the purpose of promoting and expanding practice membership.

An important activity of the practice area and the SURF networks was providing rapid responses to requests for information and technical advice. In the case of the SURF the response was normally prepared directly by one of the SURF staff, sometimes in consultation with the appropriate policy specialist. In the case of the practice areas, queries were often circulated to all network members asking about their experiences. The responses were then compiled and either sent to the person/organization requesting the information or posted on the web site and made available to all network members. Examples of the compilation of responses to questions from particular people/agencies include:

1. The UNDP Administrator recently requested information on UNDP experiences in the organization of elections in post-conflict countries. Responses were received from staff in more than 30 countries.

2. The UNDP office in Sri Lanka requested information on the types of services UNDP has offered to Offices of the President in different countries. Some 12 responses were received within 48 hours.

**Note:** All of these networks have a paid facilitator and the first 12 participate in the weekly meetings of the Knowledge Service Team.
The President’s Office in Guyana, requested via the UNDP CO, information on legislation in different countries concerning members of parliament who “crossed the floor” (switched parties). Again a large number of responses were received within a very short period.

The practice managers emphasized that the electronic network was only a tool to support the creation of a practice community, and that as far as resources permit the networks tried to promote face-to-face interaction among members and with the practice area managers.

Key Findings. At the time of this assessment, no information was available on progress towards the SRF goals. However, the networks were found to have produced other kinds of performance indicators such as network usage analysis, feedback from users (both testimonials and ratings), and documentation of examples of useful support. Figure 5.1 on the preceding page indicates the growth of the networks. Between January 2000 and June 2003 the total number of subscriptions to the SURF and global knowledge networks increased from 261 to 8,741. It was estimated in July 2003 that 4,700 people were members of one or more networks, including 4,200 UNDP staff. Over the same period the number of referrals fielded by the SURFs and networks increased from 753 to 1,672 and the number of best-practice event participants per six-month period increased from 184 to 1,139.

Network members produced an index of satisfaction with network performance on the basis of ratings. With a maximum rating of 5, it was found that average satisfaction across the 12 networks (excluding SURF networks) increased to 3.8 in 2002 and 3.9 in 2003 from 3.7 in 2001. These figures indicate a steady increase in membership and an apparent increase in satisfaction. Users are periodically invited to submit testimonials and over 100 testimonials were received in June 2003. The responses are not necessarily representative of all users, as it is likely that people with strong, positive or negative, views are more likely to take the time to respond. However, the fact that so many people responded is in itself an indication of the dynamism of the networks. The majority of the responses were positive but there were also a large number of recommendations on ways to improve the networks. Some of the positive opinions included:

- Large numbers of general comments such as "outstanding", "best network I have ever participated in", etc.
- The high quality of responses to specific queries and requests.
- The rapid response to questions.
- Excellent way to keep staff informed on what is going in UNDP.
- Great source of information on funding, activities of relevance to the CO, scholarship opportunities.
- Excellent way to learn from one another.
- Very well facilitated, and facilitators felt to be generally well qualified and very responsive.
- Useful when governments and other partners were involved in discussions.
- Weekly summaries and consolidated reports particularly useful.

A number of concerns were also raised. First, there was a need for translation to permit the active participation of non-English speakers. There were several complaints of being overwhelmed by the volume of network e-mail traffic. A series of related comments complained about the large number of communications that were not of interest because they concerned other regions, were too technical or were repeating topics discussed earlier. One of the most common requests was for the facilitators to filter messages (by region, topic, CO/HQ orientation, experienced staff/new staff, etc) to increase the utility of material received by each user.

| TABLE 5.2 TOTAL NETWORK MEMBERSHIP (EXCLUDING SURFS) (NOVEMBER 2003) |
|-----------------|---------------|
| **NETWORK**     | **MEMBERS AS OF JANUARY 2004** |
| 1. Poverty      | 809           |
| 2. Governance   | 769           |
| 3. HIV/AIDS     | 416           |
| 4. Energy and Environment | 795         |
| 5. ICT          | 467           |
| 6. HDR          | 639           |
| 7. SEMFIN       | 407           |
| 8. Gender       | 441           |
| 9. MDG          | 1,181         |
| 10. CPR         | 664           |
| 11. Management Practice | 1,422     |
| 12. Evaluation  | 456           |
| **Total**       | **8,466**     |

Source: SNAPSHOT Knowledge Networks January 2004

90. Network user figures have been compiled every six months since January 1999.


92. Of the more than 100 testimonials analyzed, only four were in French and none in Spanish or other languages. This suggests, perhaps, that non-English speakers were not motivated to participate in their own language. The Team did not determine how many non-English speakers sent comments in English.
services. centred on excellence for policy advice and related services. Through their expanded use, positioning UNDP as a leading provider of upstream policy advice. An initial assessment and analysis has been conducted on the content of the network communications and the proportion dealing with policy questions. Overall, e-discussions, requests for comments and queries to seek comparative experiences from other COs are reported to represent the majority of the messages seen on the networks. Interviews with SURF and CO staff during the country visits suggested that referrals, technical backstopping and advice on CO operational issues formed a good part of the support that COs seek through these networks. This assessment also is seen to corroborate the findings on the 'nature of policy advice' discussed in Section 3.2.

The networks are becoming a part of the UNDP culture and an increasingly effective tool for operational support and technical backstopping. In maximizing the potential and cost-effectiveness of the networks, GCF in the future could focus more resources and attention to improving their operational performance and, through their expanded use, positioning UNDP as a centre of excellence for policy advice and related services.

5.2 SURFS AND REGIONAL CENTRES

Overview. The decision of the UNDP Executive Committee, the new mandate of BDP and the institution of Sub-regional Resource Facilities were results of the "2001 Change Process", introduced in 1997 to adapt UNDP to the challenges of the future. It took about two years before the SURFs started operations in 1999, and the SURFs were launched at different times. In December 2003, at the end of the original GCF-II period, nine SURFs were established and working: three in Africa (Addis Ababa, Dakar and Pretoria), two in Asia (Bangkok and Kathmandu), two in Latin America and the Caribbean region (Panama and Port of Spain), and one each in the Arab States (Beirut) and Europe (Bratislava). Each of the SURFs has its own history, its specific type of clients, and different work capacities. Staff consists of a group of policy specialists, each of them representing one of the key practice areas of UNDP, and a small coordination unit led by a SURF chief.

"Since UNDP headquarters cannot provide effective technical backstopping or routine operations support to 132 country offices, UNDP should decentralize support and operational decision-making to clusters at the regional or sub-regional level in order to reap efficiency gains and attune its services to local conditions."

EC decision of 27 February 1997

The creation of the SURF structure was part of a decentralization drive. Between 1999 and May 2002, the number of BDP regular staff at headquarters was reduced from 250 to 139 (plus 15 vacancies). During the same time, the number of BDP staff serving in the field rose to 115 and would have equaled that of New York, had it not been for the 42 vacancies, due to slow recruitment. It is worth noting that the CO reprofiling took place after the decentralization of policy advisory services - and this is reported to have called for more emphasis on building UNDP CO internal capacities, which had been affected by the reprofiling. The fact also that BDP had been partly decentralized, created a new situation requiring new sensitivity and special communication skills from senior staff at BDP headquarters. Many SURF staff members interviewed expressed concerns about something missing in this regard, and only few policy specialists felt fully in the "global loop" of BDP.

93. For example, according to the current figures for the DGPN, approximately 30% of traffic is on referrals and 60% represents substantive queries.

94. Based on feedback from the survey of policy specialists, question 60.
The SURF structure was not meant to be another layer between the CO and UNDP headquarters, and its staff needed to be mindful of not disturbing or complicating the interaction between governments, COs and UNDP headquarters. The perception of a SURF competing with CO clients needed to be avoided. At the same time, the SURFs and their teams of specialists had to assume the role of intermediary in the two-way flow of ideas, information and initiatives. Such a role depended on a high level of acceptance and confidence from the CO. In terms of general working relationships between the RBx and BDP, 50% of the respondents to the survey of RRs reported them to be moderate to poor, suggesting some improvement in this area is needed.

**Key Findings.** BDP and the separate SURFs were found to have produced several routine reports on SURF performance and related policy specialist services. It is not the intent here to summarize those reports or repeat the information in them, but rather to focus on certain issues that arose during the course of the assessment that can influence the general future direction of the GCF. Primary among these was the efficacy of policy advice and support services in transforming UNDP to a networked and knowledge-based organization. A second issue related to the supply and demand for policy advice and support services, and whether UNDP, through the GCF, had positioned itself as a demand-driven policy advice organization. Details about the SURF policy advice and support, UNDP governance and human resource management are reported in sections 4.3 and 7.4, respectively.95

In general, the SURFs were found to have been well received and utilized by their main clients, the UNDP country offices, as documented in the RR survey and SURF reports. However, most SURF managers and policy specialists felt that the initially envisaged "critical mass" of expertise had not yet been reached. Since priority had to be and was given to meeting CO demands, the Team found a heavy bias in favour of CO-support missions and referral services in the work load of most policy specialists, far exceeding the share accorded to these activities in the matrix and leaving them too little time for analytical work, networking and knowledge management. This finding was further substantiated by the survey of policy specialists. This suggests that while the SURFs had provided effective operational support, their current organization and incentive structure did not make them an effective mechanism for contributing the GCF's global objectives.

The business processes of the SURF coordination units were well documented (the most advanced case was the Kathmandu SURF). The processes covered the main service lines (i.e. expert referrals and substantive requests, fielding missions, policy specialist services principles and implementation modalities, policy advisory services - key tasks, screening of consultant CVs, and travel cost equalization scheme). The procedures, seen as a good practice and found by their users to be easy to understand and apply, were in a standard format, laying out guiding principles and in some cases setting out step-by-step processes.

The demand-driven side of the operation was seen to apply more to referrals and comparative research. Sound systems of roster management and referral support have been developed in most SURFs usually managed by full-time staff, supported part time by other staff, with the involvement of the policy specialists (e.g. vetting CVs, qualifying TORs and the like). According to the various SURF reports, the volume of referral activity has increased significantly over the past three years. Some of the SURFs have expressed concern about the low proportion of referred consultants who are hired and wonder whether there are many cases where the CO already has its candidate in mind but is required to have a short-list and simply uses the referral service to obtain additional candidates that it probably will not hire.

Some of the SURF coordination units (e.g. the Research Support unit of the Beirut SURF) were found to do more than simply providing to the requesting CO a list of expert candidates, based on a quick keyword search. The SURF expended additional effort to validate and verify the fit of referred candidates to the specified opportunity by: discussing with the CO when necessary the TORs to obtain a better understanding of the requirement; contacting prospective candidates to confirm their interest and availability; and obtaining personal and professional references on the quality of their work. The service provided was seen as a good practice, more in line with professional services industry practice.

**Client Management/Customer Relations.** The volume of interactions with COs was seen to increase for most SURFs, and this is expected to carry over into the new Regional Centres, raising some concern over how best to manage the client relationship. This is seen by SURF staff as an important dimension of the business model, and as volumes increase, the clientele expands to more COs, other UN agencies, donors and so on, requiring

---

95. Although the SURF experience is fully documented in a well-designed and conscientiously followed reporting system and occasional reviews, the Team encountered a widely spread opinion such that it is too early to make any final assessment on impact and value for UNDP and programme countries.
more formal and structured definition of the 'client' and client management practices. A related concern was on the quality of the services and products, and this seemed to vary by practice area.

In the case of the Bangkok, Bratislava and Kathmandu SURFs, management was of the view that a sustainable internal UNDP market for their services had been created. Generally, this was seen to apply to other SURFs, but to varying degrees. This appears to be in line with one HQ strategy of transforming UNDP - at least in part - into a professional services operation along the lines envisaged in the 'knowledge management' strategy. There is no doubt that the SURFs and policy specialists in most cases have created an internal professional services market and have provided value-added services and support to the COs where most of the impact has been seen. However, as noted, the programme country or development impact of such services cannot easily be determined. The sustainability and economics of such a market may not be cost-effective, given the high corporate costs of retaining expensive policy specialists (this is discussed in more detail in Section 6.4). Clearly, a challenge for the UNDP is to refine its definition and application of policy services and related support, based both on recent past experiences and from implementing the new regional centres.

As UNDP expands and redefines its services at the regional and country levels, a number of questions arose: Who are the clients? What are their needs and service expectations? How will UNDP manage a potential complex set of client relationships? What are the measures of performance and client satisfaction? What standards define quality service?

**Regional Centres.** RBEC was the only regional bureau establishing its regional support centre (RSC) as early as 1997. One of the reasons was the fact that a number of programme countries (presently still seven) have no UNDP country offices and were served from the RSC. Others were newcomers to UNDP whose country offices needed management support services that were also provided from RSC. Two years later, the new BDP-directed SURF was also attached to the Centre, and most of the regional projects were located there as well. Thus, it was no coincidence that the UNDP Administrator decided here, at the occasion of his visit in April 2003, to favor the integration of SURFs and regional programmes. The RSC, now called Bratislava Regional Centre (BRC), was expected to serve as a role model.

The SMT decision, taken in July 2003, to integrate SURFs and regional programmes into Regional Centres was a further move in the policy of decentralization that had initially led to establishing the SURFs four years earlier. This move has obvious advantages, offering synergies and a further step towards providing the critical mass of support to COs, linking CCFs, RCFs and GCFs, and allowing for more meaningful ways of experience sharing. There was also an additional opportunity to host outposts of other headquarters units and related UN programmes at the Regional Centres. At the same time, the process of integration was not an easy task as it had to take into consideration the differences regarding primary clients (COs in the case of SURF, programme country governments for the regional programme) and headquarters units providing guidance and supervision (BPD and regional bureaus, whose cooperation had to be organized in such a way that turf battles were to be avoided). Envisaged was the creation of a competent service structure, but not a new (third) layer of corporate decision making.

Even in Bratislava where the preconditions were most favorable, this was found to be a complex operation. As the Team was informed, it took four months of intensive work to restructure the BRC whose key cell since January 2004 is the Bratislava Policy Support and Programme Development Unit (PSPD), embracing SURF and regional programme staff, organized in four practice groups (governance, poverty/economic reform, environment, and cross-cutting themes such as HIV/AIDS and capacity development). In the joint PSPD work plan for 2004, new emphasis has been given to KM activities, and the PSPD will serve as the hub for the communities of practice in the region. Terms of reference for PSPD have been agreed between the concerned UNDP bureaus. On four pages, they contain sometimes rather complicated arrangements on organizational structure, time allocation of specialists, reporting and performance assessment. There is also a clear division of labour between the BRC director and the PSPD chief. It might also be argued that the terms BRC and PSPD do not fit well into the overall UNDP terminology. RBEC and BDP are represented on the Bratislava Supervisory Board that had been entrusted with far-reaching tasks in guiding and overseeing the work of PSPD.

Another example of the implementation of the policy of SURF/regional programme integration was offered by RBAP where two well-established SURFs and one branch in the South Pacific existed. Here, it was decided to change the two SURFs of Bangkok and
Kathmandu from sub-regional into regional centres serving the whole of Asia, and to divide the practice areas between them. This would seem to be an even more difficult task than the one in Bratislava. The Team was informed that the SURFs had already overextended their services beyond their respective sub-regions and that UNDP could not afford to equip two or more centres in the region with expertise covering all practice areas. The Team noticed, however, some expression of regret in view of an expected loss of focus on South Asia.97

As in Bratislava, guidance is expected from a management board (meeting once a year); and the anomaly of the SURF chief not supervising his or her staff has been corrected in favor of a central role of the regional manager. Although the guidelines will no doubt be adjusted in light of further RC experience, they could serve as a basis for consideration and comparison by the other regional bureaus in carving out their respective arrangements. While conditions are surely different, it is in the interest of UNDP to maintain as much uniformity in its structures as possible.

5.3 PARTNERSHIPS

Overview. One of the implementation strategies of the GCF-II states that: "...strategic partnerships will be formed with institutions having greater competencies in those areas in order to ensure that appropriate expertise is provided to programme countries and that momentum is not lost.98 The move toward strategic partnerships - also referred to as global partnerships - was a response to past global programmes that had not adequately established strategic long-term relationships with development institutions sharing common goals. The GCF-II document in fact details the range and specific examples of institutions with which UNDP is to seek strategic partnerships (e.g. UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes, Bretton Woods institutions, bilateral development cooperation agencies, civil society organizations and the private sector - see GCF-II Document, paragraph 23).99

Strategic Partnerships. The use and meaning of the term 'strategic partnership' are grounded in the two MYFFs that introduced and then refined results-based management (RBM) in UNDP. GCF-II was developed between the past two MYFF periods.100 It can also be said of UNDP, as well as most other development organizations, that continuing resource constraints have been the 'necessity' of the partnerships 'invention': that is, to mobilize sufficient funds for projects and continuing relevance. This has led to the building of alliances with other UN agencies and small bilateral donors, which can, and to some extent have, counterbalanced the drive from the World Bank/IMF to follow their model.

It can be said that partnerships in the broader sense has become one of the prime modus operandi of both the UNDP generally and the GCF-II in particular for project and programme implementation at the global, regional and country levels. Most of UNDP's activities

---


98. GCF-II Document, paragraph 18.

99. The Team found that the term 'partnerships' has a wide variety of interpretations in UNDP. At one extreme, a partnership may simply describe a level of cooperation not defined by any formal legal instrument. At the other extreme, a partnership may be a formalized form of collaboration defined in a written agreement, thus giving it some legal force (e.g. the agreements between BDP and the RBx).

100. Based on feedback provided by BDP, the Team was informed that the emphasis of the first MYFF was in defining partnerships in relation to outcomes, or development changes that required the concerted effort of more than one actor. Strategic partnerships were defined as results-based rather than simply producing outputs. The second MYFF went further in listing 'forging strategic partnerships' as one of the five key drivers of development effectiveness. It goes on to reiterate that strategic partnerships are an "important mechanism to convert direct project outputs into broader development outcomes." It also mentioned the importance of advancing the MDGs and crisis recovery in defining strategic partnerships.
involve one form of partnership or another (the prime example of this would be country level projects and programmes where governments are the prime ‘partners’ -- increasingly replacing the older terminology of executing or implementing agency).

The global projects, discussed later on in this section, in all cases involve one form of partner or other. The TTFs and global cost-shared projects by their very nature define a partnership between UNDP and funding donors and other entities. Indeed, the move to partnerships is a global development phenomenon, and is also listed as MDG.

**Key Findings.** The Team found that UNDP, through the various GCF-II implementation mechanisms, had been successful in securing a very broad range of so-called 'strategic partnerships' with all of the institutions noted above, plus others. In fact, the breadth and types of partnerships are seen to be so vast that a separate study would be required. The nature of the partnerships between UNDP and UNCTAD on the (former) practice area of Trade was discussed in section 3.1 of this report. In this sub-section, the Team presents findings on selected aspects of the GCF-II partnerships objective.

**Scope and Range of External Partnerships.** Annex D identifies and describes a wide range of partnerships that have been developed by a few of the practice areas. The HIV/AIDS practice area is illustrative of partnerships secured with external organizations, and is seen to have fostered the strategic partnership objectives of the GCF-II. Box 6.3 lists the main groups of partners with the HIV/AIDS practice area, through its GGF funded activities. The nature of the cooperation, collaboration or partnership with each organization is reported to vary according to the respective roles and levels of participation. The interaction of the programme spans the UN system, Bretton Woods institutions, bilateral donors, international associations, civil society and community-based organizations, the private sector, trade unions and the media.

Of all of the UNDP practice areas, the Democratic Governance Group provided by far the most information on strategic partnerships as well as other types of collaborative arrangements. A few examples of signed partnership-type agreements in the form of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) were provided. The first example is a MOU between UNDP and the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. The operational nature of the collaboration is described primarily in the form of technical assistance services to be provided by the NDI to UNDP in global, regional and country programmes, plus general cooperation in training, and sharing of information. The MOU has no financial or legal basis, nor does it set out any financial or operational understandings. In this sense, the document might be seen as a basis for a future partnership arrangement.

Several other examples of arrangements of a 'strategic partnership' nature were provided by BDP, and they cannot all be noted here. Two of particular note are:

UN-HABITAT (United Nations Programme on Human Settlements). An MOU has been signed between the UNDP Administrator and the Head of Habitat establishing, among other things, the placement of Habitat Programme Managers within selected UNDP Country Offices, without any additional cost for UNDP. Some 10 HPMs have already been placed in Sri Lanka, Thailand, Mexico and other countries.

International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) Founded in 1913, IULA is the largest and oldest association of local authorities. UNDP has a MOU with IULA to develop capacity of local authorities and to cooperate on surveys of Mayors. IULA is now merging with the francophone FMCU (United Towns Organization) to form United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), to be launched in Paris in 2004. UNDP will attend the Congress and strengthen cooperation with this new global organization.

The Energy and Environment practice area also has a long history of collaborative working arrangements with a wide variety of global and national ‘partners’. BDP provided a representative list of 20 such arrangements (see Annex D). The following is a sampling.

---

101. *It is the view of some that the term ‘partner’ is gaining currency when relationships are endangered or unclear. In UNDP, relationships with co-funding agencies and programme countries are traditionally well described and established. However, the new ‘partnerships’ with civil society or research groups, presents some complexity in clarifying what it means.*

102. MDG Goal #8 states: ‘Developing a global partnership for development with targets for aid, trade, and debt relief’.

103. *In fact, the Team did not have the time or the resources to examine any individual partnership agreement in any detail - in terms of the quality, design, performance - nor to speak with the ‘partners’ to the partnerships. Only limited review of some partnerships was carried out in the context of the 10 sample global projects, discussed in Section 6.4 and Annex C. This subsection is therefore a summary of some of the information provided to the Team by BDP.*

The Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF). Although the GBF was founded in 1993 by IUCN, WRI, UNEP, and ACTS and includes a number of other institutions as its conveners, UNDP joined the partnership and started active participation through GCF funding in 2002. The GBF is an open and independent mechanism to encourage analysis, dialogue and partnership on key ecological, economic, social and institutional issues related to biodiversity. It contributes to the further development and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Ramsar Convention, the Framework Convention, the Convention to Combat Desertification, and other biodiversity-related conventions at the local, national, regional and international levels. UNDP sponsors various sessions of this mechanism that are most relevant to the work programme of the biodiversity sub-practice.

Internal Partnerships. Internal partnerships were found by the Team to function at the HQ, regional and country levels. In terms of those funded or supported by the GCF-II, the main partnership type of agreement is the MOUs between the RBx and BDP in supporting the former SURFs (now Regional Centres). Standard 'service agreements' were signed between BDP and each of the regional bureaus wherein each party specified their commitments to each other (i.e. with BDP providing specified services, and with the regional bureau committing to setting up SURF Boards, providing feed-back on performance). The service agreements also set out performance expectations, were supported by several annexes and were signed by the heads of the bureaus. Such agreements may not necessarily be seen as 'partnerships', but rather as a form of contract. In any event, these agreements will be subject to renegotiation with the implementation of the new regional centres.

5.4 THEMATIC TRUST FUNDS AND GLOBAL PROJECTS

Overview. The Global Projects (GLOs) and Thematic Trust Funds were designed as complementary financial mechanisms to provide GCF-II with the resources and flexibility to achieve its objective of positioning UNDP as a leading provider of upstream policy advice and knowledge on development. The two mechanisms had to achieve three main objectives:

- To serve as an attractive mechanism for donor agencies.
- To provide the flexibility, focus and predictability to allow the practice areas to develop and sustain innovative programmes in an uncertain and rapidly changing environment.
- To provide transparency and easy access to resources for busy staff and to provide accountability to donors and to the UN system.

The two mechanisms were designed to complement each other and many projects were expected to draw on both. The TTFs were intended to provide fast disbursing and often relatively small amounts for specific and short-duration (less than 12 months) activities, often as seed money. The GLOs on the other hand were designed to provide larger resources to underwrite the development of broader programmes and initiatives.

TTFs. The purpose of the TTF mechanism is to support UNDP's reform programme through a thematic focus, an additional source for non-core resource mobilization, rapid disbursement of funds, and support for strategic initiatives. The TTF mechanism was designed to provide short-term resources (usually 12-18 months) to permit the launch of new innovative programmes or to specific activities. TTFs operate according to UNDP rules and procedures and were intended to complement the Global Projects that were to focus on longer-term development objectives. Table E.8 in Annex E presents summary financial information by practice area.

104. This section only refers to Global Projects with core funding from GCFII. It does not include projects such as the Global Programme on Parliamentary Strengthening that were 100% cost-shared.
The TTFs were found to be a useful but not always exploitable resource mobilization mechanism for the GCF. The usefulness as a funding facility stemmed from the adaptability to the priorities of particular donor countries while at the same time maintaining uniform operating and reporting procedures. In most cases the TTF funds were disbursed relatively quickly so that resources could be provided at the time they were needed. The TTFs also required Practice Managers to identify a limited number of clearly defined service lines and to specify the objectives and activities of each project. This helped to provide discipline and a clear focus on many programmes that had previously lacked such clear definitions.

The TTF mechanism also allowed donors to support and focus on their particular areas of interest and expertise. In a number of cases this also introduced greater discipline and technical focus to the programmes. However, donor priorities also at times ran counter to UNDP objectives within certain practice areas, distorted programme emphases and created imbalances in regional/country allocations.

On the downside many COs complained about the short duration of the grants (around 9 months) and the considerable amount of effort was often required for very small grants. In some regions, and particularly with middle-income countries, the TTFs were found to be less attractive, as they tended to focus on LDCs. Consequently the TTF was seen to be of little interest to regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean, the Arab States and Europe and the CIS. Some staff commented that there was a seeming lack of transparency in the selection criteria and a lack of feedback on the reasons for rejecting proposals. While lists of completed projects are readily available, the Team was not able to obtain any systematic studies on the outcomes or impacts of the TTF funded projects or the programme in general.

The Team uncovered a number of concerns with respect to the management and operation of the TTFs. First, many COs were not clear about the service lines into which the projects should be placed or the proposal submission process. Second, initially there were reporting problems, both because of lack of familiarity with the programme but also because many projects, such as ICTD did not fit into Country Office SRFs and results-oriented annual reports (ROARs). Third, the one-year duration (often less) of the projects was often cited as a major draw-back. This was reported to be problematic when multiple country, regional and TTF requirements needed to be satisfied in the design and presentation of projects. Lastly, the TTFs were found to contribute to UNDP’s ‘silo’ approach and did not sufficiently encourage or facilitate cross-practice cooperation.

In comparison to the GLO projects discussed below, the TTFs appeared to have a more standardized and stricter management system. All TTF funded initiatives had to define and conform to service lines, and were subject to a stricter progress-reporting requirement. TTFs also included specific funding for monitoring and evaluation (although the quality of the studies was found to be not always high) and this is the only budget item on which commitments can be made after the 12-month project period.

**Global Projects.** The Team reviewed 10 Global projects selected by BDP. The descriptions and findings of these projects are contained in Annex C. Based on financial information provided by BDP, the total 2001-2003 budget for these 10 projects amounted to $55.3 million, of which 84% had been expended. By far the largest project is GLO/01/001 for the funding of the policy specialists, and of the total budget of $42.2 million, a total of 86% had been expended by end-2003. Funds disbursed through GLO projects were intended to underwrite the development of major initiatives and the average level of funding was around $640,000 - although there were four projects with a budget of under $50,000. The projects typically had a duration of 15-18 months but many have been extended throughout 2004. Consequently a high percentage of the projects were not implemented within the initially planned period, often because the funds were approved late or delays were encountered in project implementation.

Although all of the project proposals were required to include a Strategic Results Framework, the Team was 105. However, there is flexibility in funding TTF initiatives. According to information provided by BDP, TTF funded initiatives can be carried out directly by UNDP while others need approval from governments. As explained, COs normally must seek approval or clearance from the government if any one of the following situations apply: (1) if the project is under NEX, i.e. national execution, or part of the project is implemented by the government, irrespective of source of funding; (2) if the project, either new or on-going, involves government cost-sharing, regardless of whether it is NEX, DEX or UN agency executed (3) if the project, either new or on-going, is a "joint initiative" governed by an MOU or other legal agreements outside of the NEX or implementation arrangement. COs do not need to seek approval or clearance from the government if the following situation applies: (1) if the project is fully funded by TTF or CO resources (no government cost-sharing) and does not involve NEX. The Team was also informed that there are no specific rules for TTFs on this point. Some COs indeed have tried to simplify the process, by, for example, making the TTF initiative an add-on to an on-going project and by obtaining a simple letter from the government to waive their signature. This is not unique to TTFs at all, and the COs can decide to pursue the same for whatever is necessary under UNDP rules.
not able to obtain a SRF report for any of the 10 projects studied (all of which had been operating for at least a year and in many cases almost two years). Although many of the projects had prepared a progress report or mid-term review, in most cases these mainly reported on activities undertaken and the Team could not find any systematic evaluations. It was the Team's impression that overall supervision and monitoring of the GLOs was not very strict and the reporting requirements were quite limited. Several project managers indicated that they were considering the possibility of conducting an evaluation, but as far as the Team could determine no evaluation was being planned and it was not clear if the funds would be available.

The project documents were found to vary in format and design, some being quite detailed and others very general. The Team found that two different project documents contained the identical same brief descriptions: "The project will serve as a vehicle for the generation and sharing of knowledge, information and lessons on the design and implementation of policies aimed at promoting poverty reduction as well as the role of aid flows in support of poverty reduction etc., etc...". It appeared to the Team that the design, management and general control of project activity were functions of the individual practice/thematic group management style and capacities, rather than a function of a bureau-wide standard. Additional findings on the management of GLO projects, decision-making, reporting and so on are presented in Sections 5 and 6.

Finally, despite the fact that all or other projects go through an approval process that includes the regional and other bureaus as members of the project appraisal committee, it was the sense of the Team that the design and management of the global projects lacked transparency and often did not adequately involve consultation and participation outside of BDP. For example, apart from policy advisory services, in the survey of RRs, only four of 49 respondents responded that they were familiar with any other global project, and of 39 respondents, none found the decision making processes to be clear and transparent. More is discussed on programming aspects in Section 5.

5.5 OBSERVATIONS ON EXECUTION AND PROGRAMMING

5.5.1 Execution

The Team was asked to comment on the execution and implementation modalities of GCF-II projects and programmes. The BDP Director has the authority to sign global projects, and global projects may be entrusted to UN Agencies, governments, intergovernmental organizations or NGOs (reference Section 8.3.1 of the Programming Manual). Most of the GCF-II global programmes are in fact executed and implemented by BDP and the TTFs are managed by BDP as well (although as noted, many of the funded initiatives can be implemented by other organizational units, such as the COs). Some of the global projects are executed by UNOPS and other UN agencies. This is subject of serious discussion within UNDP. Beyond these notations and a few cases of global projects under review, the Team did not explore the execution aspects of the GCF-II in any detail, other than to generally look at the issue of implementation fees and BDP capacity to implement.

For those projects and activities implemented by UNDP, costs are recovered (referred to as execution fees). Charges to the programme funds apply to both global projects/programmes (as DEX fees) as well as to Global TTF funded initiatives (as a general management services fee/GMS). Both are seen as sources of 'extra-budgetary (XB) income' for UNDP.

In the case of DEX projects, BDP generally recovers 5% of the project budget. In the case of the BDP managed Global TTFs, the Team was informed that UNDP can recover up to 13% of the amounts

---

106. For example, a mid-term evaluation of the Urban Management Programme was conducted by the Development Planning Unit, University College London, but this was based almost exclusively on a desk review of UMP reports and did not include any field work. Consequently, there was no independent assessment of the claims made in the reports.

107. These were GLO/02/703 "Promoting Social Policy Dialogue and Social Development", approved 10 June 2002, and GLO/02/518 "Support to Poverty Reduction", approved 15 May 2003. The descriptions seem to be another example of development jargon having little obvious meaning which could therefore be applied for different activities.

108. For example, Project GLO/01/115 (Energy For Sustainable Development Global Program) was executed by UNOPS. The Team was informed that specific administrative services had been satisfactory but a funding dispute between UNOPS and BDP had seriously undermined the pace of implementation by showing commitment of resources that could ensure continuity of activities.
committed for each initiative through two recovery channels.\textsuperscript{109}

Based on information provided by BDP, the amount of fees (XB income) collected on 13 global projects over the period 2001 - 2003 was $1.2 million (see Table E.5 in Annex E). The amounts do not include execution fees for the other global projects or the GMS fee that Comptrollers Office calculates and credits to BDP at the end of the year for TTF projects. In terms of XB expenditures over the same period, BDP reported a total of $3.9 million over the same period, of which 70% was spent on office alterations (see Table E.6 in Annex E). From the information provided by BDP, it is not clear as to how much XB income was earned from the execution and management of GCF initiatives (by BDP and other organizational units), or how the money was spent.

The cost recovery amounts for the execution or implementation of global projects and TTFs appear to be significant and it would appear that BDP would have more than sufficient funds to build the necessary capacity to implement and manage GCF-II initiatives. However, this appears not to be the case as the team has learned of capacity limitations in monitoring, reporting and oversight, financial management and in human resources management (see Section 6.4).

\subsection*{5.5.2 Observations on GCF Programming}

From a planning and programming - not to mention a management or implementation - perspective the multiple overlay and intersection of GCF-II dimensions and related immediate objectives, practice areas, thematic/cross-cutting areas, design criteria, strategic areas of support and transformational goals combine to render a framework that is very difficult to programme. By definition, "Global programming is used by UNDP to translate global development aspirations and mandates into innovative and practical development interventions for application by UNDP primarily through its regional and country cooperation frameworks".\textsuperscript{110} The GCF-II document (DP/GCF/2) does not address global programming (i.e. of the GCF as a whole) or the programming of the global projects/programmes.\textsuperscript{111} A number of programming-related concerns were raised through the field visits and interviews with HQ staff. Such concerns applied more to general design of the GCF-II (discussed in Section 2), associated processes and programming principles such as flexibility, participation and consultation.

\textbf{Programming Criteria.} One of the noted weaknesses of GCF-I was that "... clear criteria were not always applied to justify programming at the global level, and as a result, interventions similar to those in regional and country programmes were sometimes duplicated at the global level" (DP/GCF/2, paragraph 15-b). As a consequence, the design of the GCF-II included three criteria to be used in global programming.\textsuperscript{112} As noted in the Team’s review of the global projects selected for this evaluation, the criteria were not always obvious in the programme documents. Further, the first and third criteria would appear to be applicable to all UNDP programming, particularly in the recent organizations of development support around the practice areas, thematic areas and indeed MDGs. Only the second criterion appears to be somewhat unique for the programming of global resources. Most of those interviewed, especially at the country level, were not clear on what criteria were used for global programming.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} The cost recovery procedures are set out in a UNDP-BDP document, 'Thematic Trust Funds - Financial Guidelines', undated.
\item \textsuperscript{110} The details of global programming are contained in a variety of UNDP-BDP documents, Such as flexibility, participation and consultation. UNDP Programming Manual, April, 1999, Section 8.2.1 of the manual also sets out the general approach to the preparation of the GCF. Section 8.3 sets out the procedures for the programming of individual global projects - the legal basis for carrying out activities and incurring expenditures -- which by and large are to follow the same procedures used for country level programmes and projects, but modified to reflect the larger number of governments and other stakeholders. Further, global programmes are to be prepared in consultation with the Regional Bureaus, ensuring that global, regional and country activities complement each other (reference Section 8.3.2 (2) of the Programming Manual).
\item \textsuperscript{111} The details of global programming are contained in a variety of UNDP documents spanning global projects/programmes, the TTFs, the re-organization and management of BDP into the new practice groups, and the UNDP Programming Manual.
\item \textsuperscript{112} These are: "... (a)The development challenge being addressed must be a shared concern among a significant number of countries in different regions; this will ensure the benefit of cross-regional exchange of experience and good practice while exploiting programmatic economies of scale; (b) The development challenge may be rooted in current global systems and regimes and thus must be addressed through global advocacy and intermediation; and (c) UNDP must have a clear comparative advantage as a development organization in the specific intervention." See DP/GCF/2, paragraph 29.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Global programming procedures. A number of the country offices commented that the procedures for programming, budgeting and resource allocation for global resources were unclear, confusing or non-existent. Some felt that the current system was not sufficiently transparent, and was subject to excessive centralization of decision-making.

Resource allocation and distribution. Some of those consulted expressed concerns over the manner in which GCF resources were distributed, or what formulas were used for allocating GCF resources to the regional/SURF levels. In RBAP, for example, it was noted that there is a large demand for governance expertise. Meeting this demand might be achieved through the allocation and distribution of policy specialists and other global resources that are aligned to need by practice, by region and by country.

CO level programming. The Team noted that countries or COs do not have direct access to global resources, other than through submissions to the TTFs and the SURFs (the GCF funds which are in any event tied up in salaries - see also Section 3.2 of this report on policy advisory services). Indirectly, the COs may be seen to benefit from various global programmes, but the drivers of design are seen to be located at HQ.

Participation and consultation. As noted in the discussion on global projects (Section 5.4), the Team was informed that COs had not been consulted or involved in the design of the GCF or in the design of individual global programmes (other than, perhaps, indirectly, through their RBx). An instance was given by the CO of a global programme (with direct impact on the country and its government) that had been developed without any input or consultation from the CO. Some governments also stated that they were unaware of the GCF or any global programmes (other than the SURF), but that they would like to participate or otherwise be consulted in future design and programming. From the survey of RR’s, 80% of the respondents were of the view that COs should be consulted in design and programming of GCF-III and global projects.

Programming/design criteria. As stated in the GCF-II document and discussed in Section 2, three “…criteria will be applied in the design of global programmes to avoid duplication and maximize synergies with regional and country programming” (see footnote #4 on page 6). The Team was not able to ascertain if these criteria were applied to specific global programmes and TTF funded initiatives. These criteria can be open to broad interpretation whereby almost any initiative might be described in such a way as to satisfy them. The criteria do not address the need of global initiatives to support the transformation of UNDP, and there appeared to be no specifics or guidelines on how each programmed initiative would benefit cross-regional exchange of experience while ‘exploiting programmatic economies of scale’.

Flexibility. As noted in the GCF-II Assessment TORs, "the relevance and flexibility to global programming was expected to come from adopting innovative out-posted policy advisory delivery mechanisms and modalities, through Sub-Regional Resource Facilities which are directly linked on the one hand to corporate policy units at headquarters, and on the other to the country offices to address 'on the ground' needs and priorities". As reported in other sections of this report, the principle of flexibility has been achieved. Also, noted, however, are the concerns that the new regional centres may diminish such flexibility, particularly in continuing the direct links between the COs and the HQ practice units.

Programming principles. It is assumed that the principles used for UNDP’s overall programming arrangements are applied to the programming of GCF funds (i.e. predictability, universality, transparency, voluntary and multi-funded nature). The recent changes to the programming arrangements have assured a higher degree of predictability for core funds (where Line 1.3 - Global, interregional and special studies receive 4.2% of the target core budget).

5.6 CONCLUSION

The goal of policy integration was supported by GCF-II. The Team found that, through the GCF-II support mechanisms, UNDP programmes were more vertically integrated, linking country, regional and global programmes. This was achieved primarily through the communities of practice and practice networks, the SURFs and role of the policy specialists, and the collaboration between BDP and RBx. However, it did not appear that GCF-II had achieved any closer geographic integration by promoting South-South exchange and cooperation across regions. Finally, there was a closer thematic integration at the SURF level through linking of relevant practices and themes, teamwork, mutual support initiatives and the like.

GCF-II initiatives have sought out a wider range of partnerships and cooperative arrangements with national and international public, private sector, academic/research and civil society organizations. GCF-
II initiatives have also been strengthened through more formal internal partnerships (e.g. inter-bureau memoranda of understanding on services) as well as those with other UN organizations. This dimension of networking and sharing through formal and informal partnership arrangements was seen to both broaden UNDP’s global reach as well as to open up the organization to outside influences and knowledge. While the quantity of partnerships has increased, the quality of these partnerships appeared uneven.

Reformed use of the Thematic Trust Fund mechanism contributed to the mobilization of non-core resources and the concentration of these resources on UNDP’s programming priority (practice) areas. However, two TTFs received the bulk of funds, and the transaction costs associated with the proposal submission process and TTF management indicate a major need for streamlining and, perhaps, consolidating some TTFs.

The design of the global projects was seen to be highly variable, with sometimes unclear objectives and measures of performance. Furthermore, decision-making was insufficiently transparent, with limited consultation and participation. Clearly, there are major opportunities for strengthening the corporate governance of global projects, and to broaden participation in design and decision-making.

The execution of GCF-II projects was seen as generally weak, with BDP appearing to have insufficient execution capacities, despite the fact that significant extra-budgetary income was generated through the collection of extra-budgetary income. There are compelling reasons for UNDP to continue to execute its own projects, but also to find alternative modalities for implementation that make the most sense, such as through operational partnerships and implementing agencies.

In terms of GCF-II programming, the criteria are too broad and do not address the need of global initiatives to support the transformation of UNDP. Further, there are no clear guidelines on the allocation of GCF-II resources or how priorities are set. There is an opportunity to define UNDP’s programming principles as they might apply to the GCF.
The TORs for this evaluation call for the examination of the overall management, delivery and monitoring of the implementation of the GCF-II at the HQ level, at the sub-regional level (SURFs) and at the country level. The Team was able to generally assess several aspects of GCF-II management based on the interviews and review of selected documentation. Section 6.1 presents the Team's findings on the 'management challenge' of the GCF-II, which is being faced for the most part by BDP. Section 6.2 addresses GCF-II oversight and accountability while Section 6.3 discusses monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The final two sub-sections examine selected aspects of GCF-II human (policy specialist) and financial resources management.

"All of us - governments, businesses, NGOs and intergovernmental organizations - need to learn to operate more openly, in the sunshine of transparency. … This is essential if we are to break the cycle of corruption and build greater confidence in our various institutions and enterprises"

Kofi Annan, Secretary General UN
Statement made at the Security Council
(April 2004)

6.1 THE MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE

BDP Management of GCF-II. As outlined in the GCF-II document, the structure of the GCF-II comprises a rather diverse mix of arrangements and mechanisms, the combined effect of which is seen to have produced a major management challenge:114

a) The Director, BDP has overall accountability for GCF-II.

b) The network of policy specialists (managed for the most part by BDP) undertakes global advocacy and analysis, knowledge networking and policy support at the region and country levels.

c) The SURF Boards (co-directed by BDP) address the relevance of the GCF-II to programme countries and policy coherence between global, regional and national efforts.

114. The HDRO and ODS were initially mechanisms of the GCF-II, but have since been structured outside of both the GCF and BDP and are not examined in this assessment, insofar as institutional arrangements are concerned. The SURFs are to be integrated in the new Regional Centres the management and institutional arrangements for which were being worked out at the time of this evaluation.
The BDP practice structure (or groups of policy specialists) promotes more integrated cross-sectoral programming.

e) The BDP managed communities of practice influence programme design and work planning at all levels.

f) Implementation of some components of the GCF-II is to be done by UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes (e.g. UNOPS, UNIFEM, etc.).

In addition to the above-prescribed responsibilities, BDP manages the TTFs, numerous global projects and programmes, carries out resource mobilization, and provides management and oversight to two specialized centres. Similar to the finding in the review of the first GCF-II the Team did not find that the MYFF, its updates, the ROAR or reports to the Advisory Committee provided much in the way of management assessment of the GCF-II. Neither were there any recent annual or routine progress reports that touched upon management or institutional issues. However, several issues were raised through the interviews.

GCF-II in the context of change. As noted in Section 2.1, GCF-II was implemented during a period of major change in UNDP -- a major management challenge in its own right. The Team found that the one prevailing concern of most staff was 'change fatigue', and this has manifested itself in some skepticism and other forms of resistance. Staff commented that the changes in UNDP have swung like a pendulum. On a personal level, staff seemed to be living in a world of starts and stops on initiatives. Amid changes in management and evaluation criteria, they were not sure what to focus on. Other signs detected by the team include:

(1) Change-related confusion: staff in the SURF locations and some at BDP HQ were confused about the change over to new regional centres, were unsure of the future in UNDP or their role.

(2) Change-related workload overload: the many changes have resulted in the need to not only adjust to the new changes, but also to sustain ongoing operations and workload.

(3) Staff burnout. As reported in many SURFs and HQ, the high level of workload, combined with the uncertainty of and investment in change, risks staff burnout, turnover and loss of morale and motivation.

(4) Change capacity reduced. All of the above combine to potentially reduce the capacity for further change, or to adjust to current change. Over the past four years BDP, has not implemented the needed financial and reporting systems to effectively manage GCF-II resources, or to adequately support the recruitment and management of policy specialists.

BDP has itself undergone major change over the course of GCF-II, with a major decentralization of staff to the field and reorganization of the HQ units into practice structures. The following findings should be seen in the context of the complex UNDP and BDP change environment. The Team was informed that BDP is currently in the process of reviewing the organizational structure of the Directorate and the Project Support Unit with a view to strengthening DEX operations and improving planning, coordination, communications and overall management functions.

6.2 OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

6.2.1 Oversight

The design of GCF-II calls for oversight, monitoring and reporting to be achieved through several mechanisms: a Policy Board and Advisory Committee, annual and other forms of routine and periodic reporting, a mid-term evaluation, and the present final assessment (GCF-II Document - Section B). The Team found that oversight of the GCF-II appeared deficient, ad hoc and piece-meal. However, certain elements such as SURF and TTF oversight, on average, were relatively effective mechanisms. The following findings are based on 'perceptions' from management and staff and the review of selected documentation. More detailed reviews or evaluations of the mechanisms would be required.

Executive Oversight (Policy Board). A Policy Board was to have been set up "... as the apex body for all development policy issues within UNDP" (GCF-II Document, paragraph 51). The Team was informed that this Board was in fact not set up, but rather UNDP's existing senior management committees provided


116. See Background Note for the GCF-II Advisory Committee (23 April, 2003).

117. Not covered in the list of oversight mechanisms are internal BDP management mechanisms (since oversight implies a level of authority, influence or direction external to the bureau).
oversight to the GCF-II (the Strategic Management Team and the Executive Team). The Team reviewed the records of discussions of the ET meetings that addressed GCF related issues. The Team found from these records that performance or issues on the GCF as a whole were not addressed, but rather consisted of presentations on various GCF-II initiatives such as the development of practice notes, the KM strategy and plan, and publications. The Team was informed by BDP that the Director convened three meetings in 2004 of a policy advisory group, an informal meeting with the heads of HDRO, ODS, EO and OA, to explore how policy coherence and integration of normative work into the BDP may be improved.

**Advisory Committee.** The more directly relevant oversight mechanism was the GCF-II Advisory Committee. Although this Committee was to have met on an annual basis, it met only once over the past three years (on 23 April 2003) for the purposes of reviewing progress, discussing certain issues and providing some comment on future direction of the global programme. The 'Background Note' for the GCF-II Advisory Committee (23 April 2003) provided an update on progress achieved according to the GCF-II dimensions. While raising some concerns, e.g. on lack of emphasis regarding gender and knowledge management, the 28 April 2003 minutes (or final report) of the meeting recorded the Committee's belief (based on the information that was made available) that GCF-II would achieve its objectives. As noted in Section 2, the Team questioned the quality and measurability of the GCF-II objectives, but in the absence of performance information, the basis on which the Advisory Committee arrived at such a conclusion is unclear.

**SURF Boards.** The SURF Boards were found to be the main operational and regularly working mechanisms for oversight of the decentralized components of the GCF-II. As at the time of this assessment, some SURF Boards were being replaced by Regional Centre governance mechanisms. During the field visits, the Team found that the effectiveness of the SURF Boards varied significantly by region, and their structure and operation appeared to be more a function of RBx governance style than that of a corporate-wide approach. For example, the Beirut SURF Board had met only twice, the first meeting in mid-2003 with the most recent meeting in December, 2003. It is chaired directly by RBAS NY, and its members consisted of five Resident Representatives who would rotate every 2 years or so. With the Director of RBAS as chair, it would seem that the local COs had little authority or influence on decisions, or that decision-making remained centralized in New York. On the other hand, the RBAP SURF Boards were found to be effective. RRs served as the Chairs, meetings were held regularly, and both the RRs and SURF members felt that these mechanisms had fulfilled their mandates as prescribed in the GCF-II document.

With the new Regional Centre, the governance of the regionalized components of the GCF-II remains somewhat open to question. BDP HQ has indicated that the concept and function of the SURF Boards would be rolled into the new Regional Centre operation. However, many of those consulted felt that the governance balance (between HQ and the COs, and between the RBx and BDP) would be subordinated to RBx interests and control. It appeared to the Team that the level and effectiveness of GCF-II related governance would continue to be more a function of individual RBx management style and culture. Those

---

118. BDP provided to the Team several Records of Discussions from ET meetings over the past few years during which time GCF-II related topics were discussed. The Team found that these discussions were more of an information-sharing nature on specific practice items, rather than presentations on performance or issues pertaining to the GCF as a whole. For example, these included discussions on: governance practice implementation (17 July 2003), anti-corruption practice note (12 February 2004), public administration reform practice note (18 March 2004), KM Strategy and Action Plan (19 February and January 2004), the publication "Making Global Trade Work for People", and the ICT practice implementation (17 April 2003).

119. "An advisory committee will be formed to provide advice and recommendations to guide programme orientation, monitor progress and suggest strategic options to expand the impact and relevance of global programmes". GCF-II Document, paragraph 52.

120. The Advisory Committee at their one meeting expressed serious concern about the way gender is being addressed; and recommended that "greater clarity and precision is required in the identification of programme areas, goals, objectives, and instruments..."
interviewed in RBAP and RBEC felt confident that the new regional governance structures would operate effectively, while those in the other regions less so.

The plans for at least the RBAP Regional Centres call for expanded oversight capacity with the setting up of: (1) review/steering committees to be comprised of government representatives to meet periodically to give guidance to regional project implementation; (2) an executive committee to meet several times a year and attended by four Resident Representatives; and (3) practice advisory boards (or panels) that will be convened periodically by UNDP practice leaders to provide input into the work of the region's practice teams. Based on the past and mixed experience of the SURF Boards, a challenge will be to ensure that these new mechanisms work as stated.

**Practice Policy Board Standing Committees.** Serving primarily as oversight mechanisms for the TTFs, separate standing committees were set up for all practices except crisis prevention and recovery (an area for which BDP no longer has primary responsibility). These committees are reported to build in the programme team concept and include membership from BDP, BRSP, BOM, OSG and the EO. These committees are said to be chaired by ASG-level 'champions' of the practice areas. The Team was not provided with the minutes, operation or performance of the practice committees; however, BDP maintains that these committees fulfilled their designated oversight role.

**Project Appraisal Committees (PACs).** Mirroring the role of the CO PAC counterparts, BDP- or HQ-level PACs have been set up to appraise, review and approve individual GLO projects and programmes. The Team was informed that membership of the PACs include the RBx and other bureaus, as may be appropriate for each individual project. BDP has implemented the practice of 'virtual PACs' where the information, meetings and decisions are made via e-mail or teleconference, and summary decisions are documented in the 'virtual PAC note'. Many of those consulted in the field and in other Bureaus felt that the PACs were non-transparent, and that decisions on projects were driven primarily by BDP or served as a 'rubber stamping' process. COs and SURFs reported having a level of participation or influence that ranged from minimal to nil (related observations on accountability are presented in Section 6.2.2 below). Another concern was that the PAC meetings were held too late in the process.

**BDP "Results Management Team" (RMT).** This is the senior management committee of BDP, and meetings were held regularly on matters pertaining to the GCF as well as other divisional matters. Minutes of meetings were produced. The Team did not ascertain the effectiveness of this management team, or how it related to the other oversight and management groups in UNDP.

"The somewhat disconnected relationship between advisers posted in the SURFs and those in HQs has been a problem since the start of GCF-II. A lot more discipline is needed within BDP and its Practice Groups."  

Senior BDP staff member

**TTF Working Groups.** The Team was informed that an informal working group had been set up within BDP to oversee the management of the TTFs. No TORs were found to have been developed for this group, and hence its decision-making or oversight authority is not known. The decision to form the working group was made by the RMT. Based on a review of one set of minutes, the working group discussed a range of operational matters (e.g. TTF reporting, EB submissions), decisions to be made, and issues/lessons in the management of each TTF.

**6.2.2 Accountability**

A key feature of the GCF-II management arrangements is that "...More centralized global programming resources allocation and management arrangements will ensure timely, strategic use of and accountability for core and non-core resources." (GCF-II Document, paragraph 50). Accountability for the GCF-II was in fact assigned to the Director of BDP. However, as noted, some accountability for the regionalized components was shared with the RBx. The Team found that the concept of accountability was not well understood within UNDP, and various concerns were expressed by those interviewed - uncertainty or lack of clarity of accountability for what, of decision-making authorities, of access to appropriate resources to implement, and inadequate and confusing systems of reporting and control.

**Matrix management.** Many of the SURF staff reported that they were not clear as to who was accountable for the SURF and policy specialist operation (the degree of the concern varied across SURFs). Matrix management was also reported to have been problematic in the implementation of projects in some of the practice areas (e.g. see Section 4.2 on Energy and Environment).

---

Roles and responsibilities were seen to be diffused and spread across the RBx, BDP, the Board and the SURFs. There was some reported uncertainty as to the policy specialists’ immediate supervisor: the RBx or BDP. The structure was perceived as very complex, although most staff saw the current arrangements as workable. Others felt that matrix management was a form of management without meaningful accountability or responsibility. The reporting and performance measurement lines were not always clear.

6.3 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING

6.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

All of the practice areas produced significant amounts of information on project activities (workshops, consultations, etc) and on immediate outputs (numbers of publications, participants attending workshops, number of subscribers to the different networks, etc). While much of this information was informative and useful, current approaches to monitoring and evaluation in GCF-II were found to suffer from a number of limitations:

1. There did not seem to be any standard reporting systems and performance indicators that were used throughout all practice areas and for all activities. Although the GCF projects were required to include a Strategic Results Framework with specific performance indicators, the Team was not able to find any progress reports prepared using the SRF data.

2. It was originally intended to apply the ROAR to GCF-II but apparently this was discontinued.

3. The project documents for many of the sample of 10 projects studied stated that the possibility of conducting an evaluation would be considered. However, it appears that as of April 2004 no plans had been made to initiate any of these evaluations - even though the projects are scheduled to close in December 2004.

4. The networks published detailed statistics on the number of network users, the types of discussions that take place and the number of consolidated reports that are prepared. However, these seemed to focus on processes, and assessments did not appear to have been conducted on outcomes or impacts. For example, the SURFs reported on the number of consultant referrals provided to the COs, but little information appeared to be available on how many of the consultants were hired, the reasons for not hiring the others, or the clients' opinion on the quality of the recommended candidates. The networks cited, as an example of their success, the fact that they were able to provide rapid feedback to queries (for example, from the Administrator concerning experience in the organization of elections in post-conflict countries, or the President's Office in Guyana on legislation concerning parliamentarians "crossing the floor"). Although the speed with which information could be assembled was clearly useful, no analysis appeared to have been conducted on the utility of the information, how it was used or whether it contributed information not already available from other sources. This illustrated again the focus on process rather than outcomes, impacts or cost-effectiveness.

5. The Team made requests to the practice area managers for specific evidence to support their claims that their programmes had affected policy or improved programme design or implementation (for example, convincing donors to integrate social issues into the PRSP, or institutionalizing participatory methods in municipal planning). Few of the managers were able to provide this information, explaining in many cases that the programmes had not been operating long enough for it to be possible to measure impacts. A couple of examples where the role of policy specialists were reported by BDP to have had clear policy impact include the development of the ICTD strategy in Djibouti and the adoption of the rights-based approach to justice and prison systems in Algeria.

Constraints on the implementation of an M&E system.
The Team found that a number of practical, methodological and political factors constrained the development of an M&E system for the GCF-II.

123. A follow-up e-mail was sent to the Trinidad SURF confirming that they did not have this information, and it is believed that other SURFs also do not have this information, or that it is spotty or based on anecdotal feedback. Some SURFs have attempted to collect this feedback from the COs but indicated that the COs often do not respond. It was noted by BDP that as relationships within the community of practice get strengthened, SURFs increasingly get client feedback on services provided by consultants, although this generally only happens in those cases where consultancy services provided were not satisfactory. Reporting such feedback as spotty or simply based on anecdotal feedback may possibly reflect insufficient understanding of the systems in place that reflect COs' judgment on the quality of consultancy services provided. Clearly, more work on this area would be required.
As many of the programmes have been effectively operating for 18 months or less, it is too early to be able to assess long-term impacts.

A challenge facing the SURFs was that they were providing a service to the Country Offices and were expected to maintain a low profile. Many of the SURFs felt it would not be appropriate for them to be claiming credit for the outcomes of the programmes they were supporting. Consequently many felt that it would not be politically feasible for them to contact the government agencies and civil society organizations with whom they had worked to ask for testimonials or opinions on the effectiveness of SURF support.

At least one of the SURFs had tried to assess network performance by requesting clients (mainly country offices) to provide feedback on their satisfaction with the services. However, they decided to discontinue the study because the response rate was very low and because BOM was planning a similar study.

It was methodologically very difficult to evaluate the effects/impacts of a particular service when clients were receiving advice and support from many different sources.124

As indicated in various parts of the report, the issue of whether and how to use UNDP/GCF advice was quite controversial in some countries, and governments were often reluctant to acknowledge that they had received policy advice from outside agencies such as UNDP. Consequently, governments (or donors for that matter) would likely be unwilling to acknowledge that GCF support had influenced their policy-making.

Despite these mitigating circumstances, it also seems that the GCF and UNDP have not given much importance to monitoring and evaluation. While recognizing the difficulties of introducing an M&E system, it still appears that GCF and UNDP management attached a low priority to systematic evaluation. Evidence for this assertion comes from: (1) the GCF-II Advisory Committee met only once and their deliberations were based almost exclusively on a desk review of documents prepared by BDP; (2) there was no pressure from management to implement the SRF reporting system; (3) all of the reports on GCF were based on input and process indicators with evidence of success being derived from anecdotal case studies; and (4) there was no evidence that any of the practice areas were planning to conduct evaluations.

### 6.3.2 Reporting

**GCF-II Annual reporting.** The Team found that the reporting and monitoring of the GCF-II had been extensive for certain components (TTFs and SURFs), but not comprehensive. As called for in the GCF-II Document (paragraph 53), annual reports on progress and impacts were to have been prepared and to have been based on the ROAR process and corporate SRF indicators. No such annual reports were prepared, other than the Advisory Committee report referred to above.125 The Administrator's note on the extension of GCF-II and the supporting Statement of the Director, BDP contained a few elements of reporting to the Executive Board, but is not seen as a progress report.126 For all intents and purposes, annual reporting on the GCF-II could not be found. In addition to the above-noted reports, BDP had prepared special reports for donors on the implementation of some aspects of GCF-II.127 The Team could not determine the number or types of reports as there is no central reporting management function or report document repository in BDP.

**SURF Reporting.** On the other hand, a plethora of quarterly and annual reports have been prepared and submitted by each of the SURFs and for overall SURF activity. These reports were found to be comprehensive and highly detailed, listing SURF activity or service volumes (e.g. advisory services, policy specialist missions, referrals and comparative research tasks by country and practice area; networking and partnerships; practice development; mutual support initiatives and related activities). These reports are in many cases supplemented by

---

124. For example, the Poverty Group believes that GLO/02/703 "Policy dialogue and social development" may have influenced the World Bank to pay great attention to social dimensions in the design of the PRSP in Viet Nam, Cambodia and several other countries. However, the World Bank was under pressure from many sources to focus more on social development concerns, and was already moving in this direction, and consequently it would be very difficult, even if an in-depth study could be conducted, to determine the degree of influence of the PG publications and workshops.

125. See also the of the Meeting of the Second Global Cooperation Framework 2001-2003, Final Report, Advisory Committee, New York, 28 April 2003

126. See: (1) Extension of the Second Global Cooperation Framework, Note by the Administrator, DPG/002/Extension 1, dated 29 May 2003; and (2) Statement by Mr. Shoji Nishimoto, Assistant Administrator and Director, BDP, at the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board annual session, 2003, item 6, dated 12 June 2003.

127. For example, see Partnership Programme Annual Report for 2002: Overview of corporate results from the first year, Report prepared for the Dutch, undated.
testimonials from COs on the quality of services and perceptions of impacts. The Team was impressed by the management discipline applied by most SURFs in structuring and reporting on their operations in a "business-like" manner. It is hoped that such practices and supporting systems will carry over into the new Regional Centres.\textsuperscript{128} If the Team had one criticism it is that many of the reports are overly heavy on detail and volumes, and more attention could be given to performance - results and impacts.

Several of the SURFs had also tried to obtain feedback from their network users to find out how useful their services had been. However, they received a very low response rate (in their perception because the CO looks at the SURF as being obliged to provide services and the CO feels no obligation to provide feedback). The point here is that many of the SURFs were highly motivated and probably had the technical capacity to conduct a systematic assessment of their activities, but they faced political and resource constraints making it difficult for them to conduct the studies.

**TTF Reporting.** TTFs is the second GCF component where reporting was seen as strong. This was likely due to the obligations UNDP had to the funding donors. A detailed report was submitted to the Executive Board in mid-2003, as noted above, and it covered all the main elements of reporting called for in the GCF-II Document (i.e. in terms of the strategic results framework and relationship to the ROAR, by main practice and thematic area, administration and funding). In addition, separate TTF donor reports were to be produced by each CO receiving TTF funding, and the BDP based TTF fund managers were to prepare routine management reports.\textsuperscript{129} Only one report had been prepared by each of the practice areas thus far (in mid 2003).

### 6.4 MANAGEMENT OF THE POLICY SPECIALISTS

The argument can be made that the implementation of GCF-II was very much and remains a UNDP staffing and human resources management operation – not only to support organizational transformation but also to support the delivery of policy-related services. Outside of the TTFs, it was felt that the majority of funds had been expended on UNDP personnel of one type or another. The recruitment and deployment of the 50 policy specialists to the field (with another 25 based in New York) was one of the primary means through which the GCF-II objectives were to be reached.\textsuperscript{130} The reader is referred to Annex G that contains a detailed description of the management of the policy specialists, beginning with initial recruitment and also covering current HR and performance issues.

The Team was informed of an initial debate within UNDP concerning which policy specialist model would best serve the interests of UNDP: (i) should the policy specialists be senior and highly experienced, recruited to more-permanent senior management equivalency posts, or (ii) should they be moderately experienced professionals recruited at the mid- to senior project-levels for periods of limited duration? While both models have advantages and disadvantages, the final decision was to pursue the second model in part because a greater number of "advisers" could be recruited within the funding levels, and short-term contracts would ensure that this resource base could be replaced and replenished in the quickly evolving disciplines.

**Start-up Challenges.** The Team was informed that the recruitment of policy specialists was highly problematic, and indeed resulted in a major delay in the launching of the programme requiring subsequent extension of GCF-II. The challenge in recruiting a large number of policy specialists was apparently underestimated by UNDP.\textsuperscript{131} Even though BDP and the RBx had done some groundwork for the utilization of policy specialists,

\textsuperscript{128} As in the case for the plans to implement new regional centres, it was the Team’s impression that the business and reporting practices of the Nepal and Bangkok SURFs set the standard for UNDP. Such systems should be emulated in all the new regional centres.

\textsuperscript{129} The “TTF reporting requirements are set out in: (1) Thematic Trust Funds - Financial Guidelines, sections 9 - 12; and (2) Thematic Trust Funds - Objectives, Management Arrangements and Approval Procedures. No sources noted, but both documents are presumed to have been developed by BDP and undated.

\textsuperscript{130} There appears to be some confusion over the introduction of the title "policy adviser". The initial EB document (DP/GCF/2) refers to these posts as "policy specialists" who, along with other components of GCF support would provide policy advice. Much of GCF documentation refers to these staff as either policy advisers or specialists, but it seems that "policy adviser" is most commonly used. This report uses the initial term "policy specialist". Further, the Team was informed that different titles are used (policy adviser and policy specialist) and the distinction is established by corporate HR, not by BDP based on the level of the post. P/L3s were reported to be "advisers" while P/L4s were reported to be "specialists", and they appear to undertake similar or same functions.

\textsuperscript{131} For example, in April of 2000 questionnaires were circulated by BDP to all Resident Representatives to help determine how best to re-deploy the policy specialists to respond to policy needs of country offices. This resulted in the development of an overall "policy map" for the regions and a proposed configuration of BDP policy positions in each region. Reference: various e-mails and documentation provided by BDP; 14 July 2000 internal joint memorandum from A. Watanabe, Director, BDP and respective RBx Directors to Resident Representatives.
several major issues arose. Many of the initial problems have since been corrected or are in the process of correction, but issues remain.

One of the major issues is the nature of the operating and service agreements between BDP and the Rbxs on how the specialists would be recruited, deployed and managed. This is being worked out concurrent to the recruitment initiative (in other words, the organizational and accountability models into which the specialists were to be deployed were not finalized). There was some initial confusion or disagreement over the reporting lines for the policy specialists, and the associated RCA (Results Competency Assessment). There was some disagreement between the Rbxs and BDP on the role of the policy specialists, the profiles and job descriptions and levels. This led to significant staffing delays in some bureaus. For example, RBAS agreed on the final TORs for a number of posts only late last year.

Key Issues. One of the main themes that surfaced was the role or profile of the policy specialist. Most of those interviewed were of the view that the ideal specialist was a person who knows both UNDP and the development business. Synthesized from feedback, the ideal specialist was described as sensitive to and understanding of each of the “client” COs served -- operations, culture, strengths and weaknesses -- that is, the reality. The person is flexible and adaptable, ready and willing to help the CO develop its programmes, including assisting in the preparation of programme documents, other backstopping, process facilitation, with ‘advice’ being provided to the CO (rather than the country). The ideal person developed relationships of credibility and trust with CO staff. Such a person had strong ‘generalist’ experience in the practice area, with a good concentration of expertise and experience in one or two of the sub-practice areas (e.g. no one person can be a ‘specialist’, ‘expert’ or ‘adviser’ on governance or any other practice area, since each area is so broad). Finally, the ideal policy specialist would have a good idea of in-country policy direction, and acquire the country-specific expertise needed for advising the CO.

Position profiles and TORs for the policy specialists continue to be developed and refined by UNDP in order to attract and retain the best personnel possible. Even though most policy specialist staffing actions have been completed or are under way, many concerns on general staffing policies and processes were raised by most of those consulted. These issues dominated the discussions and interviews at the field level, and are being addressed by corporate management or through the implementation of the new Regional Centres. However, it was felt that certain HR management and performance issues would persist, given past performance in HR management - perhaps reflecting some underlying skepticism in the ability of management to resolve the issues. Other key performance issues are discussed below and details can be found in Annex G.

“We perceived the specialists to be knowledge brokers rather than the primary source of expertise, tapping into internal and external networks to identify solutions to challenges.”

Senior BDP staff member

First, in the case of most SURFs, the demand for services has increased and the supply of specialists and supporting research capacity remains constrained. The workload of the individual policy specialists and supporting personnel has been noted to expand to the point where overall effectiveness may be jeopardized (i.e. through dilution, workload being spread thin, erosion of quality). Many of those interviewed reported working extremely long hours, with negative impacts on family life and potential for burnout and turnover. Many reported that corporate expectations of policy specialist performance were insensitive to personal and family needs. Some of those interviewed sensed that in UNDP ‘time does not matter’. Policy specialists and other personnel did not record or report their time, even though most SURF operations see themselves as business-like. Without some reporting or control of time, it was difficult to set priorities, plan or allocate resources.

Second, concerns were expressed that the recruitment and deployment of policy specialists for each practice area to each SURF or Regional Centre did not reflect the reality of variations in country needs and demand across regions and sub-regions. If UNDP is indeed demand-driven, then the supply and deployment of policy specialists should correspond to demand; otherwise, resourcing would be seen to be supply driven and a function more of UNDP priorities. Concerns were expressed that it may not be feasible that one policy

---

132. The fourth, sixth and seventh items were the only factors noted by the Administrator to have explained the delay in implementing GCF-II and seeking approval to extend for an additional year. See: Executive Board Document DP/GCF/2 Extension 1,”Extension of the second global cooperation framework - note by the Administrator”, 29 May 2003, paragraph 9. Reference to the start-up issues and causes of GCF-II implementation delay was also made in the one and only meeting of the GCF-II Advisory Committee (see Meeting Notes Final Report of the Advisory Committee, New York, 28 April 2003, last bullet point in paragraph 6).

133. However, due to the supply constraint, resulting in short country visits, it is difficult for policy specialists to acquire this capability for all the countries they are supposed to cover.

134. The Team was informed that BDP is currently considering the implementation of a basic reporting system for the policy specialists and other staff in the bureau.
specialist could reasonably service more than four to six countries. It was noted by those interviewed that considerable time was required to develop and maintain relationships with CO personnel and national counterparts, and that this was not possible or effective if the countries served exceeded five or six.

Third, to many of those consulted, there appeared to be little in the way of incentives in GCF-II to promote and reward performance. It was noted by some that there were several institutional and operational incentives in the form of tools and facilities that encouraged staff to share information, to pursue or understand global issues, to become a networked organization, and to expand the concept of knowledge sharing (e.g. practice networks). However, when it came to performance and the pursuit of quality or excellence, some felt that there was limited corporate-wide recognition or little in the way of systems that would identify and propagate experimentation, innovation and good practice. This was seen to vary by practice area and by region, however.

6.5 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The Global Financial Management Picture. The TORs called for an assessment of the "... value added as well as cost effectiveness of the SURF mechanism in delivering GCF-II products" (GCF-II Evaluation TORs, Section V, item 5). Implicit in the TORs is also an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of other GCF components. The Team endeavoured but was unsuccessful in obtaining basic financial and expenditure information on the GCF-II. The Team was alarmed at the apparent deficiencies in basic financial management and reporting with respect to so large a programme deficiencies that would not otherwise be tolerated for projects and programmes implemented by Country Offices.

Combined with generally weak controls and systems for oversight as discussed in Section 6.2 of this report -- and where the majority of projects and programmes were executed and managed by BDP -- the Team: (1) is not able to comment on the cost-effectiveness of the SURFs or of any other GCF-II component, and (2) can at best only offer the opinion that there has been a questionable use of resources associated with the global programme. Further, the Team was informed that none of the GCF-II global projects or programmes had been audited and that few had been evaluated, thus impeding the provision of financial performance information through these sources.

Key issues. The Team uncovered a number of specific financial management and related concerns at the field and headquarters levels. It is not likely that all these concerns will be resolved through the implementation of UNDP's new corporate (ATLAS) systems. With respect to the SURFs and GCF-II funded support, the team generally had difficulty in understanding SURF-level financial management, the budget picture, or the sources and applications of funds. The various SURFs in fact were not distinct operational units from a budget standpoint. Different UNDP units and/or funds, mostly by headquarters, managed the various SURF accounts. Other costs, depending on the SURF, were paid or recovered by the hosting Country Office for a range of CO services (e.g. space, travel, etc.). The seemingly complex financial and budgeting arrangements did not add to the efficient or effective delivery of GCF-II policy-related services.

135. The review of GCFI did not address any financial aspects, including cost-effectiveness, other than presenting high-level budget and expenditure summaries for the period 1997-2000 for core and non-core funds by the major programme areas.

136. The Team was informed that until recently, BDP did not use UNDP's proprietary project management tools (e.g., FIM) and there was no comprehensive list of projects. This is somewhat surprising given that BDP's 2003 project budget totaled more than $58 million (excluding GEF, DDC, Capacity 2015, and Montreal Protocol) spread across a portfolio of some 250 projects, 53 trust funds all managed or supported by over 230 staff. Some BDP technical support staff expressed concerns over the highly fragmented project and financial data, the general lack of supporting systems and limited project management skills of the staff.

137. In its Decision 2002/18, paragraph 9 (d), the Executive Board decided that 5% of the core or regular resources available for programming would be distributed to the global programme (as compared to 9% for the regional programme). Combined with non-core funds, the size of the programme budget, as noted in Section 1, is substantial.


139. A number of interesting financial management features and practices were found in the various SURFs. The following features of the Bangkok SURF are illustrative.

- The Team was informed that outside of the salaries paid to the international policy specialists (i.e. from GLO/01/001, the Energy Account, Capacity 2015, PPUE, BCPR, UNV, OPS, the out-posted GEF staff in Malaysia), the main source of income is reported to be through an annual $28,000 contribution for each of the BDP and PPUE funded Policy specialists (a total of $140,000). This amount is entered into as special (UN)DP Common Account (or DPCA) and is reported and accounted for through Allotment Advice No, 2003-DPCA-2050-4538-0010). These funds are used for a range of purposes, but primarily travel and direct support to the policy specialists.

- UNDP core funds are also provided to cover the salary costs of national professional and general service staff, short-term assistance (SSA and ALD) and miscellaneous operating expenses.

- Funds allocated to the IT post were reported to be used for two research officers to support the policy specialist team.

- The Travel Cost Equalization Scheme resulted in a considerable net surplus that was then remitted to HQ.

- The Thailand CO charges the SURF DPCA fees for processing financial and administrative transactions (e.g. purchasing of tickets), which is estimated at about $25,000 for the year -- seen as a major expense for the SURF operation, but a source of income for the Thailand CO.
1) **High cost of policy specialists**. The observation was made frequently that the cost of providing policy specialist expertise through internal resources was far greater than the cost of outsourcing equivalent or better specialist services.\(^{140}\) For example, it was mentioned on a number of occasions that the full cost to UNDP of supporting a P5 equivalent professional was in the order of US$1,000 per day worked (assuming the number of days worked a year were 180 to 200).\(^{141}\) By comparison, CO staff estimated that the cost of equivalent expertise ranged from US$200 to US$400 per day for most local/regionally-sourced professionals, and from US$500 to US$1,000 per day for international personnel, including executive-level expertise.\(^{142}\)

2) **Insourcing expertise.** In discussions with a number of SURFs, the comment was made that there are advantages and disadvantages to maintaining an critical mass of in-house policy or technical specialists—even if they were to function as networkers and to assist COs in acquiring the policy expertise as and when demanded (e.g. through an expanded referral service). Internal resources can build relationships with COs and provide dedicated service. However, they represent a fairly high fixed cost - mainly salaries - that limit CO flexibility. As noted above, the question as to whether such a role, funded by core programme resources, constitutes a 'core function' of UNDP should be revisited. Apparently, a policy on a rational combination of internal and external advisory services is still on the drawing board.

3) **Costs and cost-benefit.** The full costs of providing policy specialist and related SURF services could not be ascertained. The budget and expenditure information provided by the SURFs cover only some ongoing operational expenses, and not those associated with salaries and other UNDP overheads. Consequently, it is not possible to determine if the SURF services are cost-beneficial, relative to alternative forms of service delivery.

4) **Mutual support initiatives.** One example of this is the mutual support initiative (MSI), identified as a 'good practice'. The aggregate and full costs associated with this 'service' could not be determined - whether of a direct cost nature associated with travel, or of an 'opportunity cost' nature associated with the absence of personnel from their regular jobs while on MSI missions. Such costs may be seen as supporting training or learning, but they did not appear to be explicitly factored into CO and UNDP budgets.

5) **Cost equalization scheme.** Noted as a good practice, there are concerns in some regions that the cost-equalization scheme is not cost-effective. For example, in Panama the scheme was seen as a major disincentive in the use of UNDP policy specialists because the amount allocated for each mission (US$400 a day) is about twice the going rate for a top-of-the-line consultant in most RBLAC countries. For some of the LDCs and other regions, the scheme was seen as a good practice and reasonable expense.

6) **Mission costs.** No detailed information could be provided on the time and costs associated with travel and missions. The comment was made that travel costs in some cases might be inflated due to the potential of DSA being partly used as additional income for policy specialists and other staff that go on GCF-II funded missions.

### 6.6 Conclusion

From the above assessment, the Team found that the greatest weakness of the GCF-II was in management. Further, the findings pointed to issues that went beyond weaknesses in the management process, implying: the need for a major rethinking on the overall management strategy for GCF-II.

**Oversight** of GCF-II was found for the most part to be unsatisfactory. There should be a stronger and more regular corporate role in terms of monitoring performance and providing direction on at least an annual basis, thus providing the opportunity to formally adapt design to changing circumstances.

The **accountability** for GCF-II appeared diffuse and unclear, and there was no clear linkage between what...

---

\(^{140}\) It was mentioned on a number of occasions that the policy specialists function very much in a 'consulting' or 'professional services' capacity, and much of the work they do is similar to what an external consultant or professional might do. It is a common practice to outsource such expertise or such services if they are not considered 'core functions' of the organization. The question remains as to whether the role of the 'policy specialist' funded by core global funds is a core function of UNDP, and if so, what level would be appropriate.

\(^{141}\) This observation is not necessarily specific to BDP, but may say something about UN's inappropriate cost structure to be a development partner.

\(^{142}\) The Team was informed by BDP that there remain issues of contract duration that continue to be (one year) based on the financial system and the annual budgetary allocation as in the case of GEF- and project-funded activities. The core budget only allows for a maximum of 2 two-year contracts, as permanent contracts are no longer issued.
results were to be expected, decision-making authorities, required resources and systems for monitoring and control. It would seem that accountability structures would need to be developed at different levels, for the different components of the GCF: at the macro level for overall GCF-II performance, and at the component level for individual projects and TTFs.

The reporting of GCF-II performance was piece-meal and highly variable, with some components strong (e.g. TTFs, SURFs) and others weak (e.g. global projects). With combined weaknesses in financial information, monitoring was sub-optimal. While the new ATLAS systems and other planned improvements in BDP may redress this system, there is a need to devise a monitoring and reporting system that can be rolled up from the component level to provide aggregate GCF performance information.

The provision of policy advice through the policy specialist mechanism was not demonstrably cost-effective. First, the majority of policy-related services were not of an 'upstream advisory nature', although many of them could be seen to be operating in the broader policy domain. Second, the sourcing of such services exclusively through the recruitment of UNDP policy specialist staff represents a fairly high fixed cost, and offers little flexibility to source such expertise through other modalities (e.g. contracting out, outsourcing, partnerships, retainers and the like). There are clearly opportunities for finding optional mechanisms for the sourcing and delivery of policy specialist expertise, among which internal staffing is one option.

Finally, the resource allocation model for the GCF allows for limited flexibility for the pursuit of global issues at the country level by the country offices themselves. The bulk of resources are controlled by BDP, and the logic of global resources controlled by a single central bureau is not fully consistent with the design logic of the GCF to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends. There are opportunities to increase the flexibility of the GCF to allow country offices and, perhaps, other UNDP units greater and direct access.
7.1 LESSONS LEARNT AND EMERGING ISSUES

What main lessons and conclusions can be drawn from the past three years of GCF-II implementation? The main lessons and conclusions are from the areas of design, policy advice, knowledge networking/sharing and programme management.

1. GCF Design. Based on the evidence, it would appear that GCF-II never truly articulated the space or the niche areas that it intended to fill or address. GCF-II became more of a conglomerate of projects, funding mechanisms and other instruments that did not gel into a cohesive framework nor fit a broader strategy. A global programme as envisaged in the GCF is neither a support service to the country office nor a series of global, regional and country-level projects. Global programmes should by their very nature address truly global issues that go beyond country specific or regional dimensions. When they focus on the UNDP mandate and practice areas, global programmes are likely to enhance organizational effectiveness, promote its normative values, support all programming through innovation and research and expand the body of knowledge.

The complexity in the design of the GCF through its overlay of multiple dimensions, practice and cross-cutting areas, service lines and use of numerous instruments tend to generate unrealistically high or mixed expectations. This can quickly become a formula for disappointment when objectives are not reached or performance cannot be measured. The mixing of programme development objectives and internal organizational objectives complicates allocation of resources, budgeting and performance management. Simplicity of design is best achieved by focusing on a few main corporate goals linked to the MYFF.

Flexibility was noted to be an essential feature of GCF design. New actors have and will continue to find their way onto the stage of international development cooperation: e.g. the EU-accession countries as emerging donors; global players such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa introducing new dimensions in South-South development cooperation; large multinational corporations; global compact partnerships and the local private sector; and an expanding and increasingly active base of national and international civil society organizations. As and when conditions change, design should be sufficiently flexible and adaptable to incorporate such change.
Finally, effective design is conveyed through the use of effective language. The use of hyperbole and inflated language do not add much to the development debate nor the UNDP role in it. As elsewhere, objectives and expected results of official development assistance tend to be overly ambitious. A modest, factual and therefore more realistic use of plain language in GCF design, programming and project documents would generate greater awareness, understanding and ultimately acceptance of the programme.

2. Policy Analysis and Advice. Lack of clarity in the definition of policy advice can lead to confusion of mission, mandate and role of UNDP and the GCF in the policy domain. When too much emphasis is given to the term 'policy advice', expectations grow as to what value UNDP can add to 'upstream' national development policy, and what UNDP can expect from itself and its staff. The contribution of global programmes to the policy domain generates greater, measurable results when they are seen as contributions to policy development through a combination of dialogue, analysis, process facilitation, advocacy and other strategies. The value of UNDP GCF contributions is enhanced when driven by programme country needs, grounded in operational experience and delivered through access to credible expertise.

The role of policy specialists as policy advisers has not been measurably effective, nor is there much demand from country offices or programme countries for such services. Rather, policy specialists' greater value is generated through their delivery of a range of technical, specialized services and support to activities seen as inputs to policy development and implementation. The out-posting of policy specialists is a positive move in backstopping and enhancing country office capacities and in strengthening the community of learning.

GCF resources might be more cost-effective through optional approaches to securing policy expertise: e.g., staffing of policy specialists, contracting out or outsourcing, operational partnerships and retainers, among other options. If policy specialists are used primarily for internal country office support, then global core funds may not be the appropriate funding source. However, where the role of such specialists can be clearly linked to global programming and priorities, the use of global core resources would be appropriate.

GCF global aims are best realized through strong links with regional cooperation frameworks (RCFs) and country cooperation frameworks (CCFs), but particularly in the RCF connection. Building on SURF experiences, the new regional centres can strengthen these links and ensure that GCF-funded policy specialist resources are optimally managed close to the source of demand. Inter-bureau cooperation in the guidance and supervision of regional centres enhances performance and cost-effective utilization of GCF resources.

3. Knowledge networking/sharing. The diverse quality and overwhelming quantity of 'knowledge' products and services of UNDP can saturate the organization, erode its capacity to pursue quality work, and divert it from real development priorities. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of the portfolio of 'knowledge services' will provide assurance that value remains closely aligned to UNDP needs. Sharing knowledge and information rather than managing it is valued more by both UNDP and its development partners. Greater impacts are generated by a limited number of materials and channels for the exchange of information. More does not equal better. Practice networks and other channels for the sharing of knowledge that are user-friendly and attractive find greater usage even for overworked staff members. The amount of knowledge that is generated and shared is directly related to individual and institutional learning capacity; and if learning capacity is limited, then no amount of knowledge over and above what can be absorbed will be used.

4. Programming and Management. Unlike with other UNDP programmes, programme countries have little if any direct say in the GCF. Other bureaus within UNDP often feel left out of decision-making processes. Direct, exclusive control of programme funds can generate the perception of discretionary funding for headquarters groups, and in some cases questionable use of resources. Such perceptions can take greater root in the absence of documentation, proper systems for reporting and financial accountability. A proper oversight system ensures that decisions made within one unit are in line with GCF and corporate strategy.

Accountability for the management of GCF resources cannot be delegated to BDP or any other organizational unit without adequate execution or implementation capacity, decision-making authority, and a proper system for reporting, monitoring and resource management. UNDP, as a main advocate for governance - transparency, openness, accountability - should be an example and provide exceptional assurances that its handling of GCF-II meets all standards of good management.

7.2 STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Based on the findings of this evaluation, it is recommended that the next phase of UNDP GCF-III
feature the main strategic components given below. Section 7 of the report presents more technical recommendations dealing with performance, institutional arrangements and management.

1. Greater Focus. GCF-III should continue to provide a two-way window for programme countries - the ultimate beneficiaries - to influence and be influenced by global trends, and benefit from global knowledge in the pursuit of their national development priorities and the MDGs. The MDGs might be considered one of the organizing principles (linked to the MYFF) in GCF-III. Under GCF-III, UNDP should continue to narrow the focus on one or two practice areas plus a complementary but small set of secondary practice, thematic and cross-cutting areas. A more formalized, consultative method for programming, programme design and allocation of resources should reflect the variable demand for services by region, sub region and country. No less important, in order to link the intended objectives to measurable results, the language of the GCF should be clear, concise and meaningful, not bound by rhetoric and platitudes.

2. Refining the Global Cooperation Framework. The term 'global' needs refinement and put into practical and operational contexts - not to be used simply as a broad rationalization for any type of programming and funding of initiatives. This means that the criteria for the use of global resources must be clear and applied consistently, and sufficiently distinct from regional or country-level programming. More attention should be given to 'cooperation' through use of operational partnerships and closer collaboration with other United Nations organizations. The 'framework' itself should be simplified by narrowing the aspirations, scope and anticipated achievements of GCF. Development and transformation-related objectives must be measurable, have baselines, be easily programmed and linked to the MYFF.

3. Design and Funding Flexibility. The design of the third phase of GCF should be sufficiently flexible to respond to major changes in external and internal environments. GCF design should be formally reviewed and amended, if needed, on an annual basis. Country offices in particular should have greater flexibility in directly accessing GCF core resources to operate the two-way global windows at the local level, and to pursue sensitive global priorities that would otherwise be difficult to pursue from existing funding sources. One option might be to structure and fund a global 'sub-programme' that could be accessed directly by resident representatives, similar to the budget line to support the resident coordinator system or target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC) line 3.1 in programming arrangements. Such an arrangement would allow country offices to pursue sensitive global issues at the country level. Decentralization of human and financial resources, including GCF resources (as in the case of the out-posted policy specialists), is the direction in which UNDP is moving.

4. Change and Transformation. The next GCF phase should continue to be applied to the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-sharing, globally networked development agency. The programming of GCF resources should be based on clearly set aims and criteria. It is important to strengthen efforts to share experiences with the international community and carefully select issues for advocacy. More effort should be devoted to developing a culture of learning in UNDP. Change should be managed strategically - seen over the long term and be incremental, multi-dimensional (i.e., people, organizational structures, systems and processes), measurable, phased, linked to other change initiatives in UNDP and to United Nations simplification and harmonization processes. Special attention should be given to identifying and managing resistance to change and, equally important, to taking into account the real cost of change if the organization is to reap long-term benefits. UNDP is urged to pay greater attention to the human costs of organizational changes. Management is also urged to recognize and address the negative image of UNDP that constant reorganization creates among partners if it results in disruption or confusion of ongoing programmes.

5. Policy Advice and Policy Specialists. In terms of UNDPs transformation to an upstream policy advisory organization, it is recommended that the definition or comprehension of policy advice be modified or adjusted to reflect reality - and what many consider to be a main strength of UNDP - the provision of a range of both upstream and downstream technical assistance and professional services in the policy domain. If the notion of 'upstream policy advice' is to be continued, then it should be explicitly defined, in practical terms. The multi-faceted nature of UNDP policy work needs to be taken into account.

Clarification is needed of the role, purpose and funding of policy specialists. All policy specialists and advisers in UNDP - whether funded by core posts, regional or global programmes, or other means - should be managed strategically, and not in a piece-meal manner. This GCF component must not be perceived to be merely a strategy to build UNDP staff capacity but to better support programme countries. UNDP should continue
to use programme funds for engaging policy specialists at headquarters and in the field. But options should be studied (including cost-benefit) in terms of in-sourcing, outsourcing and/or regionalization of policy specialist resources in order to arrive at a more rational, cost-effective mix, and to optimize both the quantity and quality of service. Consideration should be given to setting up a special fund or internal corporate account for the funding of policy specialists, rather than using a project mechanism such as the Global Programme Policy Support Services project, as is presently the case. This assessment cannot comment on the optimal mix, as more study would be needed.

6. Oversight and management. GCF is large and involves a considerable amount of core, cost-shared and thematic trust funds. In view of the several management issues raised, GCF-III should not be approved without solid assurances that UNDP is installing the proper execution, implementation and performance management capacities (especially in the areas of oversight, accountability, monitoring, reporting and related areas noted in the detailed recommendations in section 7 and annex H of the report). UNDP should double its efforts on sound corporate governance (transparency, openness, accountability) and provide exceptional assurances that the handling of GCF meets all standards of prudent management. The cost effectiveness of future GCF phases can be greatly enhanced through strengthened capacities for execution, implementation and performance management. Selected evaluations of existing global projects, programmes and TTFs should be carried out, and the various global initiatives should be audited. All future global initiatives should be evaluated, if only to extract lessons and knowledge that can be shared globally.

Given GCF complexities, sufficient time will be needed to design a third phase properly. Time should be invested to analyze the noted historic challenges and opportunities and ensure that they are properly factored into a GCF-III design. Time will be needed for meaningful consultation and full participation of key internal UNDP units, external partners and other interested parties. The team was informed that preparations were underway. The UNDP Programming Manual suggests 18 months for this process.

7.3 IMPROVING SUBSTANTIVE PERFORMANCE

Sections 3 and 4 of this report identified numerous opportunities for improving the 'substantive' performance of the GCF in analysis and advocacy, policy support, and practice and cross-cutting areas. Even though the Team had the opportunity of assessing only a small slice of GCF performance in these areas, the following suggestions to improve performance might be applied to the full portfolio of substantive activities. Clearly, however, such suggestions are not meant to be comprehensive since future evaluations of specific components will target core issues.

7.3.1 GCF Analysis, Advocacy and Policy Support

A. Global Analysis and Advocacy. The challenge facing UNDP in the area of global advocacy is not one so much of finding advocacy issues, but rather in selecting issues that may have more relevance to programming at the country level. In this regard, it is suggested that:

a) UNDP staff at regional centres and country offices be more actively consulted on the selection of topics for the global HDRs in future years. Such a process would stimulate the thematic development discussion and lead to stronger involvement in the field. HDRO, ODS, and BDP should improve existing internal channels of cooperation and work alignment.

b) HDR messages be studied and translated into policy statements addressed to UNDP programme staff. The 2003 and 2004 HDRs (on MDGs, Culture) could serve as models for this exercise.

c) The concept of global public goods be actively studied within UNDP in order to clarify its potential contribution to UN development work. A decision should then be taken (a) to either incorporate the concept into the mainstream of UNDP policy thinking as envisaged in GCF-II, or as less attractive alternatives; (b) to pass such activity to an external institution; or (c) for UNDP to consciously offer a contribution to the international debate through ODS studies in global public goods without a direct link to programme activity.

B. Policy Advice and Support. As discussed in Section 3.2, the area of policy advice is open to differing interpretation and application. Where most of this service type is delivered at the country level, it is suggested that the nature and delivery of such services be revisited in the context of the new regional centres. The main suggestions in this regard are as follow.

a) As the SURFs are integrated with the new regional centres, a 'service model' should be
developed for policy-related services, which is linked to current strategies associated with knowledge management. The business model would answer questions on identification of clients, their needs and service expectations; the management of client relationships; measurement of performance; setting of quality standards; and alternative strategies (and associated costs and benefits) for service delivery. The products and services should be clearly identified. This would require supply-demand analyses for each region and not simply presume that the policy specialist or SURF is reactive or proactive, or demand driven or supply driven. The recent pilot survey of governance in RBAP could serve as a good model or starting point for such an analysis.

b) While there may be common elements across regions to ensure a level of corporate consistency, attention should be given to adapting such a service model to the unique characteristics of each region (e.g., RBA may have greater relative demand for ICT related services). This would also require a tight alignment across CCFs, RCFs and regional programmes, with potential links to a more flexible GCF-III. In the new regional centres, serious consideration should be given to deploying policy specialist resources (i.e., in the form of policy specialist UNDP staff and/or budget and contract facility) as close to their client countries as possible, in numbers and practice areas proportionate to demand at the regional and subregional levels. For example, there may be sound logic for: (a) the deployment of governance specialists and/or financial resources to both the Kathmandu and Bangkok regional centres; (b) the deployment of ICT specialists and/or financial resources to the SURF in Beirut; (c) the relocation of specialists and/or financial resources in Latin America from Panama to other countries; and (d) the continued deployment of environmental specialists and/or financial resources in Nairobi rather than their relocation to the Pretoria regional centre.

c) Policy-related services funded by the GCF should be seen more explicitly as a complement of other policy-related services funded and delivered through other modalities (e.g., country and regional projects and programmes, UNDP staff, professionals funded under other global projects and so on).

C. Knowledge Sharing, Knowledge Management and Networking. The following are suggestions for improving operational performance and knowledge sharing. The main challenges are not technological, but rather organizational. These recommendations are closely related to those dealing with practice communities. Knowledge sharing, knowledge management and networking.

a) Insofar as the GCF is to be used as an organizational transformation tool, emphasis should be given to strengthening the learning culture of UNDP by encouraging people and units to capture information, manage it, provide access to it, and generally encourage learning and sharing, including the lessons from analytical work and the experiences from capacity building efforts. Continued emphasis should be on identifying and documenting good and innovative practices that have been used on one location, and to promote their adaptation in other countries or settings.

b) More attention should be given to the country offices as the best sources and application of knowledge and experience, lessons and good practice. UNDP should strengthen its capacities to capture, document and disseminate this information.

c) GCF-III should address the need to have personal and organizational incentives to develop good practices, lessons, risk taking and innovations (e.g., as in the private sector), through awards, public recognition, promotions and financial incentives. The KM 'Roadmap' covers these issues, but the linkage to GCF should be explicit.

d) Knowledge management should not be directed only towards benefiting UNDP staff, but should also be clearly linked to the capacity development of host developing countries. The knowledge networks should be made accessible to staff in all UN Agencies as well as national counterparts in partner countries. There should be a deliberate policy within UNDP to encourage external knowledge sharing. UNDP should encourage the setting up of networks of government officials to exchange experiences (through workshops and seminars) with the objective of capacity building. At the regional level, the RC's should develop a network specifically for country participation in
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inter-country programming and exchange of experiences.

e) Internal knowledge sharing innovations designed for staff should be closely linked with external ones addressing clients and partners. This is at least as true for UNDP as it is for the Bank. Capacity development is the common goal of both programme countries and UNDP. From the perspective of UNDP’s mandate as a service organization, it would be appropriate to more closely align efforts in knowledge management and in capacity development. A study examining the consequences that this could have on the organizational structure of BDP should be carried out.

f) Knowledge sharing, as offered by its facilities, does not either guarantee UNDP the acceptance and application of its corporate message or role. In comparison to banks and commercial firms, it could perhaps be easier for UNDP "to make knowledge sharing a way of doing business". However, it would still require a major emphasis on oversight, monitoring and evaluation.

g) A welcome side effect of the KM innovations at the World Bank has been the influence of corporate language in the direction of modesty. It is no coincidence that the Bank's evaluation prefers the term 'sharing knowledge' and notes that its clients' survey shows that even "staff have become less arrogant and more open to collaboration and knowledge sharing". A similar attitude is suggested for all internal and external knowledge-related development schemes in UNDP. In this regard, knowledge management as a term should be questioned. Either the newly recruited ‘KM Strategy Communications Officer’ might clarify the term and anchor it within UNDP's culture and organizational memory, or serious thought should be given to abandoning the use of the KM term and replacing it with something more meaningful (i.e. along the lines described in the GCF-II document). For instance, the current positioning around 'Knowledge Services' could be leveraged and further promoted.

7.3.2 Practice and Cross-Cutting Areas

A. Poverty. While there is a high level of demand for technical assistance and related support services in the poverty area, there are many actors offering financing and technical support to governments and civil society. GCF success will depend in large part on its ability to find niches where it has a comparative advantage and where it can effectively leverage its financial and professional resources. A number of advocacy civil society organizations would like to see UNDP help to open up political space for NGOs to have more active participation in national dialogue on poverty reduction, MDGs and related topics. Future GCF strategies should build on MDG momentum and seek ways to translate the high level of interest into a cost-effective development instrument. The following are some opportunities for improving the focus and delivery of poverty-related services through the GCF.

a) A number of advocacy civil society organizations would like to see UNDP help open up political space for NGOs to have a more active participation in national dialogue on poverty reduction, MDGs and related topics. While this is a role that UNDP is technically qualified to play, it would probably be resource intensive and UNDP would have to determine the most cost-effective way for doing this.

b) Future GCF strategies should build upon the MDG momentum and seek ways to translate the high level of interest into a cost-effective development instrument. Some of the challenges that should be addressed include: (i) How to translate the indicators into development strategies and operational plans. One of the dangers to be avoided is diverting energy into the definition of more indicators rather than starting to find ways to improve programme performance; (ii) How to use the MDGs to promote integration among sectors and to avoid the danger of having a sectoral focus for addressing each goal; (iii) How to cost the implementation of MDG strategies. There is a danger of the MDGs becoming a "Christmas Tree" approach in which increasingly ambitious goals are added without regard to cost; and (iv) How to involve the private sector in the MDG initiatives. The Team was told that in many countries the private sector feels left out of the MDG campaigns.

B. Energy & Environment. A main challenge is how the practice architecture, including matrix management

---

144 In fact, the proposed KM roadmap or strategy is primarily focused on internal UNDP capacity development in five dimensions: knowledge networks, practice communities, knowledge content (e.g. lessons learned, best practices), knowledge systems and tools and the ICT technology infrastructure (e.g. as a result of the ERP). Also to be addressed are a range of human resources and organizational development needs.
principles, can be mainstreamed throughout UNDP, so that the importance of policy support functions at all levels of the organization will be recognized and inculcated under GCF-III. The synergies achieved can be consolidated in the MYFF and new regional centre structure by: (a) expanding the resource base through a combined TTF for the practice area; (b) achieving better knowledge extraction, especially through a review of the GEF portfolio for lessons learned from use of GCF core resources for data capture/analysis; (c) establishing a separate fund for sustainable partnerships; and (d) clarifying line authority of BDP regarding core funding of staff and their reporting/accountability with the regional bureaus.

C. Democratic Governance. There are many emerging governance issues in the ICT for development field where democratic governance has begun to establish its reputation (e-governance) and where it could make an important contribution. ICT, and particularly e-governance, is a major area of opportunity for democratic governance and it is critical to develop a coherent strategy as quickly as possible in this area. This area is large and complex and the Team's findings and recommendations are based on the assessment of only a small portion of this universe. Following are some of the opportunities for improving the focus and delivery of DG-related services through GCF:

a) While central responsibility for post-conflict activities is no longer under GCF, one of the major areas of opportunity and challenge for DG will be in helping countries rebuild electoral systems and democratic political institutions. It will be important for DG to define a clear division of responsibility with Crisis Prevention and Recovery. Given the high potential demand for post-conflict services and the specialized nature, the possibility should be considered of creating a separate service line for post-conflict, or some other appropriate title in a future MYFF.

b) There are many emerging governance issues in the ICT for the development field where DG has begun to establish its reputation (for example, e-governance) and where it could make an important contribution. ICT, particularly e-governance, is a major area of opportunity for DG and it is critical to develop a coherent strategy as quickly as possible. As indicated earlier in this report, it will also be critical to adjust the strategy and stated goals to UNDP's fairly modest technical and financial resources.

c) DG can also make an important contribution to UNDP's goal for gender mainstreaming. As for other practice and cross-cutting areas, most DG programmes have made only a modest contribution to gender mainstreaming. There are some important opportunities in areas such as political participation and access to justice where DG could be on the cutting edge of gender mainstreaming. Obviously any such initiatives would have to be coordinated with the Poverty Group and UNIFEM.

d) The Urban Management Programme is beginning to operate on a significant scale in more than 30 cities around the world and is providing a base for a range of poverty-related urban initiatives, including a potentially important HIV/AIDS initiative at the municipal level. It will be important to ensure that the momentum of this programme is maintained after the transition to the Urban Millennium Partnership at the end of 2004.

D. HIV/AIDS. The following recommendations flow from the general needs identified in Section 4.

a) UNDP corporate strategy and service lines are founded on the organization's strengths and provide a solid foundation for actions to address the current challenges of the epidemic. This strategy must be expanded globally and scaled up within countries.

b) Practice group requires more personnel and funding and wider presence in new Regional Centres to strengthen institutional alignment and programme collaboration with regional bureaus.

c) Development of southern expertise and institutions should be strengthened to support national efforts to implement 'leadership for results' initiatives. South-South cooperation should be encouraged and the capacity development component of the trade-related aspects of international property rights (TRIPS) - including civil society analysis and advocacy, regarding best practice trade policy and patent law for accessing low cost antiretroviral treatment - should be expanded.

d) Special responses should be implemented for Southern Africa and other worst affected countries and regions with high prevalence rates, based on the corporate strategy.

e) Country examples of successful leadership experiences to be better documented for replication.
f) Knowledge network practice to be reviewed for first-phase learning and experience for wider dissemination.

g) A new approach should be devised to measure the transformative methodologies being used to generate innovations, results, outcomes and impact, including shifts in norms, practices, behaviours and institutional change.

h) Resource base requires diversification and help should be sought from BRSP to design new approaches for donor mobilization.

E. Gender. Despite the progress in mainstreaming of gender in MDGs and increasing references to the importance of gender equality in policy documents, evidence suggests that progress towards gender mainstreaming has been disappointing in all practice areas, even in the area of poverty. UNDP and GCF are uniquely placed to make a significant contribution to gender equality through mainstreaming strategies but this will require a much more significant commitment of resources. At this point only three of the eight SURFs have a gender policy adviser. BDP does not have a specific allocation for gender programmes in its core budget and the Gender TTF was the only practice or cross-cutting area TTF that was never launched because it failed to attract donor funding. The only source of funding for gender programmes in UNDP is the Japan WID Fund. Democratic governance can also make an important contribution to gender mainstreaming. There are some important opportunities in areas such as political participation and access to justice where democratic governance could be on the cutting-edge of gender mainstreaming.

As with the other practice and cross-cutting areas, a great deal more analysis is required to come up with a comprehensive and prioritized list of recommendations. The following recommendations flow from the analysis that was carried out during this review.

a) Defining GCF’s gender niche. The challenge for GCF is how to strategically select entry points where it can maximize the utility of its limited resources. The following paragraphs suggest some, but obviously not the only options.

b) Mainstreaming gender in poverty reduction programmes and policies: In most low-income countries, the PRSP has become the framework for development financing and planning. The limited attention to gender in most PRSPs, combined with the potential high returns to carefully targeted gender sensitive areas of support suggests, that this can be a strategic entry point for mainstreaming gender. (See also the recommendations on Poverty in Section 7.2.2.)

c) Women's empowerment versus gender mainstreaming. UNDP in future GCF design and programming should find ways and means of mainstreaming the gender strategy, pledging high priority in all its programmes to gender equality and women's empowerment in accordance with United Nations principles and MDGs. Mainstreaming in all UNDP programmes and projects could in part be achieved through greater use of oversight committees at the CO and BDP levels.

d) Gender issues in ICT is another potential entry point. Given the limited mobility of many, particularly rural women, and their lack of access to markets and information, well-designed ICT support can have potentially important economic benefits for women.

F. Information & Communication Technology for Development (ICTD). Having recently closed the ICTD practice area and turned it into a service line of two practices, new organizational models could be considered for taking advantage of this growth area. ICTD offers some challenging opportunities for partnerships with the private sector, universities, NGOs and other organizations active in the field. There are potentially important windows of opportunity for UNDP which include, but are not limited to: (a) building on the extensive UNDP capacity-building experience to develop distance-learning facilities; (b) working in the governance field (for example, the Interlegis model in Brazil); (c) employment generation, women's empowerment, health education and formal education; (d) e-commerce; and (e) combating HIV/AIDS. The following organizational models could be considered for taking advantage of this growth area and delivering ICTD support to programme countries.

a) UNDP should consider the appropriate organizational structures for the delivery of ICTD services. While some of these can be provided through the cross-cutting modality, others ideally require considering ICTD as a business service which develops and markets clearly defined product lines.
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b) ICTD offers some challenging opportunities for partnerships with the private sector, universities, NGOs and other types of organizations active in this field. There are potentially important windows of opportunity for UNDP in the ICTD field. These include, but are not limited to: (i) Building on UNDP's extensive capacity building experience to develop distance learning facilities. There are many opportunities in the governance field (for example, the Interlegis model in Brazil), as well as in employment generation, women's empowerment, health education and formal education; (ii) Employment generation; (iii) E-commerce; and (iv) Attacking HIV/AIDS.

c) The issue of opening more of the communities and networks to outside organizations should be carefully reviewed, as there are both positive and negative aspects. The increasing volume of communications and the constraints on freedom to speak openly on sensitive topics resulting from the participation of outsiders must be offset against the benefits of learning from other organizations and strengthening linkages to development partners. An assessment should be made of mechanisms that permit networks to have certain services available to external participants and others limited to internal UNDP personnel. While these mechanisms are technically feasible, they must be designed and used very carefully to avoid creating the impression that external partners are being excluded or that there are secret discussions going on within UNDP.

d) Most of the practice communities and supporting networks are doing a good job of facilitating discussions and preparing periodic summaries and consolidated replies. Best practice in each of these areas should be reviewed and workshops or other kinds of training organized for network facilitators.

e) One of the most frequently heard requests is for filtering mechanisms to maximize the utility of communications that reach each network member and to eliminate material which is not of relevance. This is a difficult task because people have different criteria for what they wish to see. UNDP should try to learn from successful e-marketing companies such as Amazon.com (among others) that analyze the requests received from each customer and use this to structure future information sent out to each user. To achieve this, the implementation and deployment of Verity K2, the search engine that the organization purchased late 2003, should be accelerated.

f) Most, if not all, networks have had some involvement in policy dialogue or the dissemination of information on policy questions and global issues. These experiences should be reviewed to identify ways to strengthen the policy dimensions. Practice managers should cooperate with the SURFs and CO staff to prepare brief, regional or sectorally focused bullet points that can be used to show the relevance of policies to each region and sector.
g) Each practice community and network should explore potential partnerships with appropriate academic and research institutions to promote policy dialogue through the networks.

h) Portals should be used creatively to link practice members to policy documents of UNDP and other agencies. In many cases brief summaries should be prepared to make the documents more accessible and interesting to field personnel. The preparation of short PowerPoint presentations that can be used by the SURFs or CO staff to introduce the policy documents to their colleagues can also be helpful.

B. SURFs and Regional Centres. As the SURFs will disappear and their function becomes part of UNDP regional centres, it may be worthwhile to collect and document their achievements and experiences. A review study could also assess which lessons should be drawn for the ongoing change management. Related recommendations on policy services are covered in section 7.2.1-B of the report. Other suggestions include:

a) Every effort should be made to minimize the loss in terms of sub-regional services and to balance carefully services made available to the two main groups of clients - country offices and governments - who have their own close, privileged relationships. Regions, such as the Arab States, establishing regional centres at a later date, should actively seek lessons from the experiences of centres in Asia and Africa.

b) While the establishment of regional centres is going through an experiment phase, UNDP is well advised to aim for a somewhat uniform organizational structure and corporate terminology.

c) UNDP is urged to pay greater attention to the human costs of organizational changes.

d) Management is also urged to recognize and address the negative image of UNDP that reorganization creates among partners if it results in disruption or confusion of ongoing programmes.

C. Partnerships. 'Cooperation' is a key term embodied in the GCF. GCF has been implemented through an increasing number of partnerships - usually described as 'strategic partnerships'. Other partnerships are being developed to enhance collaboration among internal UNDP units. However, there exists some confusion or uncertainty over the meaning and direction of partnerships.

a) The concept and operational meaning of 'strategic partnership' should be defined, as its use is currently interpreted widely within the UNDP. Should a 'strategic partnership' be secured in the form of a written agreement, with specific timelines, expected outcomes, defined accountabilities and performance expectations? Or should they be in the form of higher level or more general 'memoranda of understanding'? What are the principles that govern partnerships? These and other questions should be answered, with some guidelines developed for UNDP managers.

b) UNDP should develop a typology of partnerships, covering formal and informal partnerships, internal and external partnerships, among others, and how these relate to the broad domain of agreements.

c) All UNDP partnerships should have some sort of exit strategy. Where some partners are funded by UNDP, their sustainability may be at question when funding is withdrawn.

d) UNDP should develop sound legal instruments for operational partnerships. These would include not only a legislative framework but also examples of different types of partnership agreements. These would clearly need to be supported by policies, procedures and standards, including legal vetting.

e) UNDP should apply more effort in developing and promoting the concept and practice of public private partnerships in its programming.

f) Partnerships might be used as a vehicle to enhance UN harmonization and simplification. The example of the UNDG pilot of implementing common services through such arrangements could be extended to programme areas, including the joint management of 'policy services' (e.g. the recent agreement between UNDP and the UNCDF may be a good example).

D. Thematic Trust Funds. The use of TTFs has evolved significantly in UNDP over the course of GCF-II. In addition to an evaluation of the TTFs themselves (supported by evaluations and audits of the funded initiatives), the main recommendations are listed below. Also, the various issues documented from the 17 April 2003 meeting of the TTF Working Group and comments made by the EB during a meeting in September 2003 should be reviewed and adjusted where necessary and acted upon.
a) TTF orientation programmes should be developed on the objectives of the TTF and the procedures for proposal submission and project reporting. Clear and simplified rules for the management of TTFs and the funding of initiatives should be developed, and should complement standard UNDP policies and procedures. TTF funded initiatives that have a direct impact on a country should be designed in consultation with the country.

b) Monitoring and reporting procedures should be reviewed to ensure standardization across sectors, and to ensure simple but comprehensive financial and output recording. TTF performance reviews should be a standard item on the EB agenda.

c) A simple impact assessment methodology should be developed to provide indicators at the project and sector level of the contribution of TTF-supported projects to UNDP/GCF goals.

d) Mechanisms should be put in place to facilitate collection and documentation of good-practice lessons from the projects. Mechanisms should also be put in place to encourage cross-practice projects.

e) The one-year period for project completion should be reassessed.

f) The smaller TTFs should be combined into a single TTF, thereby reducing the management burden.

E. Global Programmes/Projects. The global projects as a whole presented several challenges and opportunities for improvement. The Team could only scratch the surface of this area and detailed evaluations of the programmes themselves are required. However, some of the suggestions for improvement include:

a) The design and documentation of global projects should adhere to a common standard and format, and should be explicit in terms of the anticipated results, linkages to the GCF and to the SRF. The new formats being designed by UNDP for country programmes should be adapted.

b) The process of design, participation and consultation regarding global projects should be defined, and associated decision-making open and transparent.

c) The PACs (virtual or not) should be standardized as effective and efficient decision-making tools.

d) All minutes and decisions of PACs should be documented in a standard format and circulated to all participating members. The PAC should explicitly address and approve all inputs used for global projects, with assurance that they are linked to measurable results.

e) The SRF, or a similar performance monitoring system, should be enforced.

f) The duration of grants should in some cases be increased, but with stricter requirements to complete the project within the stipulated period.

F. Programming. More review and analysis are required on the programming of GCF funds and how they relate to other UNDP programmes. Had Section 8.3.1 of the UNDP Programming Manual been applied more rigorously, some of the following recommendations may not have been necessary.

a) The Team was informed that the UNDP Programming Manual is to be replaced by electronic "prescriptive practices". While this may increase flexibility (i.e. from procedures to guidelines), the downside is a potential erosion of control and consistency (e.g. for follow-up, oversight, evaluation, and overall accountability). Both prescriptive practices and more detailed guidelines should be developed for the GCF and global programmes.

b) The Team was also informed that the CCF is being transformed into a new "Country Programme" and the development of a smaller and simpler Country Programme Document is part of overall UN harmonization and simplification objectives. There is an opportunity to transform the GCF as well as RCF documents into more results-oriented cooperation documents to ensure consistency and inter-linkages across the three levels.

c) Specific measures and guidelines should be developed for the design and programming of global projects and programmes that ensure transparency of decision-making, broader consultation and participation.

d) The design criteria for global programmes and GCF funded initiatives should be reviewed, and measures taken to ensure that they are applied to all GCF funded initiatives. Where there are exceptions, these should be clearly noted in the programme documents and decision records.
a) The rules, procedures and formula used for resource allocation and earmarking of global resources should be communicated to all concerned parties within UNDP and external partners.

e) Consideration should be given to greater decentralization of GCF resources. The funding and out-posting of policy specialist resources is a good start, as it deploys resources close to the point of demand. If the greater portion of demand is at the field or country level, then GCF policy services-related support should be decentralized. A formal policy on the centralization or decentralization of GCF-II resources should be developed.

f) In light of the discussion and findings in this report, GCF programming principles might be developed and combined with design criteria that would assure a greater coherence between objectives and design of the GCF and the design and implementation of specific initiatives. For example, strategic management or the programme approach should be used. Accountability for the GCF as a whole and for each funded initiative should be clearly defined, and linked to decision-making authorities, resources or capacity to implement and oversight/control. Other explicit principles (generally discussed in the GCF-II) might include the promotion of partnership approaches to development with special emphasis on ensuring UN system harmonization and coordination.

G. Execution and Implementation. More work will be required in examining the issue of global project execution and implementation. The following suggestions emerged from the limited review of this area.

a) The policy and practice of cost recovery (DEX fees) should be reviewed. The percentages charged to DEX projects - especially TTF initiatives - appear high. UNDP should consider reducing the charge and ensuring that a greater percentage of the global funds reach the target beneficiaries. An audit should be carried out on the collection and application of DEX fees, to ensure that they are used for their intended purposes.

b) The GLO/01/001 project (the recruitment and funding of policy specialists) is a special case and may require specially applied standards and rules.

c) UNDP should move away from the notions of DEX and NEX, and simply experiment, develop and select executing and implementation modalities that make sense, including the use of operational partnerships.

7.5 STRENGTHENING MANAGEMENT

Managing GCF-II is a daunting task. GCF is managed for the most part by BDP, but as the components are increasingly decentralized, tighter management arrangements need to be developed. The GCF is also only part of the BDP mandate, and any improvements to the GCF must be done in the context of overall BDP management reform. At least the GCF and all its components should be subjected to the same rigor and standards expected of regional and country programmes. Presented below are the main management recommendations. (Annex H of the report provides a series of detailed technical recommendations).

a) The concept and implementation of oversight insofar as it applies to the GCF should be overhauled, streamlined and simplified. Special attention should be given to the linking or inter-relationships of oversight accountability among the various mechanisms. Future GCF oversight should also include the recommendations of the recent UNDP 'Oversight Group'.

b) At the corporate level, the Advisory Committee should either be disbanded or restructured to make it an effective contribution to the GCF and to UNDP (i.e. the right membership, regular meeting agendas, a meaningful mandate).

c) Future GCF evaluations should be based on detailed reviews or evaluations of the various GCF components. This 'component level' evaluation should be done before the GCF-II evaluation, managed and synchronized much as it was done prior to the review of GCFl. Evaluations should be done against objectives, outputs, results and outcomes that are clearly set in the design document, and that are measurable.

d) A standard reporting/monitoring system, such as the SRF should be introduced and actively used in future programmes. Indicators should cover inputs, implementation processes, outputs and outcomes/impacts.
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c) All policy specialists and advisers in UNDP - whether funded by core posts, by regional or global programmes, or by other means -- should be managed strategically, and not piecemeal. The GLO/01/001 funded policy specialists should be seen as one component of the overall BDP or UNDP 'policy specialist' human resources base and as regular staff with career chances similar or equal to those of all other UNDP colleagues. Such career paths may be in the specialist categories (thus creating opportunities for higher-level policy specialist positions) or in the management categories (as is currently the case).

f) UNDP should carry out management, performance and financial audits of the GCF-II global projects, programmes and TTFs. Some emphasis should be given to 'value-for-money' audit in order to ensure that scarce global funds are utilized in the most cost-effective manner.

g) All global projects and programmes should be subject to standard corporate budgeting and financial management procedures and controls, as are applied, say, to projects at the country level. All project/programme budgets and inputs should be explicitly linked to outputs and results of the specific initiative as well as to overall GCF objectives, results and/or outcomes. All project/programme documents should contain a narrative description of the inputs. PAC approvals and minutes should include references to the inputs.

h) It is recognized that GCF funds only a portion of the new Regional Centres. However, there should be a single and consolidated budget for each regional centre. All sources and applications of funds and budgets for the new regional centres should be rationalized and simplified. The many sources of funding should be clearly recorded and accounted for in the context of the single RC financial operation and financial statement, clearly identifying GCF components. GCF related financial performance in terms of all types of expenditure should be reported regularly in order to obtain a complete picture of the cost of the operation.

i) Through audit, performance review or some other mechanism, the full costs of providing policy support and related services at the regional level should be determined. This would include all implementation and execution costs recovered by UNDP and COs in implementing GCF-funded initiatives, and in other costs (such as those charged by COs for providing space, travel and other services to SURFs/Regional Centers). Further, systems should be implemented that can capture full costs (cost accounting) which could then support analysis and reporting on the cost-benefit of such services as well as to support financial planning and forecasting.

j) Along with the organizational changes currently being explored by BDP, a comprehensive capacity assessment of the Bureau should be carried out. This may result in the production of a strategic/capacity development plan for the organization, clearly demonstrating all the capacities (including personnel and financial resources) that would be required for the cost-effective management of GCF.

k) Greater attention should be given to strengthening UNDP as a learning organization - that is, to invest resources in learning, professional development and allow sufficient time for country office staff to familiarize themselves with ongoing policy debates, research, studies and analysis. A part of this would be to develop a corporate commitment, incentives and means to strengthen the bridge building between its study initiatives and innovation of mainstream, corporate policy.

7.6 CONCLUSION

It is important to remember that GCF-II was implemented in a period of major organizational change not only in BDP, but also in other parts of UNDP; in a way, it became a vehicle for a number of UNDP transformation goals. The strengths and shortcomings of GCF-II should be viewed in this context. The evaluation findings present challenges and opportunities for UNDP and its many partners as it approaches the design of GCF-III. New actors have and will continue to find their way onto the stage of international development cooperation: e.g., European Union accession countries emerging as donors; global players such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa introducing new departures in South-South cooperation; large multinational corporations; global compact partnerships and the local private sector; and an expanding, increasingly active base of national and international civil society organizations.

In line with the organization's corporate objectives, in the past four years, GCF-II has contributed to UNDP development and transformation goals, notably in turning UNDP into a learning, knowledge-sharing organization. However, lingering questions on the
meaning and quality of upstream policy advice and the noted weaknesses in governance and management may combine to generate a perception that GCF serves as an exclusive facility for internal purposes only. If the next GCF phase is to serve UNDP corporate goals further, changes will be needed in the design, programming and management of the GCF facility. More fundamentally, GCF must define more sharply its niche for addressing truly global development issues of strategic importance to UNDP, and provide a clear strategy for enhancing the quality and effectiveness of UNDP work at the country level through global programmes.
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GCF-II Documents


Background Note for the GCF-II Advisory Committee (23 April 2003).


Global Country Cooperation Framework Strategic Considerations, internal document, undated.

Global Project Documents (series of GLO projects selected for the assessment. See Annex C)


Statement by Shoji Nishimoto, Assistant Administrator and Director, BDP, at the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board annual session, 2003, item 6, dated 12 June 2003.

148 Numerous internal GCF related documents, files and reports were reviewed by the Team, and the following lists only the main reports.
Various Internal Documents and Budget Reports:
GCFII Budget Information.
Holistic Overview of GCFII: Dimensions, Projects, Budget
Map of Intended Results for GCF II

Relevant BDP Reports and Documents:

Internal BDP Reports on the Activities of the Practice Areas

BDP Organizational Chart, April 2003.


HIV/AIDS Group, Corporate Strategy on HIV/AIDS, 2003,


Management Working Group/Team - Meeting Notes, (selected items)

Partnership Programme Annual Report for 2002: Overview of Corporate Results from the First Year


Transforming the Mainstream: Gender in UNDP.


Thematic Trust Funds - Objectives, Management Arrangements and Approval Procedures.


Various Internal Documents and Reports
BDP Retreat with the Administrator: 14 November 2003.
Policy Specialists - Draft Joint Memorandum to Resident Representatives by the Director), RBx/BDP Service Agreements - 2003.

SURF-related documents

Agreed Principles and Detailed Action Plan for the Merger of SURFs and Regional Programmes in Asia/Pacific, version 9.

Partnership Program Annual Report for 2002:
Overview of Corporate Results From the First Year


SURF Annual Reports, from West Africa, Bangkok, Kathmandu, Arab States, The Caribbean.
Strengthening Practice and Network Communities.
Work Plan for GLO/02/661.

General UNDP Documents

Assessment Report of the UNDP Oslo Governance

149. Many SURF reports were provided to the Team during the course of the separate SURF visits. The reports pertaining to the individual SURFs are not referenced here, but are referenced in the individual Mission Reports prepared by the Team and submitted to the Evaluation Office.
Centre, Evaluation Office, United Nations Development Programme, October 2003 Audit of Global and Inter-Regional Projects, Report # IAS0057, UNDP-OPAR, 16 May 2000


Global, Inter-Regional, Regional and Sub-Regional Programme of UNDP: Differentiated Rationales and Planning, Management and Oversight Arrangements.


Lopes, C. and Theisohn, T., Ownership, Leadership and Transformation, UNDP.


Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) documents.


Records of Discussions from the Executive Team, selected records from the past three years.
Statement by Elizabeth Lwanga, Deputy Director, RBA, January 2004, at Meeting of Joint Executive Boards.
The Administrator’s Statement at Glen Cove, New York.


UNCTAD-UNDP Global Programme on Globalization, Liberalization and SHD, with support from GCF-II (GLO/98/615 & 01/615).


Other Documents and Publications


World Bank, Influential Evaluations, Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank, 2004
ANNEX C: FINDINGS : Selected Global Projects

GLO/01/115. ENERGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GLOBAL PROGRAMME

Scope and Objectives

The programme was set up to strengthen the production and use of energy in ways that support and promote human development, economic growth, poverty reduction, social equity and environmental sustainability. Drawing upon post-UNCED and WSSD agreements to strengthen access to energy through services for poverty reduction, the UNDP global energy programme seeks to maximize commitment and action to the UNSG's "WEHAB" initiative in the five key thematic areas of Water, Energy, Health, Agriculture and Biodiversity in order to achieve a comprehensive approach towards sustainable development.

The objectives of the programme are to: 1) strengthen national policy frameworks to support energy for poverty reduction; 2) promote rural energy services; 3) promote clean energy technologies; and 4) increase access to investment financing. A fifth objective addresses cross-cutting activities for global advocacy and analysis. While the assessment did not explore this latter goal in depth, it should be noted that the programme has produced and documented in a fairly short time frame (two years) several tools and methodologies making UNDP more visible at the global level.

Funding and duration

GCF core funding for this programme was approved in stages during 2001 and 2002 under preparatory assistance at a level of $850,000 out of a total allocation to the energy sector of $2.3 million [$330,000 went to support of the WB/UNDP ESMAP project GLO/01/116]. As provided under UNDP financial rules, the project was used as the vehicle for budgetary purposes. Incremental budgetary revisions over the two years impeded implementation of activities and impacted unsatisfactorily upon COs resource expectations under the programme. Also, rollout of many initiatives did not occur well into 2002 due to protracted BDP/OPS negotiations on overhead costs. The programme's full phase commenced with another financial allocation of $1.050 in 2003 for a total of $1.90 million.

The delivery rate in 2003 was 95%, demonstrating the accelerated drawdown for programme activities. The initial $2.3 million of GCF core has leveraged
approximately $10 million in associated non-core from six bilateral donors through the Energy Thematic Trust Fund. This is a major achievement in that every dollar of core leveraged four dollars of non-core (4:1), which exceeded the envisaged GCF target of 2 to 1 BDP-wide. It also indicates the advantage of the design strategy pursued to align the project’s objectives precisely with the service lines of the energy TTF. The chief lesson from the programme and the TTF is that greater advocacy will be required with donors to overcome their tendency to geographically earmark non-core. This tendency relegates some COs to limited or no funding and to force BDP to forfeit the demand-side of the equation. To illustrate, during the first round, 187 applications were submitted and only 20 could be funded.

**Activities**

The programme carried out a variety of activities at the country, regional and global level that attempted innovative approaches but often yielded mixed results. These included inter alia launch of a sustainable energy network focusing on topical issues such as rural energy, women and energy, etc. and the development of three post-WSSD Partnerships. The SENetwork solicited funding that provided COs with consultants to collect case energy studies (50) for content portal contribution to the UNDP IntraNet. The 2003 ROAR review showed heavy underreporting of GEF support due to their non-TRAC funding, including the energy sector; however, data reports also indicated that COs were linking energy to rural poverty issues as a reference item within GEF criteria.

The WSSD support [Global Village Energy Programme (GVEP); public/private partnership with industry in six countries (Ghana, South Africa, China, Vietnam, Honduras, Morocco); and the UNEP/UNDP knowledge network for 10 Centers of Excellence (3 in Africa, 4 in Asia, 2 in Latin America, 1 in Arab States) that promotes South/South exchange on energy services and the development of three post-WSSD Partnerships. The SENetwork solicited funding that provided COs with consultants to collect case energy studies (50) for content portal contribution to the UNDP IntraNet. The 2003 ROAR review showed heavy underreporting of GEF support due to their non-TRAC funding, including the energy sector; however, data reports also indicated that COs were linking energy to rural poverty issues as a reference item within GEF criteria.

Meetings with the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) and the CO Environment unit in Kenya acknowledged the high quality of analytical support for conceptualizing rural energy links to poverty reduction, and establishment of a Centre, with UNIDO input, to promote cleaner production of SMEs to reduce pollution. A regional climate change/CDM [Clean Development Mechanism] workshop was also funded. However, Kenya benefited primarily from technical backstopping on environment/GEF matters, rather than on the energy side. Of the three CEA Environmental SURF Policy Advisers out-posted to Nairobi, the policy specialist Energy focal point for the GVEP TTF informed that the initiative required greater resources and that providing policy advice is a tough sell in the absence of money. On the other hand, it was noted that the Energy mandate is very focused, clear and supportive as opposed to the Environment and is esteemed as a good practice model despite the Advisers’ criticism of BDP in general.

**Implementation strategy and experience**

An experimental approach to decentralized management has proved effective in the practice area. Leadership for different components of the objectives linked to service line delivery is distributed among five task managers, not all of who fall under the Programme Manager’s reporting [i.e. performance appraisal] authority. An example is the management of objective 3 on clean emissions technologies by a GEF adviser who extracts knowledge on this thematic area from the GEF project portfolio. Task managers can issue instructions to OPS but only for their area and immediate objective. The approach has proved effective in avoiding fragmentation. The energy team meets twice weekly and has done so for two years and has constituted an effective programme mechanism from the time of the PAC process. This mechanism has incurred high transaction costs linked to its monitoring function but the design has achieved a focused review of results linked to expenditure and utilized the matrix management approach in an appropriate manner. Cross-practice participation by BDP in the energy sub-practice appears to have been weak.

Programme execution by UNOPS and the specific administrative services has been satisfactory but, as mentioned above, the funding dispute between OPS and BDP seriously undermined the pace of implementation by slowing commitment of resources that could ensure continuity of activities.

SURF Policy Advisers in Africa, Asia and Latin America have played a constructive role in backstopping in-country delivery and follow-up but had no financial authority as per the GCF design. The divorce of policy advice from money management was viewed as positive but reverting to the practice group for budget approval for travel and other administrative activities likely constrained field-based implementation.
It has been pointed out that the 12-month implementation structure is unrealistic and that the time frame encourages COs to use TTF resources for gap-filling rather than for value-added activities such as knowledge management. SURF Environmental Policy Advisers were very critical to proposal design, substantive review and prioritization despite their limited numbers and wide geographical coverage [2-Bangkok, 3-Nairobi, 1-Costa Rica, 1-Dakar (2004)]. Three Advisers are based at BDP/HQ, which includes the programme manager who only covers Energy. For the most part, COs did not benefit from capacity building by the policy specialists, which was not a priority goal in the project's design. Due to a lack of resource mobilization by the Environment TTF, the two TTF practice areas funds will be merged in 2004.

**Impact/outcomes**

In light of the seamless alignment of the programme's goals and TTF service lines, it is necessary to identify impact from a singular perspective. This is necessary because there remains a distinct tension between the practice area's view of results in fulfilling global-level objectives and the TTF's mandate to support CO level activities.

1) Impact at the global level is documented through the preparation and dissemination of books, brochures and reports on energy as a development issue financed through the global programme. As informed by one respondent, "all [documents] fulfill the global advocacy and analysis role of the GCF. GCF is the glue that binds." It was noted that impact could also be assessed through the WSSD global partnerships, in two of which UNDP has a leading role, and in support to portfolio reviews of core and non-core funded energy initiatives across UNDP at national and regional levels. Impacts at the country and regional level are identified through projects such as GVEP, but primacy is given to UNDP's ability to influence the global development dialogue on energy and to advocate on global energy issues. Without recourse to external partner institutions, which the schedule of the Assessment Team precluded, and cross referencing of global policy documents in the energy sector to investigate UNDP inputs, this self-assessment could not be corroborated. No general evaluation of the GLO energy programme (project) exists at this time.

2) It was suggested that the main impact of the Energy TTF has been the alignment with service lines and implementation for results by COs. Second, an energy and poverty nexus evolved that achieved some macro-policy impact on rural energy/informal economy sectors. Third, the TTF-fostered partnership development that yielded donor resources and trust in UNDP. Finally, in some cases, a national knowledge base was generated on such issues as mainstreaming rural energy into the PRSP process. However, although there is reporting on indicators to substantiate instances of such outcomes, evidence for full-scale claims is elusive. The three-year experience with the TTF mechanism did not meet expectations of COs or BDP because demand and supply of financial resources could not be balanced in a consistent way. The TTF appears to have given a more enhanced prioritization to the substantive orientation of UNDP by bringing focus around practice areas but was less satisfactory as a delivery mechanism.

The challenge remains that delay in GCF disbursements until 2002 suggests that impact of policy expertise on the energy programme cannot yet be demonstrated but leveraging of non-core by core funding did contribute to effective synergies and linkages.

**Contributions to GCF Objectives**

It is claimed that the programme's energy documents and outputs contribute to growth: equity and sustainability of the GCF and are linked to poverty reduction and environmental protection, and to global public goods through activities to protect and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere.

**Lessons Learnt and Future Orientation**

The practice team/policy advisers suggested the following challenges and concerns as opposed to a strict accounting of best practice/lessons learnt:

Management mechanism was complex and time consuming to set up but has produced synergies and teamwork that worked well. Introduction of matrix management through task managers for each service line promoted budget transparency distinct from programme resources.

Alignment of GLO Energy Programme to Energy TTF facilitated consistency in tracking, monitoring and reporting on energy issues.

There has been a 4:1 core to non-core resource mobilization in energy under the GCF umbrella to build programmes and partnerships.

The delay in programme implementation due to BDP/OPS corporate breakdown was detrimental and warrants greater attention to delivery concerns.
The presence of Policy Advisers in three regions was critical in building effective linkages with regional bureaus and country operations, and an expanded presence will be needed to address gaps in covering Eastern Europe and the Arab States regions.

Knowledge products and platforms have been financed through the global programme.

Failure to approve a timely resource allocation before the end of 2004 will impede programme momentum and credibility with external partners. Clear guidance is needed from senior management regarding the efficacy of the TTF mechanism given the incorporation of service lines into the MYFF. TTF sustainability is in question due to competition between TRAC and TTF within the donor community that could lead to reduction in core resources. This issue goes beyond BDP to corporate survival and need to strengthen alignment/balance of regional programmes with UNDP corporate priorities.

Reference Material
1. GLO/01/115 Preparatory Assistance and Programme Documents

GLO/01/319. INVESTING IN WOMEN

Scope and objectives
The purpose of the project was to ensure that gender issues were adequately addressed in the World Summit on Social Development. This was to be achieved by: (a) ensuring that gender issues were fully addressed in the final document of the preparatory conference on Financing for Development (FfD) and (b) building on this process to strengthen the networks and capacities of the women's economic justice movement to raise the profile of gender issues at the WSSD. It was also hoped that the increased attention to gender in the WSSD would provide a stimulus for gender issues to be incorporated into economic and financial planning in countries around the world.

Funding
UNDP contributed $45,000 as part of a larger UNIFEM/WEDO Programme on Gender and FfD. The project was used to fund the publication of the Gender Policy Briefing Kit and the organization of the high-level panel at the Monterrey Conference - including participants' travel costs.

Activities
The project involved the preparation of a Gender Policy Briefing Kit providing specific guidance on how to address gender in different sectors and at the policy and programme levels, and the organization of a high-level panel in which the messages from the Briefing Kit with respect to the key Conference topics were presented and discussed.

Implementation experience
The project was implemented by WEDO with the active participation of UNIFEM, which also contributed to the Briefing Kit. It did not involve the SURFs or the UNDP country offices. The panel was organized by UNDP.

The project design followed the GCF design criteria in that it was addressing a development challenge (the lack of attention to gender in economic planning and financial management) of concern to a significant number of countries and that was clearly rooted in current global systems and regimes. It was also an area where UNDP, in cooperation with its partners (UNIFEM and WEDO) had a clear comparative advantage. UNDP had previously helped coordinate a number of workshops and capacity building activities on gender budgeting and other central themes addressed by the project.

Outcomes/Impacts
The main outcomes were:

The gender perspectives on globalization were integrated into the FfD proceedings, culminating in a high-level panel discussion, chaired by the UNDP Administrator and UNIFEM Executive Director and involving ministers of finance and trade, feminist economists and women's NGOs. The UNDP Gender Policy Briefing Kit "Financing for Development" was produced and launched at the FfD conference. It was widely disseminated in the FfD conference and the subsequent WSSD.

No data is available on the influence of this project on the mainstreaming of gender in financing development. However, the Briefing Kit and the panel seem to have been well received and the following indicators suggest some multiplier effects and potential impacts resulting from the project:
The toolkit has subsequently been translated into Russian, French and Arabic at the request of regional or country bureaus that also covered part of the cost of translation and publication. Given the high demand for UNDP support on topics covered by the toolkit, UNDP has organized a number of training of trainers activities with leading economic institutions such as the Russian Institute of Management (under the President's Office). All of the participants were experienced trainers and most were economists and financial planners rather than gender specialists. The Team did not have access to information on how many training programmes were subsequently organized, who were the participants or what impacts the training might have had on the integration of gender into financial planning and budgeting in Russia. The Briefing Kit was subsequently mailed to all Country Offices and according to the Gender Group has been used extensively by the country offices "to support their work on poverty and macroeconomic policy with a gender perspective". The Team did not have access to any information on how widely the material had been used by the COs. However, country visits indicated that many COs would welcome this kind of material as they recognize the need to address gender concerns in many of their programmes. Japan has provided follow-up funding to produce a CD-ROM version of the Kit and to help develop further training material. Finland has also expressed interest in supporting UNDP's work on gender sensitive budgeting.

Contributions to GCF objectives

The activity contributed to the GCF dimensions of globalization, participation and growth.

Lessons Learnt

The project showed that modest financial support for carefully selected activities of other agencies can leverage significant resources and have a broad impact. UNDP has high credibility in fields such as gender, so that its support can be critical for ensuring high-level participation in activities such as the Monterrey panel discussion. It also shows there is a high level of demand from country offices and partner agencies for succinct, user-friendly advocacy tools on the gender dimensions of development issues. Finally, it is important to pursue, and have resources to support, the potential follow-up opportunities which frequently evolve from high-demand initiatives.

Reference Material

2. Response from the Gender Group to the self-assessment survey administered by the Independent Assessment Team.

GLO/01/616/C/11/56. URBAN MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (PHASE 4)

Scope and objectives

This is Phase 4 of an Urban Management Programme (UMP) whose first three phases were implemented during the 1986-2001 period. This will be the final phase and an exit strategy has been prepared. The objective of the UMP was to strengthen the capacity of governments and other stakeholders to develop pro-poor action plans through a focus on urban poverty reduction, urban environmental management, participatory urban governance and HIV/AIDS support at the local level. Gender mainstreaming was also a cross-cutting objective. The short-term objectives were:

- Pro-poor participatory urban governance
- Consolidating capacities of regional anchor institutions
- Knowledge management systems created and linked to complementary systems
- Strengthening capacity of local government to manage the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Funding, administration and duration

Phase 4 (2002-4) had a budget of approximately US$ 6.5 million. UNDP contributed $900,000 and this was leveraged 6 times from bilateral partners: UK, Switzerland and Sweden. The UMP also coordinates closely with the Public-Private Partnership for Urban Environment (PPPUE), based in Pretoria and many of the participating cities have been able to access PPPUE.

150. Phase One (1986-91) focused on research and the publication of results. During Phase Two (1992-96) the programme was decentralized through four regional offices in Africa, the Arab States, Asia and Pacific and Latin America. Phase Three (1997-2001) involved the creation of anchor institutions and city consultations were initiated in cooperation with UNDP/HABITAT. The World Bank was taking a leading role in Phase One and during Phase Two their involvement was downgraded to "associate status".

151. See Mid-term evaluation Section 1.3 (Post-Phase IV).
grant funding. As of January 2004 the programme had spent approximately US$ 4.5 million.

Activities

Phase 4 provides support to urban local governments in four thematic areas:

- Urban poverty reduction
- Urban environment management
- Participatory urban governance
- HIV/AIDS at the local level.

Given that this is the final phase, there is a strong focus on creating the institutional structures and other conditions to enable the activities to continue independently of UMP. The UMP has worked on more than 140 city consultations in over 50 countries in cooperation with the UNDP Regional bureaus in Ecuador, Abidjan, Johannesburg, Nairobi, New Delhi and Bangkok. By 2003 the consultative process had been institutionalized in more than 40 cities. The process of institutionalization is intended to change the way local governments operate, particularly with respect to inclusion, participation, transparency and other norms of good governance. Examples of the process include:

- **Tunisia**: the UMP promoted a city development strategy with key stakeholders. This included a social development pact for the Media, a local development pact for various low-income neighborhoods and an information/marketing strategy. Youth were given a central role.

- **Colombo, Sri Lanka**: the focus of the consultations was on poverty reduction. A city profile was prepared and community development councils were established to strengthen capacity building. Participatory budget initiatives are now underway in 13 cities.

- **Johannesburg, South Africa**: the city consultation and city development strategy are being consolidated with significant participation from the private sector. In several cities profiles have been completed and funds have been approved to strengthen the poverty focus of the integrated municipal development process.

- **Port of Spain, Trinidad**: the city consultation on solid waste management resulted in the finalization of the action plan using a participatory consultation process.

Implementation strategy and experience

The managers of the UMP believe that the nine-monthly Programme Review Committee meetings have been an important mechanism for keeping the programme on track and for strengthening governance. The programme works closely with UNDP Country Offices and they provide expert knowledge on local political, economic and institutional conditions in the municipalities and regions where the programme operates.

According to several SURF advisers met with by the Team, the demand for the municipal management support has steadily increased as experience has shown that many issues previously considered to be purely technical in fact involve important questions of governance. For example, the Trans-millennium urban transport corridor in Bogotá, that had previously been considered an engineering programme, was found to have critical governance issues relating to the regulation of public and private transport providers.

One of the challenges that UMP faces in Africa and perhaps some other regions is the continuing distrust by many government agencies and academics of the private sector. This is an added challenge for promoting the involvement of the private sector in the management and delivery of municipal services. A further complicating factor is that UNDP only records private partners when funds go directly through UNDP, so there is a significant under-reporting of the real level of private sector participation.

It was reported during one country visit that one of the challenges in developing a community of practice has been that UNDP tends to be very inward looking and is more concerned to develop its own capacity than in strengthening country agencies. UNDP is also reluctant to share knowledge. In a recent study that identified 187 best practices in municipal development it was found that only 9% of cases came from COs, emphasizing the importance of outward looking KM strategies. An innovative approach to knowledge creation on decentralization and municipal development in the LAC region involves the creation of knowledge on innovative projects which is then disseminated through "virtual knowledge fairs" and through strategic alliances. The 20 pilot projects that are underway have shown that a knowledge product on an innovative project can be created for less than $1,000.

---

152. Note, however, that interest in decentralization programs has been slow to develop in many, particularly the smaller, countries.

153. Virtual knowledge fairs were organized in Costa Rica on environment and in Bogotá on decentralization and municipal development. Both events emphasized the importance of creating specific cooperative agreements on follow-up between countries. Over 40 such agreements were created following the Bogotá fair.

154. Meeting with Democratic governance team in Panama.
One Local Government Ministry in Africa stated that while the implementation methodology was good, the overall programme design was too rigid and had not been able to adapt to the new political environment following recent local elections. The LogFrame was also felt to be too complicated and inflexible. They would also have liked UNPD to have played a more proactive role in coordination among the different donor agencies as there is little cooperation and communication among donors. Despite these specific concerns, UNDP is a trusted partner and the Ministry (and government in general) is very happy to have UNDP coordinating programmes.

A general challenge in Africa, and some other regions, is that unstable political situations mean that much institutional development and capacity-building work is lost - or put on hold for long periods - due to political breakdown or radical changes in the political environment.

In Latin America it has proved a challenge to interest COs in decentralization programmes, as staff are overworked and this is a low priority area. As a result many TTF and PPPUE funding opportunities have not been taken up by COs. Decentralization has traditionally received a particularly low priority in smaller countries as there is a strong tradition of highly centralized government and they do not see the need for decentralization.

### Outcomes/Impacts

No systematic evaluation of the UMP outcomes and impacts has yet been conducted although extensive documentation is available on the implementation of the activities conducted in each city and region. A Mid-Term Evaluation and Forward-Looking Assessment of Phase IV was conducted by the Development Planning Unit of University College London in October 2003. However, the DPU team did not undertake any field visits and the assessment was based on a desk review relying almost exclusively on UMP documents. The main findings of the DPU evaluation are summarized in Table C.1. The main conclusions with respect to the 5 main objectives were as follows:

1. **Pro-poor participatory urban governance is practiced by participating cities:**

   City consultations were conducted in over 130 cities and actions plans (“institutionalization”) was achieved in more than the planned 30 cities. However, there was little evidence of policy impact on the PRSP or UNDAF process and only limited influence on government urban policies (influence was mainly in Asia and LAC).

   There are a number of examples where UMP programmes have been scaled-up to the national, sub-national or regional levels, including: Lebanon, Tunisia, Sri Lanka, India, Thailand and Burkina Faso.

2. **Capacities of regional anchor institutions consolidated.**

   Workshops and follow-up activities organized but many of the anchor organizations still not actively involved in implementation. Knowledge materials and strategies developed for all regions but the quality of the content of the KM systems was variable.

   The anchor institutions have been successful in helping launch campaigns for secure land tenure in all regions.

3. **Consolidation of UMP knowledge management systems with complementary global KM initiatives**

   Global and regional web-sites were put in place in all regions but many were not updated regularly and (as indicated above) the quality of the content was variable.

   All regions produced a steady flow of publications but the Team did not find any assessment of the utilization or impacts of the publications. As of October 2003 work was still under way on the completion of the KM tool.

   There were some indications that the UMP had influenced the urban policies of global partners. For example, it is claimed that as a result of the global partners retreat in May 2002 a number of urban policy tools were developed. Many partners were actively involved in the launch of the UNDP-HABITAT Campaign.

4. **HIV/AIDS crisis and urban management capacity building.**

   As of October 2003 most of the activities were just getting under way, although two planned activities had been launched in each of four countries.

---

155. In the Panama CO for example, the program officer responsible for decentralization also has to cover poverty, the NHDR, gender, private sector development, housing and resource mobilization.

156. Information provided by the UMP team leader. It was not possible to independently assess these scaling-up activities.

157. Mid-term review Section 2.2.2 (under knowledge management) "However, it is notable that the quality of overall information systems appears to be weak."
5. Mainstreaming gender in urban management.

There was a specific focus on gender in products from at least 8 countries in Asia, Africa and LAC. However, there is no evidence presented to show that gender has been systematically mainstreamed in all programmes and documents. The only area in which gender had been systematically mainstreamed was in the HIV/AIDS programme.

The mid-term review also reports that the Brussels Brainstorming Session held with programme staff and donor agencies in October 2003 expressed some reservations about the readiness of the programme to ensure its sustainability after its transformation to the Urban Millennium Partnership at the end of Phase IV. The concerns related, among other things, to the capacity of the regional centers and anchor institutions to continue to provide the required momentum.

The self-assessment questionnaire completed as part of the GCFII Independent Evaluation identified the following additional results/outputs:

- Participatory budgeting has been promoted in Senegal and South Africa.
- Networks of practitioners have been established around already existing institutions in many countries. Some of the most important include: the African Network of Urban Management Institutions and the Near East and Northern Africa Urban Forum. All anchor institutions are now self-sustaining and do not depend on UMP funds.
- A methodology for tackling HIV/AIDS at the local level is being finalized.

**Influencing the policy of other donor agencies**

SIDA has used the UMP experiences extensively in Africa: the Lake Victoria regional City Development Strategy activities supported by SIDA are based on UMP experiences. More recently, SIDA has agreed to follow-up on HIV/AIDS City Consultations being held in eight locations. The World Bank included the preliminary results of the UMP City Consultations in the recent WB publication on HIV/AIDS at the local level.

Following the City Consultation, DFID provided follow-up funds in Colombo for a three-year activity with Colombo City Council to develop policies and programmes for urban poverty reduction.

In addition to providing significant financial support, a number of bilateral donors are also attending the Programme Review Committee meeting chaired by UNDP every nine months. During the current Phase bilateral partners have leveraged approximately seven times the original UNDP contribution from the GCF. UMP is currently being restructured to transform into the Urban Millennium Partnership and DFID and Sweden have already expressed interest to support this process financially and have also offered to participate in joint missions and to contact other donors for additional resource mobilization.

The World Bank also acknowledged the relevance of the UMP network and funded the extension of City Consultations as City Development Strategies (CDS) in 7 cities: Cuenca (Ecuador), Santo Andre, (Brazil), Tunis, (Tunisia), Shenyang (China), Colombo (Sri Lanka), Bamako (Mali) and Johannesburg (South Africa).

**Contribution to GCF objectives**

The programme addresses the areas of globalization and decentralization with a strong focus on the development of participatory approaches at various levels.

**Lessons learnt and future directions**

According to the self-assessment the following lessons and issues, all of which are consistent with the findings of the present evaluation, have emerged:

- The scaling-up process has legitimized City Consultations as a participatory methodology. The tools developed have facilitated the creation of partnerships.
- Knowledge Management is an important decision-making tool.
- Partnerships must be strategically developed around specific goals.
- Creating partnerships with non-UN agencies has strengthened the programme and broadened its knowledge and institutional base.
- The involvement of UNDP Country Offices has been critical to the programme's success.
- The involvement of other UN agencies such as the UNAIDS group has been critical.

**Conclusions**

In the opinion of the Team, the Urban Management Programme has the potential to make an important contribution to improving the access of the urban poor
to municipal services. The City Consultation methodology seems to have developed a mechanism for forging alliances with key government, private sector and donor agencies and has facilitated the preparation of urban action plans in 40 or more cities. Although the available evidence does not permit a systematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE/OUTPUT</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Pro-poor participatory urban governance practiced by citizens in specified developing countries** | • 138 city consultations, many with action plans  
• Little participation in PRSP/UNDAF process  
• Some policy influence in Asia and LAC |
| • Strengthened capacity of local governments for pro-poor participatory governance |  
• Pro-poor action plans approved and implemented |
| • Pro-poor action plans approved and implemented | • To a limited extent: 6 cities in LAC, 8 in Asia and 2 in Africa |
| **2. Capacities of regional anchor institutions consolidated** | • Many major anchor institutions not yet involved in implementation  
• Workshops and follow-up meetings held in all regions |
| • Strengthened capacity of anchor institutions to implement and scale-up action plans | • KM materials and strategies being developed in all regions.  
• Excellent systems and distribution in LAC, not known for other regions. |
| • Establishment of knowledge management systems in all anchor institutions | • Anchor institutions have capacity to advocate for and provide technical assistance in pro-poor urban governance |
| • Anchor institutions have capacity to advocate for and provide technical assistance in pro-poor urban governance | • Support for urban governance and secure tenure launched in all regions.  
• HIV/AIDS partnerships in Africa. |
| **3. Consolidation of UMP knowledge management systems with complementary global KM initiatives** | • A global and regional network of information, experts, practitioners and policy makers |
| • A global and regional network of information, experts, practitioners and policy makers | • Global and regional web sites in place but not expanded or updated regularly.  
• Steady production of publications in most regions and regular global newsletter  
• Data base in most regions but several are not yet electronic |
| • Analysis and synthesis of lessons learnt | • KM tool near completion and training manual to be prepared  
• Partial documentation and dissemination of key issues. |
| • Analysis and synthesis of lessons learnt | • Increased global influence on the urban-related policies of external support agencies and enhanced awareness of urban management issues. |
| • Increased global influence on the urban-related policies of external support agencies and enhanced awareness of urban management issues. | • Improved urban management policies and practices through increased coordination with complimentary global programmes and UNDP initiatives |
| • Improved urban management policies and practices through increased coordination with complimentary global programmes and UNDP initiatives | • All regions involved in UNDP-HABITAT Campaign launch |
| **4. HIV/AIDS crisis and urban management capacity building** | • Capacity of local governments and urban actors to respond to HIV/AIDS epidemic strengthened in 8 cities |
| • City consultation process implemented and city action plans developed by local governments and urban actors in 8 cities | • Activities just beginning  
• Small number of leaders trained  
• Planned activities launched in a few countries. |
| • Knowledge, experience and lessons learnt from the city consultation process analyzed and documented | • 2 planned activities already conducted in each of 4 regions. |
| **5. Mainstreaming gender in urban management** | • Gender mainstreamed in all UMP and project reporting activities.  
• All HIV/AIDS products specifically focus on gender.  
• Specific gender products in most regions. |
| • Gender mainstreamed in all UMP and project reporting activities. | **Source:** Urban Management Programme: Mid-Term Evaluation October 2003. This was a desk review based on UMP publications complemented by phone calls.
assessment of the extent to which the UMP is achieving its five development objectives, a large number of case studies are available to demonstrate potential impacts. However, most city programmes have been operating for less than two years and it is still too early to assess the impacts and urban policy and access to services of a fully operating programme.

The UMP is to be congratulated for having developed a systematic exit strategy. However, the Mid-Term Evaluation suggests that many of the institutions tasked with ensuring the continuity of the city programmes after December 2004 (when UMP ends) are still relatively weak and during the remainder of 2004 will require considerable capacity development support to prepare them to take over the programme.

Reference material
1. Self-assessment questionnaire.
2. Reports from Team meetings with SURFs, CO Office staff and government agencies.

GLO/02/618. DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PRACTICE PROJECT

Scope and objectives

The purpose of the project is to complement the TTF with resources that are designed to support the underlying principles of assistance to democratic governance and conflict resolution, specifically participation in political and civic life, inclusion of the poor in matters of public policy development and accountability, especially of public office holders to the demands and priorities of the poor. The project provides support to each of the six service lines (see below) as well as global practice management and agenda setting at the level of the overall governance practice. The objectives and targets are set out in the results framework which identifies seven main outputs: (i) Practice leadership and agenda setting; (ii) Advocacy and communication; (iii) Knowledge management; (iv) Support to country offices; (v) Partnerships; (vi) Professional development; and (vii) Resource mobilization.

Funding, administration and duration

The project was approved in November 2002 for 15 months with a budget of $3,417,120. The project was directly implemented by BDP (DEX). The overall Governance Programme receives funding from both the global projects, and the Thematic Trust Fund. Some service lines are funded exclusively from one of these two sources, while others, such as Electoral Systems receive funding from both. The TTF is intended to fund shorter-term innovative and catalytic activities while the Global Projects are intended to support longer-term processes. The evaluation found that the two sources of funding are combined in a clear and logical way to support a coherent development strategy for the practice area.

The project includes six service lines:
- Strengthening legislatures
- Electoral systems and processes
- Local governance and decentralization
- Access to information
- Access to justice and human rights
- Public administration reform

The project included some 15 intended outputs (building and populating knowledge networks, direct support to country offices and SURFs, conferences and related events, provision of policy advice etc); and some 70 distinct activities.

Implementation strategy and experience

The Results Framework presents a clear definition of intended outputs and activities that in their totality propose a comprehensive strategy for efficiently utilizing the resources to cover the objectives of the six service lines. The framework does not, however, identify the impacts or outcomes to which the outputs are intended to contribute. A virtual PAC was conducted during the week of 20-27 September 2002 and recommendations were incorporated into the project design to strengthen: the incorporation of experiences from country and regional initiatives (to complement global knowledge), focus on cross-cutting practice building; and to define in more detail the strategy for incorporating external partners in the different sub-practice areas.

The identification of six clearly defined service areas proved a useful planning tool, both to define the often nebulous concept of governance and also to indicate what services were and were not provided. This helped give the programme a sharper focus.

An effective, and well-received planning tool was the survey of Resident Representatives in Asia that mapped their attitudes to the six service lines and to the overall design of the Governance Practice Area. Most Resident

159. As of October 2002 the governance network included 527 subscribers from the poverty network, 425 from MDGs and 425 from gender.
Representatives consulted with government and partners before responding. Many indicated that they found the instrument very useful and they planned to replicate it for other service lines. There was agreement in principle to replicate the survey with RBEC in the Europe and CIS country offices but this has been postponed at least temporarily due to 2004 budget cuts.

The project document does not define the role of the Oslo Centre (funded under the TTF) through which many of the cutting edge activities were designed and delivered.160

Outcomes/Impacts

Given the coordinated way in which the Global Project and TTF funds are combined, it is not possible to make an independent assessment of the outcomes and impacts produced solely by the GLO component of the GCF. The following initial indicators of outcomes and impacts of the programme/project were proposed by the Practice Team:

The project has helped to establish the democratic governance practice. The knowledge codification and networking, policy development, policy advisory and alignment aspects of UNDP in this area were all largely supported by this project.161

The project, in coordination with the TTF has helped to shape the more assertive stance that UNDP is taking as an advocate for democratic governance, particularly as a key means to achieve the MDGs.162

The project has contributed to the alignment of democratic governance with UNDP's institutional goals as defined in the Strategic Results Analysis of the DGPNet over the last 12 months found that of the 122 queries posted on the DGPNet from 1 January-30 December 2003, 25 or approximately 20% were cross-posted with one or more other networks and the figures are trending higher so far for the DGPNet for 2004.

The project has helped leverage global funding for cost-sharing programmes that advance the same aims.163

This is probably the practice area with most success in developing partnerships that have involved both significant cost-sharing and collaborative development of programmes.164

All of the service lines have contributed to the promotion of the MDGs both through raising awareness and by helping create conditions for the conducting and dissemination of national, and increasingly sub-national, MDG programmes.

In the opinion of the Team these are all reasonable claims supported by available evidence.

No systematic evaluation studies have yet been conducted to assess programme impacts and to determine the extent to which observed changes can be attributed to the effects of the projects. However, a number of documents such as the Governance TTF Report for May 2003 provide specific examples of the contributions the different service lines can make. It seems very probable that such areas of support as that provided to legislatures in Timor Leste or Paraguay, or the support to development of electoral systems in countries such as Lesotho, Cambodia, Mali and Kenya have been extremely useful; but the challenge is to isolate the contribution of these specific areas of support from all of the other concurrent activities and to assess their long term effects. The analysis is made more difficult by the fact that GCF’s strategy is to cooperate with and support other agencies so that it is rarely possible to identify the unique contribution of the GCF support.

Contribution to GCF objectives

The project document does not refer directly to the four GCF objectives, but the project focuses primarily on the participation objective.

Lessons learnt and future directions

The programme is demand-driven and it is planned to continue with the same service lines until a clear demand arises for new services or it is decided to drop one or more lines due to lack of demand.

It is expected that there will be an increase in demand for support in the areas of decentralization and elections. Local governance is proving a useful entry point for a number of initiatives such as the organization of local level MDG activities. Potential new areas

160. The Oslo Governance Centre is described in Section 4 of the report under global advocacy, together with the Rio Centre, HDRO, and ODS.

161. In the opinion of the Team this is confirmed by the fact that Governance is now a dynamic practice area.

162. Examples of how this has been achieved include leveraging partnerships so as to extend the reach of the program and obtain access to a wider pool of expertise, and developing practice notes for each service line that have reached external audiences as well as CO staff.

163. For example, $1.6 million from Germany and Norway for the DGTTF and $15 million from Sweden for the Hurist project.

164. See Annex C for a discussion of the partnerships developed by the Urban Management Programme.
include water governance and the creative use of regulatory mechanisms. Goals for 2004 include strengthening links between the service lines and strengthening links to other practice areas. At present the strongest link is to crisis-related programmes.

A number of challenges were identified:

The short time frame makes it difficult to assess progress towards the ambitious long-term goals set by UNDP. The changing expectations within UNDP as to what a practice area should be make it difficult to plan and to assess performance. Although the primary purpose of the project is to promote global objectives, there are continual pressures to respond to country and regional priorities. A constant challenge is defining and maintaining the appropriate balance among these competing demands.

Reference Material

1. Project Document.

GLO/02/661. IMPROVING DELIVERY OF KNOWLEDGE-BASED ADVISORY SERVICES

Scope and objectives

The objective of the project is to help developing countries benefit from global knowledge on critical dimensions of sustainable human development to reduce poverty and human inequity through the promotion and strengthening of UNDP’s knowledge-based advisory services in the thematic areas covered by the GCF. This would be achieved by introducing a new Practice Architecture that would maximize the delivery of timely, high-quality knowledge-based services to programme country governments in the priority support areas covered under the GCF.

The project seeks to complement the work of the knowledge networks, which essentially focuses on virtual connections and knowledge sharing, with group events and other capacity development initiatives related to building UNDP’s Communities of Practice. This includes Mutual Support Missions related to policy advisory services, Practice events, and promotion knowledge codification activities.

Funding, administration and duration

The $1 million approved for 2002-3 was administered directly by BDP (DEX). Some $540,000 was spent up to December 2003 and the remaining $460,000 is scheduled to be spent in 2004. It is hoped an additional $500,000 may also be raised for 2004. The project promotes participation and. Consequently, the SURFs will have an active role in deciding how the remaining funds should be used. It was projected that $480,000 would be spent on personnel (international consultants, $120,000; and travel, $360,000), and $420,000 for training.

Activities

There are a total of 12 knowledge and practice networks financed under this project (see Table C.2). In addition, the project also supported the eight SURF networks. The project was intended to produce four main outputs:

Group events: meetings to contribute to UNDP policy product and service development.
Moderated network discussions: group discussions are convened by knowledge and network members to contribute to UNDP policy, product and service development.
Knowledge building: through scholarships, research assignments, staff publications, staff exchanges, participation in advisory missions and other learning opportunities.
Community building: visits to Country Offices to promote and expand practice and network membership.

Implementation strategy and experience

A practice architecture was designed with assistance from McKinsey & Co. to build practice communities. This resulted in the conversion of six UNDP knowledge networks - governance, poverty reduction, environment, 165. The project document referred to the four development dimensions defined in the original GCF II documents. However, these four dimensions have since been replaced by the practice areas that our now considered the guiding principles for GCF II and many practice managers informed the Team that they no longer take the dimensions into consideration in the programme planning. However, the four dimensions are still referred to in some documents so the "Dimension-Practice Area Disconnect" can be a source of confusion.
ICT, HIV/AIDS and Crisis Prevention and Recovery (the latter was still in the process of creation) - into Practices. Each practice network was to be supported by dedicated and experienced staff, who would anchor the Practice. Members would include practitioners (Resident and Deputy Representatives and Country Office Staff) and HQ staff involved in each area.

The emphasis was on practice community building combining electronic communication with face-to-face interactions through group events, knowledge building through scholarships, exchanges etc and through visits by anchor staff to Country Offices. The project tries to allocate as much money as possible to the Country Offices to actively involve them in the networks. The project management believes that one of the most effective ways to do this is by funding mutual support missions that create buy-in and help promote programme cadres and a larger consultant and advisory resource pool. GCF pays for knowledge creation functions including: workshop costs, resource persons for network discussions, travel and allowances for knowledge building activities (scholarships, research assignments etc) and community building (visits to country offices etc) and BDP pays for management time. Although only $20,000 is given to smaller SURFS (more to larger ones) these funds are important as they are the only discretionary resources that the SURFs control.

In contrast to many practice development strategies that build on existing communities of practice, UNDP was creating new communities by inviting people who had similar work responsibilities, but who were not members of communities to join and create a community. Due to considerations of time and cost, the main form of interaction for many network members was limited to electronic communication.

Some of the mechanisms used to promote participatory governance include:

- Extensive consultation on the project documents, usually through virtual PACs.
- Six-monthly review of progress and issues covering group events, practice network activities, and knowledge activities. This is very time consuming, particularly as there are no standard reporting formats, and there are delays in receiving reports but it is considered a useful mechanism.

During the country visits, Team members were able to obtain feedback on the networks from SURF and UNDP Country Office staff in all regions. While many people regularly used the networks and found them of high quality and directly relevant to their work, a number of criticisms were expressed:

Many Country Office staff told the Team they were too busy to take advantage of the networks even though they recognized that much of the information would be useful to them. Some also complained that there was too much material and that the quality of much of the material was not too good. It was stated that staff evaluations take into account their contributions to the networks so that many people feel pressured to write something - even if they do not have anything important to say. While some staff found the inclusion of material from all parts of the world to be interesting, others complained that this meant that a high proportion of the material was not of direct relevance to them. There was a frequent request for the facilitators to include filters to screen out material not relevant to particular countries or regions.

It was frequently stated that staff had never received any training in how to use the networks and that consequently it was difficult to navigate. For example, several said they had difficulty in finding the consolidated replies.

Having to communicate in English is a strong disincentive to many staff. Some said that if they wish to participate in the discussions they have to have their English dictionary by their side, which makes network participation very time-consuming. This also means that there is much less material published on regions such as Latin America and West Africa, again making the network less interesting to many people from these regions.

Outcomes/ Impacts

As with all other Global Projects, a Log-Frame based Results Framework was included in the project document defining the intended outputs, the activities through which the outputs would be achieved and the resource allocation. Also in common with other projects, no results from this framework were available to the Team for use in this evaluation. However, the project has produced other kinds of performance indicators such as network usage analysis, feedback from users (both testimonials and ratings), and documentation of examples of useful support.

Basic quantitative indicators are produced every 6 month. The report produced in June 2003 presented the following findings:

Between January 2000 and June 2003 the total number of subscriptions to the SURF and global knowledge networks increased from 261 to 8741. Over the same period the number of referrals...
fielded by the SURFs and networks increased from 753 to 1672.
Over the same period the number of participants in best-practice events per six month period increased from 184 to 1139.

The networks are subject to two comprehensive assessments by users. First, the BDP Policy Support Coordination Unit undertakes yearly surveys (which can be responded to anonymously). Second, every year UNDP undertakes a survey of HQs Products and Services and every BDP Practice network is included in it. Results to date have been positive. Presumably only people with a certain level of interest will bother to send comments, so almost nothing is known about people who do not find the networks useful. Most of the comments are very positive although many people include suggestions for improvement. However, even if there is a bias towards positive responses, the fact that more than 100 people sent in responses in July 2003 is an indication that the networks are becoming a useful tool and part of UNDP culture.

Networks with a paid facilitator have grown from the original 6 to 12 (not all in BDP). The approach has attracted interest from many other agencies, including the World Bank and bilaterals and BDP believes that the practice network has become a unique UNDP product.

In the opinion of BDP the most successful networks in terms of participation, utility and (in the case of BDP networks) the generation of external funding are the Democratic Governance, MDG and Management Practice Networks. Examples of the practical utility of the Democratic Governance Network include:

- Compilation of experiences in organizing elections in post-conflict societies - to be used in Iraq.
- Legislation concerning MPs "crossing the floor" requested by Guyana.
- Advice to Office of the President in Sri Lanka on the services UNDP has provided to Offices of the President in other countries. The results of the survey, which was completed in 48 hours, was then taken up by UNDP/Afghanistan.

**Contribution to GCF objectives**

These four dimensions are not used as a planning tool. Most planning is done around the practice areas as this has direct operational implications.

**Lessons learnt and future directions**

The lessons presented in this section are based on extensive field interviews with SUR and UNDP CO staff in all regions, meetings with HQ staff, analysis of an e-mail survey with Resident Representatives and Policy Advisers, participation by Team members in networks and analysis of testimonials.

1. Networks need to be moderated and facilitated to ensure quality control and promote participation by the practice community. Moderation has been effectively achieved by the networks but it is important to recognize that it is expensive as a full-time moderator is ideally required for each network.

2. The consolidated reply system has worked well, but it is important to ensure that comparative experience is global (real time information on any development issue). Neutrality of responses is also essential as well as ensuring that all information is thoroughly digested (knowledge services).

3. Networks are becoming an important product line as evidenced by the high level of donor interest and references (World Bank, Harvard).

4. Language issues are a challenge. The country visits made by the Team found that in Latin America many Country Office staff are reluctant to contribute to the networks because they must write in English. This is a vicious circle as it results in less material being produced on Latin American countries so the networks are of less interest to Latin American subscribers. Some sub-networks do operate in local languages. Funds available for translation but have not been used.

5. Other findings:
   a. Practice networks have taken off and usage is increasing overall.
   b. Networks are not just electronic but must promote direct interaction among people. The most successful networks focus on direct face-to-face interactions and only use electronic communication as one tool. However, this is clearly difficult and expensive to achieve with network members working in many different countries.
   c. A major target audience has been national staff and networking offers opportunities for CO interaction with other country offices and with a wider range of UN colleagues.
   d. Many HQs managers still do not understand the democratic, participatory nature of networks and still believe communication should be hierarchical.

---

166 In the analysis of the more than 100 testimonials sent to network managers in June 2003, it was found that four messages were sent in French but none in Spanish - suggesting that LAC staff who do not feel comfortable writing in English may not feel comfortable using the networks.
There is still a widespread image that the networks are managed from New York and are organized for the benefit of HQ.
e. It is difficult to sell the idea of knowledge contributions to the common good without direct personal benefits. Consequently it is difficult to convince busy country office staff to contribute to the networks. Recognition (seeing ones name in print) is often a good incentive.

Reference Material

1. Third work plan for GLO/02/661.
2. Internal testimonials from network users December 2003.
3. Network performance. 2/18/04. Tables showing referrals fielded, network subscription, CO support, and best practice event participants.

GLO/02/703. PROMOTING SOCIAL POLICY DIALOGUE

Scope and Objectives

The objective of the project is to generate and share knowledge and lessons on the design and implementation of policies to promote social policy dialogue and social development. It is intended to provide windows for developing countries to benefit from global knowledge on critical dimensions of sustainable human development, through the exchange and dissemination of practical policy lessons among development practitioners, government officials, development agencies, academia and civil society.

There appears to be some overlap with GLO/01/518 Support to Poverty Reduction as the description of both projects is very similar. A memorandum intended to clarify the difference stated that the Social Policy Dialogue project focuses on social policies such as safety nets, the issue of care, and social inclusion/exclusion while 01/518 concentrates on more hard-core macro-economic issues. The latter project was not included in the sample of projects selected for the independent evaluation so the Team is not able to comment on this clarification. ***

Funding, administration and duration

The project budget of $630,000 was administered by UNOPS at the 10% AOS rate. The budget was originally approved for 18 months (through December 2003) but in November 2003 a proposed revision was approved to carry over $198,601 through December 2004.

Activities

The programme started in June 2002. The main activities were:

- Synthesis and publication of existing studies by organizations such as UNRISD and International Labour Organization (ILO), and operational experiences such as the work of UNDP Chile and other agencies on social protection.
- In-depth studies reviewing all of UNDP’s poverty programmes and experiences. For example: A review of micro-finance experience and analysis of linkages to macro-policies (scaling up).
- Developing linkages to the work of other agencies and to other websites.
- Knowledge management activities to generate and share experiences and lessons. This is usually done through conferences and workshops.
- Initiating policy debates and dialogues.

Implementation strategy and experience

The project cooperates closely with the SURFs in developing strategies for sharing knowledge among institutions working in the area of social policy. For example, the SURF Poverty Specialist in Kathmandu helped create linkages for knowledge sharing with national and regional research and policy institutions; institutions; the macroeconomic specialists in Bratislava cooperated on the social exclusion paper; a number of country offices contributed to the review paper on UNDP’s support to poverty reduction strategies; and RBA and several country offices cooperated on the synthesis paper on infrastructure-led employment in Africa.

Linkages were also established with other institutions and organizations, through developing networks, preparing publications and disseminating information through conferences, publications and web sites. The project also provided rapid responses to queries and requests from government agencies and other organizations. The approach was to tailor findings to different audiences. For example a presentation was prepared for the government of India on employment programmes in India.

One of the challenges facing the project was that UNDP
does not have well-established mechanisms for horizontal integration such as cross-practice linkages. The project had some success in promoting cross-network discussions on some of the social policy issues but no systematic assessment of the effectiveness of these cross-linkages has been conducted.

Outcomes/ Impact

As this is a knowledge-based project, it must be assessed by its influence on social development policies and not by conventional measures of activities and outputs. At this point there is little systematic information available on the programme's influence. The evaluation team was informed that the practice area hopes to conduct an assessment of programme impacts, but it should be noted that no systematic impact evaluation has yet been planned, even though the programme is scheduled to end in December 2004.

The following are the intended outputs, and, where possible, examples are presented of the targeted types of influences and impacts.

1. The production of analytical, empirical and policy studies at the global, regional and country level that contribute to policy formulation on critical issues of social policies, particularly on social exclusion, social dimensions of globalization and social protection. These would be disseminated through reports, books, policy notes and other documents. Progress to date include: a publication on Employment and Social Exclusion, within the context of the PRSP, and a review of the microfinance experience and analysis of linkages to macro-policies (scaling up). At this point no systematic information is available on the influence of these publications, although there are indications that they may have influenced organizations such as the World Bank and national governments in the formulation of social policy in particular countries.

2. In the area of PRSP, UNDP has been involved in organizing broad-based consultations in many countries. It is believed that some of the outputs (publications and follow-up dissemination workshops and electronic communication) of the project have provided inputs to the NGOs in bringing in the issues of social policies into debates and dialogues. This has happened in Cambodia, Ghana, Vietnam, and Zambia, among other countries. Thus the project may have contributed to the creation of a process and a political space for civil society to participate in the PRSP process. It is also believed that the project has contributed to specific social concerns being incorporated into the broad-based poverty reduction strategy debates and dialogues in Cambodia, Ghana, Vietnam, and Zambia. Social policy issues have been prominently included in PRSPs of these countries and also of Lithuania and Tanzania. It is should be noted, however, that it is difficult to attribute the inclusion of these issues to the GCF-supported publications.

3. A system and structure of knowledge base and information network on social policies is now in place in UNDP and its contribution in terms of content, maintaining and updating, establishing linkages ensured on a systematic basis. It is believed that this has contributed to a broader awareness of the social policy issues.

4. The programme has been successful in developing cross-practice linkages. It has been possible to engage colleagues from other practice areas, UNDP COs and SURFs in this interaction. For example, for the social exclusion paper, relevant issues were raised in the Poverty Network and a lively debate followed with active participation from other networks, which helped the development of the paper and its suggested policy options. However, no systematic evidence was available to the Team on the extent of these cross-practice exchanges or their impacts on social policy.

Contribution to GCF objectives

It is claimed that the project has contributed to the GCF goals of globalization and economic crises and sustainable human development.

Lessons learnt

The following lessons, all of which seem plausible were suggested by the project team:

There is a compelling case for integrating social policies with economic policies. This case can be made by the production and dissemination of policy studies based on a synthesis of existing research and operational experience. An effective form of engagement with all key stakeholders is essential in order to influence the incorporation of these issues into policy making and planning. Knowledge management and knowledge networks are an essential component of the influence process. Engagements at every level with SURFs and UNDP Country Offices are a key for achieving the desired results of a knowledge-based project.
Reference Material


GLO/02/G07. INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK FOR TRADE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN DJIBOUTI

Scope and Objectives

The purpose of the project was to conduct a phase one diagnostic trade integration study [DTIS] in Djibouti to serve as a basis for integrating/mainstreaming trade into national development planning and a poverty reduction strategy (PRSP). UNDP is one of the six cooperating agencies responsible for managing components of the Revamped Integrated Framework (IF) for Trade Related Technical Assistance to the LDCs [GLO/03/G01]. This project was established as a non-pilot, country-specific entity under the global umbrella project for which UNDP manages the multi-donor Trust Fund ($23 million supported by 17 donors in 21 LDCs), leads DTIS activities where the WB is not present and coordinates/facilitates country-level DTIS capacity development.

Funding and Duration

The project was established separately in 2002 to contribute GCF II resources ($300,000) to the IF Trust Fund for Djibouti and was due to end in April 2003. The budget was revised to add $50,000 and approximately $60,000 remains available to complete activities through 2004.

Activities

Advocacy and sensitization on capacity and policy measures on trade mainstreaming;
Identification of trade capacity building needs and activities;
Preparation of Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) and Action Plan Matrix; and
Holding of national validation workshop to review IF/DTIS report/recommendations in May 2004.

Implementation strategy and experience

The project (DEX-executed) relied heavily on the backstopping of the BDP SDG (now PG) policy specialist who, until recently, was the only staff person responsible for aid coordination and trade and for management of the GLO/03/G01 Trust Fund. The national economist in the CO coordinated project activities and was focal point for liaison with the Office of the Prime Minister and Ministry of Commerce until the appointment of the Secretary General of the Djibouti Chamber of Commerce in January 2004. SURF Trade Policy Advisors in Addis and Beirut provided small inputs to a concept paper. UNCTAD and ITC cooperatively recruited the DTIS consultants in a timely manner and collaboration with the WB and IMF on PRSP issues was generally achieved. A draft evaluation prepared in November 2003 stated that awareness of the IF process was inadequate within a local stakeholder group. Practice management recounted a detailed process of consultations and consensus building activities across a spectrum of institutions and civil society that indicates the IF exercises were highly participatory. In June 2003, all stakeholders attended the sector workshops at the time of the main DTIS mission. Linkages to other IF countries' experience via networks and participation in external IF country workshops appear not to have featured under the project, although the umbrella IF project supports this activity.

Outcomes/ Impact

At one level, the project achieved its essential purpose by preparing the DTIS. The Government gave commitment to the process at the highest levels by establishing an IF National Steering Committee (NSC) that mainly consisted of government officials. However, linkages mainstreaming trade to the PRSP and national development planning are difficult to assess, given Djibouti's incomplete poverty reduction strategies or a review of other macroeconomic instruments. The WB has indicated that the DTIS section on poverty reduction (while highlighting other sectoral poverty impacts) did not provide a specific analysis of trade and poverty.

OECD/DAC reviewed the Djibouti DTIS case study in March 2004 somewhat favorably and Djibouti is viewed as a prime candidate for bridge funding under the IF's second window. These are indicators of policy level impact. Also the national validation workshop held 12-13 May 2004 drew 120 participants from public and private sectors, civil society, the legislature, donors and the six cooperating agencies. Given the small number of resident donors (France, EC, USA and UN) in Djibouti, a challenge has been to identify another donor to become the IF Facilitator as envisaged under the project. Djibouti's economy is not robust and the country's physical infrastructure is seriously eroded. All of these challenges will need to be addressed if favorable results of the IF process can be realized. The agreement between the Government and the Dubai Port authorities on a multi-million investment in a deep-sea port facility and oil terminal at Dorale provides a
significant opportunity to validate the project’s outcomes. This large development initiative should have major links to the domestic economy for poverty reduction and trade integration in the country.

**Contribution to GCF objectives**

The project has contributed to the goal of growth: equity and sustainability in advancing a framework for developing trade sector linkages to pro-poor policies and strategies for economic empowerment.

**Lessons Learnt**

Consultation/sensitization process should be broad-based and participatory. In Djibouti, the private sector and civil society, as well as donors and levels of government appear to have been fully informed about the IF process, well represented on the NSC or made aware of intended results. Networking of IF knowledge and experience of other IF countries should be shared and participation in cross-country/region workshops should be encouraged. National ownership was clearly visible through establishment of focal point mechanism to identify, coordinate and monitor IF process and implementation.

**Reference Material**

1. GLO/01/G07 Project Document & Map of Intended Results for GCF II (2001-2003)
3. UNDP Djibouti comment on IF evaluation

**GLO/03/552. HIV/AIDS LEADERSHIP CAPACITY BUILDING PROJECT**

**Scope and Objectives**

As agreed at the 2001 UNGASS (UN General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS), GLO/03/552 responds to the repositioning of HIV/AIDS as a priority development issue by creating an enabling policy, legislative and resource environment to achieve UNGASS and MDG goals. It assists programme countries to engage in a new transformative paradigm/response that addresses underlying causes that fuel the epidemic, and alleviates negative impacts on individuals, families, communities and societies, as well as the institutional systems involved in addressing HIV/AIDS. The aim is to achieve outputs that strengthen capacities for personal and institutional commitment and action within government, civil society, private business and PLWHA (people living with HIV/AIDS). Envisaged results are capacities developed within individuals, communities and institutions leading to emergence of "breakthrough" innovations designed to promote prevention and support new delivery systems for synergistic action at the sub-regional, national and local level. In furtherance of a broad-based set of objectives, there are three service lines: 1) leadership and capacity development; 2) development planning and implementation; and 3) advocacy and communication. A participatory methodology involves stakeholders in action learning through cross-sectoral approaches.

**Funding and Duration**

A total of $2.014 million was allocated to the project in 2003, but due to BDP’s cash-flow ceiling, only $1,007,275 was released and approximately $830,000 was spent. Subsequently, installation of the new ATLAS system has caused problems with accessing funds and delay in reconciliation of accounts. The global HIV/AIDS TTF project was set up in 2002 to support the then five service lines of the practice and allocations were based on criteria favoring geographical prevalence of the disease and LDC status, with priority given to sub-Saharan Africa (60%). The global allocation to leadership capacity [titled Leadership for Results] was less than 29% out of a total $6 million non-core. Refinement of HIV/AIDS service lines in 2003 reduced the service lines to 3, now incorporated into the MYFF, 2004-2007. A Standing Committee chaired by the HIV/AIDS Champion (Director of RBA) and members from all regional bureaus as well as BDP approves TTF proposals.

Dutch (the solitary donor to the HIV/AIDS TTF) funding to the HIV/AIDS TTF (2001-2003) amounted to $8,855,618 million. While there is some direct country funding by donors, the cutback of 2004 TTF resources creates a shortfall, which suggests that sustainability of support to service lines could be jeopardized. It should also be noted that phase one proposals generally were funded at a low level, indicative of a more demonstration or pilot approach. UNDP, as a co-sponsoring agency received $7.4 million for global and regional actions (2002-2003) from UNAIDS to support the three service lines. UNAIDS Secretariat’s expanding implementation role at country level and appointment of country coordinators has made
it difficult for UNDP to negotiate with donors for new resources.

**Activities**

According to GCF and TTF reviews, service line #1 accomplished more than its planned activities. Phase one activities were completed in all countries over a nine-month period that included at least three sessions on leadership and other workshops. Breakthrough results were generated through the nine-month process and plans are under way for the next year's programme in each of the countries. Another programme component - community conversations (CC) - was conducted in all countries in 2003, except for Haiti and Ghana (to be held in 2004), and it was reported that that initiative has led to a national scale-up in Ethiopia under an NGO mechanism with support from the WB. A brochure produced by the Country Office [Voices of Change, Voices of Action -Transforming the Response to HIV/AIDS: An Ethiopian Experience] is a good example of documenting the CCE and other service line approaches.167

Ukraine is another country where the programme achieved many breakthroughs. For example, participants who went through the nine-month leadership competency development programme decided to break the silence. They organized a concert for 20,000 youths where for the first time, the silence was broken in the public domain. People living with HIV talked about their lives. Other breakthrough initiatives included workshops for people working with those affected by HIV/AIDS, conducted by government employees; a testing campaign for men who have sex with men, organized by the Association of Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals; the creation of educational materials for children, including computer games, a website, and cartoons that are aired on a government channel reaching 10 million viewers; the creation and distribution of prevention booklets for Hungarian, Polish, and Romanian individuals living in Ukraine; and a partnership between NGOs and government to contact and provide support for individuals dying of AIDS in their homes.168

The practice group is very proficient in collecting and preparing compendia of programme activities [workshops, seminars, and global and regionally supported meetings] in all three service areas. Indeed, there is a wealth of material and documentation on HIV/AIDS that goes well beyond the scope of this report. However, the challenge remains to comprehensively capture the results and scale of support for attribution in country progress reporting, reflecting both upstream policy influence and downstream technical support. It has been noted that there is a need to have better monitoring. A common UNAIDS M&E mechanism exists, called the Country Response Information System (CRIS). With reference to evaluations, the team noted that three assessments have taken place - the UNAIDS Partner Programme Review, the Five-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS, and the UN System Strategic Planning Evaluation.

**Implementation strategy and experience**

As noted, HIV/AIDS is BDP's fifth Practice area, and thus far has received only $800,000 from GCF-II core funding ($2,014 million was allocated, but $1.07 million was released in 2003). In contrast, it was pointed out that UNICEF devotes $35 million globally (for 2003-2005) to the same practice area.169 Since the Practice Group did not exist when BDP made the initial allocation of 50 Policy Advisers in the field, two policy advisers were provided - one was placed in Pretoria to cover all of Africa (in recognition of the fact that nine of the 10 highest HIV/AIDS prevalent countries are in southern and eastern Africa). The second policy specialist was placed in Delhi to cover Asia. (In 2004, two regional policy specialists were placed in Bratislava and Egypt, jointly funded by the regional bureaus and BDP- from UBW, not part of the 75 policy specialists). Four policy specialists were posted at HQ but not funded under GCF-II core resources. One post is funded by UNAIDS and three posts are funded from the management fee for GFATM. GCF funding has been made available for one post in May 2004 out of the 25 BDP HQ allotment. There are now two HIV/AIDS policy specialists out of 50 in the field. It is clear that HIV/AIDS representation in the SURFs and at HQs is not aligned with the practice area's substantive needs, given the critical nature of the emergency. Practice Network meetings developed with regional bureaus HIV/AIDS focal points, also including SURF and regional programme participation, serve as the essential mechanism for ongoing review. A global RR meeting in Pretoria in 2001 and a Practice Area Retreat in Katmandu (2002) created a resource network on HIV/AIDS and identified six Flagship countries for phase one. Design for the initiative was developed with


168. UNDP Ukraine; 2004; Leadership for Results Project; UNDP.

COs through extensive consultations with RRs, DRRs and other relevant units involved in the PAC process. Cross consultation with other practice area focal points has ensued and an oversight mechanism has been put in place.

A major concern of the Group is scaling up projects and marshalling rollout to other countries. The programme is designed for a three-year period. The second year will be focused on intensifying national capacity development, expanding the leadership programme, and generating resources at country level. The third year envisages scaling-up the strategies nationwide, establishing South-South collaboration in order to roll out programmes in other countries. Whenever policy advisers are based in a region, they have been fully involved in the activities of the programme. In every region, sub-regional meetings were organized where countries participated bringing together government, civil society, the private sector and the UN system. These meetings served to introduce the methodologies and to explore interest, revisit the country’s response and generate new opportunities. The Trinidad SURF was very supportive on the regional (six countries) initiative in the Caribbean that is viewed as strategically scaling up UNDP's response to HIV/AIDS in Barbados/OECS, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago. The project is being implemented closely with the CARICOM Secretariat and other regional partners in a region that has the second-highest prevalence globally after sub-Saharan Africa. However, the budget of $350,000 seems inadequate for promoting an ambitious transformative process. A decision to "scale up" operationally through two frameworks, 1) arts and media and 2) "trimtab" synergies to meet the special GFATM mandate, could yield some key results overtime. The knowledge network appears to work well and has generated sub-practice networks (Global Fund). An interesting example is the current development of the Leadership Alumnae network to further capture and share cross-regional/institutional experience.

The HIV/AIDS Group works very closely with HIV/AIDS focal points in all five bureaus and develops and implements joint regional programmes/activities with RBAS, RBAP, RBEC and RBLAC. In RBA, it was agreed through a series of consultative meetings that the regional HIV/AIDS project would continue to support countries for mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into sectors, studies and analyses, as well as NHDRs (mainly service line 2). It was agreed that BDP policy specialists support multi-sector partnership and leadership development, community capacity enhancement, advocacy and communication with arts and media, and CSO capacity development (mainly service lines 1 & 3). The practice group has affirmed its intent to complement and avoid duplicating the mainstreaming focus of the regional project. Lesotho is cited as an example of effective collaboration, which began in December 2003. The strategy document was prepared with help from the RBA regional project. The challenge is to implement policy that generates an effective response. BDP policy support was provided to implement the plans, jointly with the regional project. However, given the scope of both initiatives, it is not difficult to see how some confusion might arise, unless there is clarity concerning the roles and responsibilities as envisaged under the new Regional Centre. This new mechanism will help strengthen relations with RBA and bring about greater complementarity in the practice area.

The HIV/AIDS Group has strategically re-positioned UNDP's contribution from making the case for HIV/AIDS as a development issue, to generating an effective response to reverse the course of the epidemic. There are a number of ways in which the HIV/AIDS Group has helped to shape the policy and programmatic response in the Southern Africa region. These include:

Strategically positioning UNDP at the Special Joint Inter-Agency Session of the Executive Board on Southern Africa. (2004). The statement by the Resident Representative in Swaziland on behalf of UNDP was a joint effort of the HIV/AIDS Group and RBA.

The leadership challenge is one of the four central challenges and responses put forth. Strategically positioning UNDP at the High Level Meeting of Southern Africa Ministers and the Heads of Agencies from the UNAIDS CoSponsors entitled ‘Scaling up Action on HIV/AIDS.’ (2004) The strategic issues paper submitted by UNDP on ‘HIV/AIDS and Human Resource Capacity Challenges in Southern Africa’ was a joint effort of the HIV/AIDS Group and RBA.

Policy and programmatic responses to the crisis in Africa include:

- Leadership for Results programme, which synergistically addresses UNDP corporate service lines. These are:
  - Leadership development programme - now under way in Swaziland, South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi and soon to be launched in Zambia.
  - Community capacity development programme - now under way in South Africa, Botswana, and Swaziland and soon to be launched in Malawi.
  - Re-orientation of National Strategic Frameworks to respond to HIV/AIDS
- Advocacy through Arts and Media - now under way in South Africa.
- In the future, it is foreseen that the newly established Regional Service Centre will be strengthened with position to lead each of the core programmes referred to above.
- Trade, Trips and Access to Medication -- preparations under way for:
- Assessing of options and opportunities in building south-south partnership between India and Africa for accessing ARVs.
- Holding a Joint Capacity Building Seminar on best practice trade and health policy measures and patent laws with the AU, TWN, WHO and UNDP.

Outcomes/Impact

The project has produced a large impact within one year, and according to the high number of programmes and activities implemented across five regions, this assessment may be accurate. Ethiopia, Ukraine and Cambodia are among the countries cited as good examples of results achieved through open-ended or issue-based approaches. Technically, the project met its design criteria, produced outputs and exceeded its envisaged scope of activities. For example, Ethiopia was able to nationalize its HIV/AIDS response within two years. Another initiative emerging from the programme in Nepal has integrated HIV/AIDS into the training curriculum of both the police and military, reaching 200,000 people annually. Based on the practice group's mantra "halting HIV/AIDS: reversing the pandemic," a focus on multi-sectoral emphasis through transformational methodologies have produced commitment to action. Under TTF and GCF allocations, cross-regional experience is being generated. While the CRIS mechanism exists to track results, a more rigorous M&E process is needed for transformative leadership processes, and to extrapolate findings into a larger programme. Although testimonials, changes in service utilization rates and anecdotal cases are available at this stage to characterize results, more needs to be done in this area to capture the innovative cases.

Several activities have taken place under the Development Planning service line. GFATM resources. The HIV/AIDS Group is responsible for global implementation of the "City Responses to HIV/AIDS" programme also under this service line, in partnership with UMP and UN-Habitat. The programme methodology marries the HIV/AIDS group LDP and CCE methodologies with UMP's City Consultations methodology. In addition there has been a regional development planning support activity in the Arab States. UNDP has also partnered with UNAIDS, the World Bank, ECA, the African Development Bank and Shell's Global Business Environment Team to develop scenarios exploring different potential paths for the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa http://aids scenarios.unaids.org/scenarios/.

A number of African countries - South Africa, Botswana, Swaziland, Mozambique, among others - have submitted requests for BDP/SURF support to review national plans. Using a simple, participatory approach of all stakeholders, two draft Guidance Notes were prepared by BDP in partnership with all UNAIDS co-sponsors on 1) HIV/AIDS and Development Planning: an Integrated Approach to National Responses, and 2) District Planning and Implementation Guidance Note. In addition a broader practice document called National Strategic Planning: an Implementation Approach has been prepared and used at country level.

The intended impact would be mainstreaming local strategies into all sectors to combat HIV/AIDS.

Contribution to GCF Objectives

The project focuses heavily on participatory methods. This dimension is considered a best practice in progress for the leadership capacity service line. Botswana is cited as a good example. Three workshops were implemented that generated commitment and initiatives for action to be supported by the Botswana National HIV/AIDS Commission as a key partner. GCF TTF resources provided catalytic funding with emphasis placed on mainstreaming leadership as a baseline to unlock bureaucratic inertia. Botswana twinned with Ethiopia as indicator of south/south cooperation. Inter-sessional meetings of leaders were benchmarked for monitoring progress and took place at all levels, down to the local districts. It is evident that leadership commitment to the HIV/AIDS emergency is coherent and focused in Botswana starting from the Presidency. The Team mission confirmed the participatory inclusiveness of every societal group in fighting the pandemic, and noted that the project's leadership capacity support played an important role. Botswana's participatory approach appears to be leveraged from a number of programme and institutional sources. not only from UNDP's inputs.


Findings and future orientation

The HIV/AIDS epidemic has advanced beyond worst-case scenarios and infections are not leveling off. Today, 40 million people are living with HIV/AIDS, with five million newly infected in 2003 alone. While Southern Africa has been hardest hit, major epidemics are unfolding in the Caribbean, South Asia, China, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Arab States. It is truly a global phenomenon. Against these sobering statistics, the High Level Committee on Programming for Southern Africa states 'the fundamental ways in which the UN responds must be entirely new and radically scaled-up to make a difference.' The areas of support evolved by the HIV/AIDS Group and known as 'Leadership for Results' has introduced innovative technologies that first disclose the underlying factors driving the epidemic and then empower people and institutions to take effective action. It comprises four synergistic dimensions including: (i) leadership and capacity development, (ii) development planning (iii) community capacity enhancement, and (iv) arts and media - which are designed to collectively generate a society-wide response to reversing the epidemic.

Overall the HIV/AIDS Group has made important headway in using the GCF II and TTF resources to advance new cutting-edge methodologies to develop leadership competencies within Government - at national and decentralized levels - and, civil society - including the arts and media - that generate results that respond to the epidemic. The resources have also been used to initiate processes of dialogue at the community level that skillfully break the silence by disclosing and then taking committed action to address the personal and societal norms, practices and beliefs that drive the epidemic. In countries where the programme has been in place for two years, impressive results have been documented. These include: Ethiopia, Ukraine, Swaziland, South Africa and Cambodia. Important initial results have been registered in countries where the programme has just started, such as Lesotho and Botswana. Initial processes of south-south exchanges have been organized to enable countries to benefit from best practice application of leadership initiatives and should be encouraged. Initial processes of developing local capacity to deliver the leadership and community enhancement have been undertaken and effective local facilitators and coaches can be found in Cambodia, South Africa and Ethiopia. Local capacitation is an important strategy of the programme that needs to be actively fostered. While the approach has demonstrated important results in the countries where it has been tried, it is still not well known within the organization because the strategies are recent innovations, and need to be more systematically mainstreamed into country and regional work. Below are suggestions for future orientations:

UNDP's Corporate Strategy and service lines are founded on the organization's strengths and provide a solid foundation for actions to address the current challenges of the epidemic. This strategy must now be expanded globally and scaled-up within countries. Practice group requires more staff and funding and wider presence in new Regional Centers to strengthen institutional alignment and programme collaboration with regional bureaus. Development of southern expertise and institutions should be strengthened to support national efforts to implement 'leadership for

BOX C.2 - LIST OF HIV/AIDS GROUP PARTNERS

UN System
UNAIDS Secretariat
- WHO
- UN Habitat
- UNICEF
- ILO
- UNV
- UN Secretariat
World Bank
GFATM - Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, Malaria
Donors and other Partners
- GAIN - Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition
- USAID
- ITAC - International Treatment Access Coalition
Civil Society
- NGOs
- AFRICASO
- LACASO
- GNP+, ANP+
- TWN
- ICASO
- MSF
- Consumer Technologies
- Bread for the World
- ENDA Tiers Monde
CBOs - Community-Based Organizations
Private Sector
- Shell Global Business Environment Team
- Local Businesses
Trade Unions
Artists and the Media
results' initiatives.

South/south collaboration should be encouraged and the TRIPS capacity development component, including civil society analysis and advocacy, regarding best-practice trade policy and patent law for accessing low cost antiretroviral (ARV) treatment expanded.

Special responses should be implemented for Southern Africa and other worst affected countries and regions with high prevalence rates, based on the corporate strategy.

Country examples of successful leadership experiences to be better documented for replication.

Knowledge network practice to be reviewed for firstphase learning and experience for wider dissemination.

A new approach needs to be devised for measurement of the transformative methodologies being used to generate innovations, results, outcomes and impact, including shifts in norms, practices, behaviours and institutional change.

Resource base requires diversification and help should be sought from BRSP to design new approaches for donor mobilization.

**Case 2 - HIV/AIDS.** The HIV/AIDS practice area is illustrative of the scope and range of partnerships being secured with external organizations, and is seen to have fostered the strategic partnership objectives of the GCF-II. Annex D identifies the partners of the HIV/AIDS GCF and global TTF, a summary of the initiatives and events thus far completed and an indication of the planned activities for 2004. Box C.2 lists the main groups of partners with which the HIV/AIDS practice area, through its GCF funded activities, has formed partnerships. The nature of the cooperation, collaboration or partnership with each organization varies according to the respective roles and participation. As can be seen, the interaction of the programme spans the UN system, Bretton Woods institutions, bilateral donors, international associations,

---

**BOX C.3 UNDP’S COMMUNITY CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME (CCE)/COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS**

“UNDP’s CCE programme is the most innovative, impactful program we have ever implemented. For the first time we have been able to address cultural practices that for years have gone unquestioned. Communities have ended longstanding practices of female genital mutilation and wife abduction. We have decreased HIV/AIDS and we are seeing widespread testing in Aba province. The programmes have energized the response to the epidemic and strengthened the capacity of leaders and institutions to respond to HIV/AIDS in a strategic and coordinated manner at all levels and across sectors, in addition to strengthening partnerships among UN agencies.”

**Dr. Bogaletech Gebre,**
Founder Kembata Women’s Self-Help Centre, ETHIOPIA

“In a province with 5% infection rates, community conversations is the most effective programme we have implemented to address the epidemic. For the first time our communities are finding their own solutions to the epidemic. We plan to expand community conversations to every village in our provinces”

**Dr. Ou Khe Viehea,**
Director of Battambang Province Health Programme, CAMBODIA

---

**BOX C.4 EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

“The team that played a major role in the Leadership Development Programme became members of an HIV/AIDS and Substance Abuse Commission. …this commission is to develop policy and support the secretariat for the coordination of Tobago’s response to HIV/AIDS. And this commission then became a part of the National Coordinating Committee which is managed by the Prime Minister.”

**Claudia Groome-Duke** | Dept. of Gender, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

“In the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional States, all political leaders were enrolled to take voluntary testing to be an example for others to do the same. This is a very huge statement in a country where people were silent about HIV/AIDS and other problems even.”

**Alemayehu Haile Mekonnen** | Facilitator, ETHIOPIA

“We had 13 groups, 19 Breakthrough Initiatives; one group ... was made up of Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Home Affairs. That is: the army and police force... they came up with integration of HIV/AIDS into the training system of police and army. Now, every six months, police and army are being recruited and being trained. And every time when they train, HIV/AIDS is a part of the curriculum.... altogether they are reaching about 200,000 people every year.”

**Dilli Bikram Ingwaba** | HURDEC, NEPAL

“For me, I felt very pessimistic about Cambodia, I said there’s no way to rebuild this country. The social fabric is broken. Social cohesion is broken and so people don’t trust one another. And I felt very hopeless at that time. But through the Leadership Development Programme, I can see people start to have hope. And the hope is from the heart, and people saw the way that they can work hand in hand. And so I feel strongly that Cambodia can be a great country in the future.”

**VA Sopheak** | Cambodian Red Cross, CAMBODIA
civil society and community-based organizations, the private sector, trade unions and the media. These partnerships were unique in that they were not only about bringing people together, but also about collectively generating actions and results.

For example, in Cambodia, UNDP has helped strengthen and expand partnerships between government, civil society and donors through the Leadership for Results strategy. The Leadership Development Programme (LDP) was implemented in partnership with the National AIDS Authority, with participants from government ministries, NGOs, religious institutions, and the National Senate. Participants created several breakthrough initiatives, among them: HIV/AIDS roundtable discussions at the Ministry of Education that led to a nationwide programme in schools; a survey of street children in Phnom Penh to assess their risk of infection; the implementation of gender and leadership issues into the activities of several organizations, including the Ministry of National Defense; and outreach activities and surveys to help children living with HIV/AIDS.

As a participant from the Red Cross stated, "the LDP is very extraordinary and very important for Cambodia, because the strategies of the programme were designed in a way that tried to build hope for people. In the way that it teaches people to learn to trust one another and also in the way that it is designed to grab people, from top down, from every corner of the national society to join together, to work together. And, it is something that we never had seen in the past...senators, national assembly members, sex workers, PLWHA, union workers, people at the grass roots, NGOs, government, all together, seeking together, working together, and discussing HIV/AIDS-related disorders and identifying the root causes... and then working to identify the solution, and acting together. This is a really important thing, that we appreciate as the result of this LDP programme."

Twenty-five communities in urban and rural areas are currently participating in the community capacity enhancement initiatives, which are facilitated with the help of the Provincial AIDS Secretariats. Communities have reported that the initiatives have resulted in a more tolerant attitude towards people living with HIV/AIDS, the reduction of domestic violence, the creation of funds to support funeral organizations for people who have died of AIDS, psychological support for people who are living with or affected by the virus, and the creation of partnerships between communities and CSOs. The Director of Health Programs in Battambang Province stated "in a province with 5% infection rates, community conversations is the most effective programme we have implemented to address the epidemic. For the first time our communities are finding their own solutions to the epidemic. We plan to expand community conversations to every village in our provinces." The programmes are being scaled up in 2004 to reach even more leaders and communities.
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- HIV/AIDS Group and Urban Management Program; 2003; Developing City Responses to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic; UNDP
- RBAP; 2001; Cooperation between RBAP Regional and Country Initiatives and UNDP Global Special Initiative on HIV/AIDS; UNDP
- RBLAC; 2001; HIV/AIDS Initiatives in the Caribbean Region; UNDP
- Project Appraisal Committee Meeting for the Regional Project on HIV and Development in sub-Saharan Africa, February 2001;
- Maseru Cluster Meeting, February 2001;
- IATT; 2002; Strengthening the Country-Level UN Response to HIV/AIDS
- HIV/AIDS Group; 2003; UNDP Regional HIV/AIDS Strategic Planning Meeting Report, New Delhi, India 19-21 November 2003, BDP, UNDP

Documents for Policy Formulation

- HIV/AIDS Group; Corporate Strategy on HIV/AIDS, October 2003; BDP, UNDP
- Multi-Year Fund Framework, 2004-2007; BDP, UNDP
- HIV/AIDS Strategic Results Framework, 2002; BDP, UNDP
- HIV/AIDS Group; Corporate Strategy on HIV/AIDS, October 2001; BDP, UNDP
- HIV/AIDS Group; UNDP Thematic Trust Fund HIV/AIDS, December 2001; BDP, UNDP
- HIV/AIDS Group; 2002; HIV/AIDS and Poverty Reduction Strategies, BDP, UNDP
- ILO; Responding to HIV/AIDS in the World of Work; UNDP and ILO in Partnership
- GAIN and UNDP in partnership
- 3 by 5 Initiative: Roles and Responsibilities of UNAIDS co-sponsors and Secretariat

Video Interviews

- Testimonials from the Field, February 2004; BDP, UNDP
- Video interviews on the impact of Leadership Development Programmes, March 2004; BDP, UNDP
D.1 OVERVIEW

One of the implementation strategies of the GCF-II states that: "...strategic partnerships will be formed with institutions having greater competencies in those areas in order to ensure that appropriate expertise is provided to programme countries and that momentum is not lost".174 The move toward strategic partnerships -- also referred to as global partnerships -- was a response to past global programmes that had not adequately established strategic long-term relationships with development institutions sharing common goals. The GCF-II document in fact details the range and specific examples of institutions with which UNDP is to seek strategic partnerships.

The GCF-II does not define the operational meaning of strategic partnerships, but information provided by BDP suggests that such partnerships parallel those in the private sector, minus the profit motive. As UNDP recognizes that it does not have within its institutional framework all the necessary means to fulfill its mandate at all levels, its many programmes need to be complemented and enriched by 'partners' who have complementary strengths, working under a commonly agreed framework. Other qualifying characteristics would include:

- "Strategic" relates to options for achieving common priority objectives.
- Strategic partners are those who enhance UNDP's options and who share UNDP's objectives.
- Strategic partners complement UNDP's comparative advantages by adding their own.
- Strategic institutional partners are not necessarily the largest, the richest or the most knowledgeable actors in the field.
- Geographic coverage, networking potential, media contacts, global trust, positive track record, shared values and ability to contact, nurture and enhance the capacity of development actors and leaders in programme countries can be desirable assets.

(e.g. UN specialized agencies, funds and programmes, Bretton Woods institutions, bilateral development cooperation agencies, civil society organizations and the private sector - see GCF-II Document, paragraph 23).175

The use and meaning of the term 'strategic partnership' are grounded in the two MYFFs that introduced and then refined results-based management.


175. The Team found that the term 'partnerships' has a wide variety of interpretations in UNDP. At one extreme, a partnership may simply describe a level of cooperation not defined by any formal legal instrument. At the other extreme, a partnership may be very formalized form of collaboration defined in a written agreement, thus giving it some legal force (e.g. the agreements between BDP and the RBx).
Partnerships Evaluation of the Second Global Cooperation Framework

BDP provided a representative list of 20 such arrangements with a wide variety of global and national partners. BDP also has a long history of collaborative working with co-funding agencies and programme countries are traditionally well described and established. However, the new ‘partnerships’ with civil society or research groups, presents some complexity in clarifying what it means.

The Team found that UNDP, through the various GCF-II implementation mechanisms, had been successful in securing a very broad range of so-called ‘strategic partnerships’ with all of the institutions noted above, plus others. In fact, the breadth and types of partnerships are seen to be so vast that a separate study would be required. The nature of the partnerships between UNDP and UNCTAD on the (former) practice area of Trade is discussed in the context of capacity development in Section 3.1 of this report. The Team is able therefore to report only selected aspects of the GCF-II partnerships objective. First, the general scope and range of partnerships is discussed, based on selected case cases. Then, some observations are made on UNDP ‘internal’ partnerships. The sub-section concludes with some recommendations.

D.2 SCOPE AND RANGE OF EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

Case 1 - Energy and Environment. This practice area also has a long history of collaborative working arrangements with a wide variety of global and national ‘partners’. BDP provided a representative list of 20 such arrangements. The following is a sampling.


- Third World Network. In 2001, UNDP joined the Third World Network partnership, which is an international network of organizations and individuals involved in issues relating to development, the Third World and North-South issues. Its objectives are to conduct research on economic, social and environmental issues pertaining to the South; to publish books and magazines; to organize and participate in seminars; and to provide a platform representing broadly Southern interests and perspectives at international fora such as the UN conferences and processes.

- Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI). Through Phase II of the Poverty and Environment Initiative

176. Based on feed back provided by BDP, the Team was informed that the emphasis of the first MYFF was in defining partnerships in relation to outcomes, or development changes that required the concerted effort of more than one actor. Strategic partnerships were defined as results-based rather than simply producing outputs. The second MYFF went farther in listing ‘forging strategic partnerships’ as one of the five key drivers of development effectiveness. It goes on to reiterate that strategic partnerships are an “important mechanism to convert direct project outputs into broader development outcomes.” It also mentioned the importance of advancing the MDGs and crisis recovery in defining strategic partnerships.

177. It is the view of some that the term ‘partner’ is finding increasing currency when relationships are endangered or unclear. In UNDP, relationships with co-funding agencies and programme countries are traditionally well described and established. However, the new ‘partnerships’ with civil society or research groups, presents some complexity in clarifying what it means.

178. MDG Goal # 8 states: "Developing a global partnership for development with targets for aid, trade, and debt relief".

179. In fact, the Team did not have the time nor the resources to examine any individual partnership agreement in any detail - in terms of the quality, design, performance - nor to speak with the ‘partners’ to the partnerships. Only limited review of some partnerships was carried out in the context of the 10 sample global projects, discussed in Section 6.4 and Annex C. This subsection is therefore a summary of some of the information provided to the Team by BDP.
(PEI), launched in July 2002, UNDP, in conjunction with the European Commission, the World Bank and the U.K. Department for International Development, is helping countries to integrate the environmental concerns of the poor into poverty reduction strategies and policies, to identify practical measures for their implementation, and to share their experience and good practices.

- The Monterrey Bridge Coalition (MBC). The Monterrey Bridge Coalition is a multi-sector, multi-year initiative that works with other parallel initiatives within the MDGs process to integrate and enhance their impact. The coalition was established in the spring of 2002 to encourage resolution of the hitherto considered paradoxes between compelling realities that make up the paradigm for combating hunger and poverty and providing biodiversity stewardship and ecosystem management. The MBC is a joint initiative of IUCN, Future Harvest, CGIAR, IFAD, UNDP, IICA and representatives of civil society from around the world.

- The Global Biodiversity Forum. Although the GBF was founded in 1993 by IUCN, WRI, UNEP, and ACTS and includes a number of other institutions as its conveners, UNDP joined the partnership and started active participation in GBFs through GCF funding in 2002. The GBF is an open and independent mechanism to encourage analysis, dialogue and partnership on key ecological, economic, social and institutional issues related to biodiversity. It contributes to the further development and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Ramsar Convention, the Framework Convention, the Convention to Combat Desertification, and other biodiversity-related conventions at the local, national, regional and international levels. UNDP sponsors various sessions of this mechanism that are most relevant to the programme of the biodiversity sub-practice.

**Case 2 - HIV/AIDS.** The HIV/AIDS practice area is illustrative of the scope and range of partnerships being secured with external organizations, and is seen to have fostered the strategic partnership objectives of the GCF-II. Table D.1 at the end of this annex identifies the partners of the HIV/AIDS GCF and global TTF, a summary of the initiatives and events thus far completed and an indication of the planned activities for 2004. The nature of the cooperation, collaboration or partnership with each organization varies according to the respective roles and participation. As can be seen, the interaction of the programme spans the UN system, Bretton Woods institutions, bilateral donors, international associations, civil society and community based organizations, the private sector, trade unions and the media.

One of the global projects reviewed by the team addressed HIV/AIDS and related partnership issues. The project is being implemented closely with a special secretariat and regional partners, with the Netherlands as the primary donor. The project focuses heavily on participatory methods that are considered best practices in progress for the leadership capacity service line. Botswana is cited as a good example of this where three workshops were implemented, generating commitment and initiatives for action to be supported by the Botswana National HIV/AIDS Commission as a key partner.

**Case 3 - Governance.** Of all of the UNDP practice areas, the Democratic Governance Group provided by far the most information on strategic partnerships as well as other types of collaborative arrangements. A few examples of signed partnership-type agreements - in the form of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) -- was provided by BDP. The first example is a MOU between UNDP and the National Democratic Institute (NDI) for International Affairs. It lays out the respective strengths and broad experiences of both organizations in democratic governance, describes the purpose of the MOU ("... to establish the framework for strengthening the cooperative working partnership..." between the two organizations), and lists several areas of potential collaboration. The operational nature of the collaboration is described primarily in the form of technical assistance services to be provided by the NDI to UNDP in global, regional and country programmes, plus general cooperation in training, sharing of information. The MOU has no financial or legal basis, nor does it set out any financial or operational understandings. In this sense, the document might be seen as a basis for a future partnership arrangement.

The second example is also a MOU signed between the UNDP and AWEPA International - European Parliamentarians for Africa, and flows from the Millennium Declaration. The MOU sets out a framework and areas for cooperation between the two organizations and prescribes a strategy for MDGs that focuses on three complementary initiatives (a research project, development of reports, and an advocacy

---

180. See Section 6.4 and Annex C on project GLO/03/552 - HIV/AIDS Leadership Capacity Building Project.
campaign). Unlike the above noted MOU, the UNDP-AWEP.

The third example of what might be seen as a strategic partnership is the Urban Management Programme (UMP), under way since 1986, and now in its fourth phase. Several other examples of a 'strategic partnership' nature were provided by BDP, and they cannot all be noted here. Two of particular note include:

- UN-HABITAT (United Nations Programme on Human Settlements). An MOU has been signed between Mark Malloch Brown and Anna Tibaijuka establishing, among other things, the placement of Habitat Programme Managers within selected UNDP Country Offices, without any additional cost for UNDP. Some ten HPMs have already been placed in Sri Lanka, Thailand, Mexico and others.

- International Union of Local Authorities IULA Founded in 1913, IULA is the largest and oldest association of local authorities. UNDP has a MOU with IULA to develop capacity of local authorities and to cooperate on surveys of Mayors. IULA is now merging with the francophone FMCU (United Towns Organization) to form United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), to be launched in Paris in early May. UNDP will attend the Congress and strengthen cooperation with this new global organization.

"The agencies have no intention of being coordinated by the UN, although they must pretend to be in favor of it. In the coordination section, our self-serving documents papered over this ambivalence by being skillfully drafted to give the appearance of saying something while giving offense to no one."

Brian Urquhart (1991, based on experience from the 1950s)

D.3 INTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

Internal partnerships were seen by the Team to function at the HQ, regional and country levels. In terms of those funded or supported by the GCF-II, the main partnership type of agreement is the MOUs between the RBx and BDP in supporting the former SURFs (now Regional Centres). Standard 'service agreements' were signed between BDP and each of the regional bureaus wherein each party specified their commitments to each other (i.e. with BDP providing specified services, and with the regional bureau committing to setting up SURF Boards, providing feedback on performance). The service agreements also set out performance expectations, were supported by several annexes and were signed by the heads of the bureaus. Such agreements may not necessarily be seen as 'partnerships', but rather as a form of contract. In any event, these agreements will be subject to renegotiation with the implementation of the new regional centres.

A second level of collaboration was found to exist at the country level. The prime example of this was found with the Katmandu SURF that had developed a new way of working with regional programmes (partnerships) to strengthen practices. While not secured in any written agreement, the 'informal partnership' was seen to comprise a pattern of activities where SURF staff and policy specialists supported the implementation of regional programmes, cooperated with the RBx on research (e.g. decentralized governance), provided technical backstopping and facilitation services on regional workshops, among other related activities. It is expected that the working relationships between the GCF funded policy specialists and regional programmes will be articulated in the implementation plans, organizational agreements and other management instruments at both the regional level and between the RBx and BDP.

"The agencies have no intention of being coordinated by the UN, although they must pretend to be in favor of it. In the coordination section, our self-serving documents papered over this ambivalence by being skillfully drafted to give the appearance of saying something while giving offense to no one."

Brian Urquhart (1991, based on experience from the 1950s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PARTNER</th>
<th>INITIATIVES/EVENTS</th>
<th>NEW 2004 ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS Secretariat</td>
<td>Development Planning and Governance Workshops (UNDP convening role)</td>
<td>Partnership for leadership development in 5 countries (China, Honduras, Lesotho, Sudan, Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-sponsor partnerships: Programme Coordinating Board, Unified Budget &amp; Work plan and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Coordinating work of UN agencies in the area of development planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World AIDS Day 2003 with UNAIDS Secretariat and Co-sponsors, African Services Committee and Church World Service</td>
<td>Partnership with UNAIDS on XVth Int. AIDS Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports: HIV/AIDS Inter-Agency Task Team publications; HLCP report on “Organizing the UN Response to the Triple Threat of Food Insecurity, Weakened Capacity for Governance and AIDS”; Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization</td>
<td>Joint best practices publications on Development Planning and National Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership for Inter Agency Task Teams on education, intravenous drug users, access to care, monitoring and evaluation, young people, condom use, gender, workplace and orphans</td>
<td>Partnership continuing for Inter Agency Task Teams on education, access to care, intravenous drug users, monitoring and evaluation, young people, condom use, gender, workplace and orphans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership for leadership development in 5 countries being currently identified</td>
<td>Partnership established for TRIPS projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership development for MDGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WHO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement and support partnership in DPR Korea, Iran and Myanmar (UNDP principal recipient for Global Fund)</td>
<td>“City Responses to HIV/AIDS” programme will begin in Brazil, Cambodia, Côte d’Ivoire and Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiated dialogue on TRIPS and access to drugs</td>
<td>Joint Best Practice document with UN Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN Habitat</strong></td>
<td>“City Responses to HIV/AIDS” programme established in collaboration with UN Habitat and the Urban Management Programme; programme under way in India, Lebanon, Malawi and Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td>Partnered with UNICEF on care for orphans at global level and in selected countries</td>
<td>Leadership capacity development partnership in 3 countries (incl. Dominican Rep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with UNICEF on care for orphans at global level and in selected countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO</strong></td>
<td>Partnership established on HIV/AIDS in the Workplace</td>
<td>Implementation of partnership in Ghana, Thailand, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership for the leadership development of trade unions in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Best Practice document with ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNV</strong></td>
<td>Initiated discussions for work at global level and for Southern Africa</td>
<td>Partnership to address capacity development of UNVs, including those going to Southern Africa through Leadership Development Programmes and Community Capacity Enhancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HIV/AIDS Practice Group, BDP*
### TABLE D.1 - HIV/AIDS GROUP PARTNERSHIPS: GCF AND GLOBAL TTFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PARTNER</th>
<th>INITIATIVES/EVENTS</th>
<th>NEW 2004 ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFATM - Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>Partnership for UNDP to be Principal Recipient (PR) for grants under special circumstances (20 countries)</td>
<td>Regional approach to support implementation of GFATM projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working to strengthen GFATM Country Coordinating Mechanisms (Haiti)</td>
<td>Support to countries to develop GFATM proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with GFATM CCM members in proposal development (Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Barbados and Regional Caribbean proposal)</td>
<td>Working to develop indicators and Monitoring and Evaluation standards with countries and GFATM Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity development agreements with GFATM Principal Recipients in 5 countries</td>
<td>Developing leadership capacity of CCMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors and other Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN - Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition</td>
<td>Established partnership for leadership development</td>
<td>Providing management services to GAIN for leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships for sector planning guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC - International Treatment Access Coalition</td>
<td>West African Health Organization planning workshop</td>
<td>Partnership for promotion of access to care and treatment in developing countries, and support for expertise exchange on treatment management and delivery and home and community care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Society</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs, CSOs and coalitions, e.g. AFRICASO, LACASO, GNP+, ANP+, TWN, ICASO, MSF, Consumer Technologies, Bread for the World, ENDA Tiers Monde</td>
<td>Leadership and capacity development for AIDS CSOs from 45 African countries</td>
<td>Strengthening governance of Networks of CSOs in Africa, Arab States, LAC and Asia, their advocacy and lobbying capacity for the interests of communities they serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and capacity development of NGOs/CSOs working on AIDS from 14 countries in the Arab States</td>
<td>Skills building for CSOs in Africa and Asia, enabling them to address underlying causes of HIV/AIDS: gender inequality; stigma &amp; discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity development for strategic planning for West African Network of AIDS Service Organizations</td>
<td>Partnering with Global Networks of people living with HIV/AIDS and Global Networks of CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and capacity development for people living with HIV/AIDS in Eritrea</td>
<td>Capacity development of CSOs for negotiating TRIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and capacity development for women’s leadership coalition in Ethiopia</td>
<td>Support to East Africa CSOs on learning contracts, to be expanded to Asia and LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBOs - Community-Based Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Training of trainers for community capacity enhancement for Francophone CBOs in Africa</td>
<td>Coalitions established at the on XVth Int. AIDS Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Global Business Environment Team</td>
<td>AIDS in Africa: Scenario building project with Shell Global Business Environment Team, UNAIDS, World Bank, ECA, African Development Bank</td>
<td>AIDS in Africa: Scenario building project continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Businesses</td>
<td>Partnerships through participation in Leadership Development Programmes in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Swaziland, Ukraine, Botswana, Dominican Rep, Ghana, Haiti, India, Malaysia, Senegal</td>
<td>New partnerships will be developed through Leadership Development Programmes in Brazil, China, Nigeria, Russia and Vietnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table provides an overview of partnerships and initiatives involving GFATM and various other partners in the context of HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria. It highlights new activities and initiatives that were introduced in 2004.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Private Sector</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Private Sector</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shell Global Business Environment Team</td>
<td>▪ AIDS in Africa: Scenario building project with Shell Global Business Environment Team, UNAIDS, World Bank, ECA, African Development Bank</td>
<td>▪ AIDS in Africa: Scenario building project continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Businesses</td>
<td>▪ Partnerships through participation in Leadership Development Programmes in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Swaziland, Ukraine, Botswana, Dominican Rep, Ghana, Haiti, India, Malaysia, Senegal</td>
<td>▪ New partnerships will be developed through Leadership Development Programmes in Brazil, China, Nigeria, Russia and Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td>▪ Partnership request from trade unions in Ukraine</td>
<td>▪ Partnership with trade unions and industry in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Partnerships with trade unions and industry in Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Partnerships with trade unions and industry in Ukraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Artists and the Media</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Artists and the Media</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artists and the Media</td>
<td>▪ Capacity development workshop for AIDS responses with 75 artists/media in 5 African countries</td>
<td>▪ Capacity development workshop for AIDS responses with artists/media in Francophone Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Arab States Workshops enrolled key media and entertainment personalities to break the silence</td>
<td>▪ UNDP to support the establishment of coalitions of media for addressing the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Ethiopia, Cambodia, Swaziland, Botswana, Lesotho, Ghana, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ South Asia arts and media workshop to generate positive and empowering HIV images and messages</td>
<td>▪ Establish South-South collaboration between media – process already initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ethiopia workshop with 150 artists/media to develop capacity and address stigma &amp; discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HIV/AIDS Practice Group; BDP*
### TABLE E.1 SECOND GLOBAL COOPERATION FRAMEWORK: RESOURCES 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME CATEGORY</th>
<th>CORE RESOURCES</th>
<th>NON-CORE RESOURCES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy support services a</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies b</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global programme</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.3 a</strong></td>
<td><strong>115.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>202.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Including field-based policy specialists
- Allocations made at the discretion of the Administrator
- Including a carry-over of $30 million from the first GCF (1997-2000)

(Source: DP/GCF/2, November, 2000, Annex)

### TABLE E.2 SECOND GLOBAL COOPERATION FRAMEWORK: RESOURCES 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME CATEGORY</th>
<th>CORE RESOURCES</th>
<th>NON-CORE RESOURCES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy support services a</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies b</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global programme</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>115.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>202.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: DP/GCF/2/Extension 1, May, 2003, Section IV - Recommendations)
### TABLE E.3 - TTF ALLOCATIONS BY GCF PROGRAMME AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>SERVICE LINE</th>
<th>NO. OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>ALLOCATIONS (US$ THOUSAND)</th>
<th>ORIGINAL 2001 - 2 ALLOCATION</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL FUNDING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>SL1: Benchmarking and monitoring poverty</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7571.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2: Participatory processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>560.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3: Pro-poor policies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2027.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4: Piloting and innovation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>964.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,124.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,124.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTD</td>
<td>SL1: National and regional ICT for development strategies (e-strategies)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1077.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2: Strategy implementation and capacity development (e-initiatives)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3: ICT for democratic governance (e-governance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4: Digital grants initiative (e-grants)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL5: National awareness, promotion and stakeholder campaigns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,182.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,382.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>SL1: Advocacy and policy dialogue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,490.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2: Capacity development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,782.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3: Mainstreaming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4: Human rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>440.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL5: Information and multi-media technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,262</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,262</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Governance</td>
<td>SL1: Support to legislatures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,401.0</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2: Elections</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,427.0</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3: Access to justice and human rights</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4,491.0</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>7,681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4: Access to information</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL5: Decentralization and local governance</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL6: Public administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,109.0</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,318.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,035</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy for Sust. Development</td>
<td>SL1: Policy frameworks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,074.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2: Rural energy services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>522.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3: Clean technologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4: Financing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>288.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,099.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,799.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOR ALL TRUST FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,986.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,617.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,603.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Total for first and second tranche.
2. 2002 replenishment.
3. Many grants covered several service lines but only one line was attributed for the purposes of accounting.
4. 2003 replenishment.
5. This is an approximate value for the 2003 as the grant will be NK20 million.
6. The figures do not include the US$2.3 million grant from OPEC as the MOU was signed before the establishment of the Trust Fund. However, the funds are managed “as if” it were a trust fund.
7. The table only covers the active TTF for the GCF sectors. For this reason the Crisis Prevention and Recovery TTF is not included as this is no longer part of GCF and the Gender and Environment TTF are not included because no funds were committed for either one.
8. The number of projects only refers to the first tranche.

*Source: Thematic Trust Fund Reports for each Practice Area.*
### TABLE E.4 - LIST OF GCF-II PROJECTS (FULLY OR PARTIALLY FUNDED THROUGH GCF II) 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1-BDP</strong></td>
<td>GLO/01/001/D/11/34</td>
<td>34,772,535</td>
<td>Policy support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLO/02/661/A/11/34</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Knowledge-based advisory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLO/03/001/11/34</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>PEER project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,272,535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **E2-Poverty Group (PG, formerly SDG):** | |
| GLO/98/615/11/40 | 309,051 | Globalization, liberalization and SHD |
| GLO/00/516/N/11/31 | 579,077 | Trade and SHD |
| GLO/01/318/B/11/31 | 862,880 | Gender mainstreaming |
| GLO/01/319/A/11/31 | 49,500 | Investing in women linking FFD with WSSD |
| GLO/01/615/C/11/40 | 1,179,052 | Globalization liberalization and SHD |
| GLO/02/G07/A/11/34 | 300,000 | Integrated framework - Djibouti |
| GLO/02/515/A/11/34 | 1,700,000 | Global Poverty Centre (Rio Centre) |
| GLO/02/518/A/11/31 | 324,900 | Support to poverty reduction |
| GLO/02/703/A/11/31 | 630,000 | Policy dialogue and social development |
| GLO/03/515/A/11/34 | 485,550 | Policy advice for economic alternatives |
| GLO/03/517/A/11/75 | 900,000 | Improving the quality for UNDP Micro-finance Programme |
| **Total** | | 7,320,010 | |

| **E3-Energy and Environment Group (EEG, formerly ESDG):** | |
| GLO/96/109/11/31 | 722,760 | Sustainable energy programme |
| GLO/98/123/11/31 | 315,500 | Poverty environment workshop |
| GLO/99/124/11/31 | 312,333 | Tools for environmental mainstreaming |
| GLO/01/115/E/11/31 | 2,090,000 | Sustainable energy global programme |
| GLO/01/116/11/42 | 192,500 | Techn. Advisory group - Energy support to ESMAT |
| GLO/02/116/A/11/34 | 750,000 | UNDP inter-agency support to CGIAR |
| GLO/02/117/A/11/31 | 1,258,841 | PA to develop global programme on environment |
| GLO/02/119/A/11/31 | 243,400 | Poverty and environment initiative Phase-II |
| GLO/02/617/B/11/31 | 527,491 | World summit on sustainable development |
| GLO/03/116/11/31 | 55,000 | ESMAP/TAG member energy sector |
| **Total** | | 6,412,825 | |

| **E4-Democratic Governance Group (DGG, formerly IDG):** | |
| GLO/97/617/11/31 | 90,551 | Global umbrella programme on governance |
| GLO/97/627/S/11/31 | 227,410 | LIFE (Participatory Local Governance) |
| GLO/99/620/G/11/31 | 168,458 | Global decentralized governance programme-Phase II |
| GLO/99/621/C/11/72 | 680,654 | Establishment of a legal resource unit |
| GLO/01/616/C/11/56 | 900,000 | Urban management programme-Phase IV |
| GLO/02/605/11/99 | 20,000 | HURIST |
| GLO/02/618/B11/34 | 1,429,920 | Democratic governance practice project |
| **Total** | | 3,516,993 | |

| **E5-Information and Communication Technology for Development Group (ICTDG):** | |
| GLO/01/215/11/31 | 30,791 | TICAD follow-up activities |
| GLO/01/217/D/11/34 | 200,001 | ICT DOT FORCE |
| GLO/02/215/B/11/31 | 385,000 | Develop global programme ICT |
| GLO/02/516/A/11/31 | 192,500 | Research publications: Applied development policy |
| GLO/03/215/A/11/31 | 381,500 | UNDP support to WSIS |
| GLO/03/216/A/11/20 | 25,000 | Policy and strategy support WSIS |
| GLO/03/217/A/11/34 | 93,810 | Support to partnerships in ICTD |
| GLO/03/219/A/11/31 | 99,992 | Capacity development knowledge network |
| **Total** | | 1,408,594 | |
E6- HIV/AIDS Group (HIV/AIDS):
GLO/02/552/B/11/43   181,655   International HIV/AIDS conference in Barcelona
GLO/03/551/A/11/34   200,000   Support for IP and access to drugs capacity building
GLO/03/552/A/11/34   1,007,275  HIV/AIDS leadership capacity building
Total:                1,388,912

E7- Capacity Development Group (CDG, formerly OPARG): PPP AND RTC
GLO/01/015/B/11/34   500,000   Reforming Technical Cooperation (RTC)
Total:                500,000

Total approved under GCF-III (2001-2003): 57,900,000
Total programme in 2004: 1,080,131

Note: The Team found that the project expenditure information provided by the BDP finance support unit was inconsistent with the data given to the Team by the practice area people. The figures presented in Annex C cover both approved budget and estimated expenditures (in most cases) to December 2003, while the BDP budget figures cover expenditures through 2003. The following five projects are listed as examples of the variances in financial information. As can be seen, the figures are fairly close for 2 of the 5 projects, moderately close for one and completely inconsistent for the other two.

01/319 Investing in Women:
Practice area figures. $45,000 total.
BDP central figures $50,000.

01/616 Urban Management Programme.
Practice area figures $900,000 core funding and $5.6 million cost sharing
BDP central figures: $2.942 million core funding. Cost sharing $1.2 million

02/618 Democratic governance practice project
Practice area figures Core: $3.417 million
BDP central figures $318,000

02/661 Knowledge based advisory services
Practice area figures: $1 million of which $ 540,000 spent up to December 2003
BDP central figures: $373,000

02/703 Promoting social policy dialogue
Practice area figures: $ 630,000 to core of which about $430,000 spent to Dec/03
BDP central figures: $449,000
TABLE E.5  DEX FEES COLLECTED FROM 2001 TO 2003 AND CREDITED TO EXTRA-BUDGETARY ACCOUNT OF BDP ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NO.</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCF2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL001001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>455,896</td>
<td>468,605</td>
<td>924,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL001015</td>
<td>23,808</td>
<td>59,809</td>
<td>18,530</td>
<td>102,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL001217</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,269</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>9,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL01416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,707</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL001450</td>
<td>9,435</td>
<td>26,216</td>
<td>37,501</td>
<td>73,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002515</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002552</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,607</td>
<td>19,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002661</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>12,927</td>
<td>13,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002G07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,173</td>
<td>10,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL003217</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL003551</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL003552</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,018</td>
<td>32,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total GCF2</td>
<td>33,243</td>
<td>583,439</td>
<td>610,203</td>
<td>1,226,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TTF:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GL002M11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002M12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002M13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002M14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002M15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL002M16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,350</td>
<td>22,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL003M03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,788</td>
<td>56,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total TTFs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,123</td>
<td>100,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORMULA:

1) For GCF2: DEX fee rate varies (5%, 6%, and 8% of project costs)
   
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   \text{BDP} & = \ 4\% \ \text{of project costs} \times 95\% \\
   \text{UNDP Non-Specific} & = \ 1\% \ \text{of project costs} \\
   \text{BOM} & = \ 4\% \ \text{of project costs} \times 5\%
   \end{align*}
   \]

2) For TTFs: DEX fee rate also varies (8% and 5% of project costs)
   
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   \text{BDP} & = \ 8\% \ \text{or 5\% of project costs}
   \end{align*}
   \]

NOTE: This table does not include GMS fee (General Management Services) that Comptroller's Office calculates and credits BDP at the end of the year for TTF projects.

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   \text{BDP} & = \ 10\% \ \text{of 4\% of GMS Fee (4\% of project costs)}
   \end{align*}
   \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>TOTAL ($MILLION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>Salaries - Established Posts - IP Staff</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>174.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050</td>
<td>Temporary Assistant - SSA General Service Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0060</td>
<td>Consultants - SSA International</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0070</td>
<td>Local Consultants fees and travel</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0080</td>
<td>Overtime and night differential</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>Post Adjustment - Established Post - IP Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0120</td>
<td>Dependency Allowances - IP Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0150</td>
<td>Contribution to Joint Staff Pension Fund - IP Staff Rental</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>Home Leave Travel and Allowance</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>ALD-Base Pay (Staff Cost)</td>
<td>(88.6)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>ALD-Pension Fund Contribution (Staff Cost)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>ALD-Medical Insurance (Staff Cost)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>ALD-Reimbursement of income tax (staff cost)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>ALD-Appt/Separation Costs incl. Travel (Staff)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Transportation Tickets</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>125.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Promotional Materials and Distribution</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>260.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,675.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2,755.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Telephone - Long Distance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Telephone installation rental and maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230</td>
<td>Office EDP supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2250</td>
<td>Miscellaneous supplies</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310</td>
<td>Purchase - Furniture, Fixtures (incl. Freight &amp; ins.)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>Purchase of Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>Purchase - Installation of Microcomputer hardware</td>
<td>290.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>316.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120</td>
<td>Appointment/Separation Cost</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3140</td>
<td>Workshops - General</td>
<td>(234.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(234.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>Miscellaneous income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(88.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Costs - Reimbursements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Cost</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total as per Upstar report</td>
<td>253.4</td>
<td>3,283.5</td>
<td>371.5</td>
<td>3,908.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE E.7 SUMMARY INFORMATION ON THEMATIC TRUST FUNDS

During its first two years of operation (2001-2), the TTFs obtained total commitments of $36.9 million for the GCF programme areas (poverty, ICTD, HIV/AIDS, democratic governance and energy).\(^{181}\) Efforts to launch gender and environmental trust funds were not successful. By December 2003, the total commitments had increased to at least $54.6 million\(^{182}\). Annex E (Table E.3) presents financial details of the TTFs by practice area. The following briefly describes the use of TTFs for the practice areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>AMOUNTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>$11.1 million of funding supported over 70 projects with more than two thirds of the funding going to Benchmarking and Monitoring Poverty and the promotion of pro-poor policies</td>
<td>According to the July 2003 progress report the TTF helped countries complete MDG reports and poverty assessments, and has promoted policy dialogue and awareness building on MDGs. It has also developed capacity for poverty monitoring and supported pro-poor policies (for example, a study on links between macro-economic policies and poverty in Sri Lanka and privation and inequality in Mongolia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$6.2 million supported 31 projects with over 80% of the funds going to advocacy and policy dialogue or capacity development</td>
<td>About one third (31%) of the funds were allocated to global programmes, the largest being Leadership for Results. The remaining two thirds (69%) were allocated to country and regional programmes. According to the July 2003 progress report the TTF has allowed countries to develop and popularize cutting-edge transformative methodologies, enhancing their development effectiveness, governance and capacity to respond to the challenges of HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic governance</td>
<td>$33 million was mobilized, inclusive of costs. This was allocated among 6 service lines: decentralization, local governance and urban/rural development (30.8%); access to justice and human rights (26.4%); public administration reform and anti-corruption (13%); parliamentary development (12.8%); access to information (9.5%), and electoral systems and processes (7.5%).</td>
<td>Some $4.7 million was allocated to global programmes to operationalize service lines, develop programme tools, support key events, implement the public information, partnership and advocacy strategy and for planning and policy support to CO as part of the BDP global network. The remainder was allocated to country and regional programmes. According to the July 2003 progress report, the flexible funding mechanisms were particularly effective for responding to critical moments in politically volatile environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTD</td>
<td>$10 million. During 2002-03 $2,182,500 was disbursed through the first two tranche to 5 service lines: e-strategies (56%), e-initiative (23%), e-grants (14%), e-governance (5%), and Advocacy (2%).</td>
<td>With the conversion of ICTD from a practice area to a cross-cutting theme in December 2003, and with the reassignment of ICTD staff to the Poverty and Governance practice areas, the management of the ICTD TTF will have to be clarified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy for sustainable development</td>
<td>$4.7 million was allocated among 4 service lines with approximately half going to the development of policy frameworks and one quarter (24.8%) to rural energy services</td>
<td>The remainder was divided between increasing access to investment financing (13%) and clean technologies (10%). All of the funding went to regional and country projects and there were no global projects. According to the April 2003 progress report the TTF contributed to the achievement of the MDG, particularly the proportion of people living in poverty. It also helped link energy to a broader set of development objectives and positioned UNDP to engage in upstream policy dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

181. Figures are taken from the Thematic Trust Fund progress reports. These underestimate the total resource generation as they do not always include complementary initiatives which either started earlier or which operate in a slightly different way.

182. It is possible that not all 2003 commitments were captured in the TTF reports that were published in mid 2003.

183. The new names for the service lines are used.
F.1 POVERTY PRACTICE AREA

Poverty and related SURF/policy specialist support services. There is usually a high demand for SURF services in the area of poverty and MDGs, and much of it is in the previously mentioned areas that are emerging as UNDP’s niche market. While advisory services provided by the SURF specialists were often observed to be in the area of technical backstopping or project formulation, the PG team cited many examples where the main areas of demand from country offices concern macroeconomic policies, trade policies, employment policies and budget formulation. The PRSP process also generated a demand for SURF services, although in many cases the demand would be limited by the fact that the donors e.g. World Bank, or in some cases Governments, often preferred to identify their own consultants.

The demand for SURF services in the field of macroeconomics and poverty varied according to the characteristics of each country and to the nature of participation of major donor agencies. The services required in very poor countries, in many of which the large donors had only a limited presence; was quite different from the kinds of support required in middle-income countries. In the area of poverty and social development, the picture was mixed, with a range of ad hoc activities being undertaken in response to requests from CO’s in LDC and middle-income countries alike. However, PG staff believed that GCF supported initiatives were now producing material in areas such as the social dimensions of poverty reduction, trade and export strategies for small countries (the Djibouti model), gender budgeting and mainstreaming gender in poverty reduction which were increasing donor demand for UNDP services in poverty reduction programmes in middle-income as well as poorer countries. The Team was given a number of specific examples of donor and government interest in these studies and publications, but no BDP reports were available on the overall reaction to, and demand for these studies and services.

In many regions, the MDGs and the preparation of national MDG reports has become one of UNDP’s signature products. MDG monitoring and reporting were considered by many to be perhaps BDP’s single most important contribution over the period under consideration. PG provided leadership, took charge of inter-agency coordination and established and managed the MDG-Net.\footnote{The MDG e-network got highest rating in 2003 Global Staff Survey; and was the only e-network to include external members from CSOs, governments, donors & UN agencies.} Over 70 country reports have been issued, together with five regional reports PG also set up a project with other UNDG members for statistical literacy at country level, using DevInfo.
development and launch of the Arab MDG report was considered to be an example of a good collaborative effort between BDP and the regional programme and an effective use of the TTF. The SURF had also provided support to national MDG programmes in Latin America, Africa, the Caribbean and Asia. During the country visits the Team was able to confirm the high level of interest in UNDP support on the design and implementation of MDG programmes at the national and local levels.

The SURFs were found to be supportive of the Regional Bureaus and the COs in the preparation and promotion of the regional HDR and NHDR, which was well appreciated. However, in at least one country (Panama) the national MDG and HDR reports were published at more or less the same time, and there was some confusion between the two, particularly as they covered some of the same ground.\footnote{The Team was informed that the difference between MDGR and NHDR has now been clarified in the MDGR guidance note as well as in the MDG-Net. The former is for public advocacy, and the latter for policy advocacy.}

The SURFs have also participated in two regional research programmes in Asia and the Arab States that highlighted practical policy options and institutional means to foster pro-poor stabilization and growth. In Cambodia, the study led the national authorities to promote economic policies more pro-poor. Specific recommendations on how to make economic alternatives; but rather they offer not attempt to produce macro models or propose alternative development models; but rather they offer alternative development models; but rather they offer specific recommendations on how to make economic policies more pro-poor.

There is a supply-side constraint in terms of the availability of specialists to respond to the needs of around 15 countries covered by each SURF, especially in view of the increasingly specialized nature of the demand from CO’s. CO’s have stated that what they needed more assistance with innovative poverty project development and in building up a pipeline of projects with the participation of SURF specialists (or

In Latin America, the Team was informed by CO and SURF staff that the demand for SURF policy advisers was limited by the fact that the cost to the CO of contracting SURF policy advisers is approximately twice the market rate for equally well-qualified national consultants. Also countries such as Brazil consider that SURF staff cannot compete with the professional qualifications of internationally recognized Brazilian economists. BDP staff in HQ were of the opinion that the $400-per-day fee is not a meaningful comparison, as GCF/SURF consultants should be seen as a more cost-effective and better qualified alternative to the much more expensive international consultants that were previously being hired in many countries, and they should not be considered as competing with national consultants.

PG has launched a number of global initiatives in the areas of trade, globalization, economic alternatives, MDGs, gender, and poverty reduction. The initiatives combined review and synthesis of the experience of other organizations, new research, and sharing; dissemination through publications, workshops and conferences, training of trainers and the Practice Network and regional and country support through the SURFs. While global reports can make an important contribution, it should be emphasized that UNDP’s major role is, and will continue to be the provision of country-specific support and most poverty-related studies focus on national and not global issues. For example, the Asia-Pacific regional programme promoted national policy-oriented reports in nine countries while in Europe and the CIS, UNDP helped produce similar reports for Armenia, Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan. Similar initiatives were being launched for Syria, Sudan and Yemen and a 6-8 country regional programme on Economic Policies for Poverty Reduction is planned for Africa. The PG team emphasized that these reports do not attempt to produce macro models or propose alternative development models; but rather they offer specific recommendations on how to make economic policies more pro-poor.
identified suitable consultants) and knowledge of best practices in other countries. In some instances, a substantive contribution was made to developing project documents. However, more attention seemed to have been paid by BDP, in general, to developing the concepts and theoretical basis for projects, rather than the projects themselves. In some cases this was due to a deliberate decision by the SURFs to provide technical backstopping, but not "substantive assistance". Areas in which important innovative work was found included pro-poor economic policies, trade policies, fiscal policies and economic policy.

It was stated by the CO's that the SURFs generally provided good links to publications and resource persons; this service was provided in many SURFs by research assistants. There was a preference for accessing the SURF for referrals rather than the practice networks because the candidates on their roster knew the region and the languages required. Responses to such requests were very few from the networks. The networks were considered useful for sharing experiences and getting comments on papers etc.186

Note on the Brasilia Poverty Centre. The International Poverty Centre in Brasilia was created in August 2002 under GLO/02/515 "Establishment of UNDP Global Thematic Facility for Poverty Reduction". It has three main objectives: (i) training of high-level analysts and decision-makers in poverty reduction; (ii) South-South research on alternative anti-poverty strategies and pro-poor policies; and (iii) creating a global data-base for quantitative poverty analysis. Its aim is to expand the knowledge base and capacities of developing countries to design and implement effective policies against poverty. The centre was planned as a partnership with support from the Government of Brazil and IPEA (the Institute of Applied Economic Research)187, and with the intention of developing twinning arrangements with institutions to organize joint training and capacity development and hosting resident fellows and researchers from developing countries. One of the goals will be to use regional programmes as vehicles to translate general approaches to particular country contexts.

The reasons for locating the centre in Brazil were the following. First, UNDP wanted to locate the Centre in a country with world-class poverty research experience. UNDP already had very strong links with IPEA which is one of the top poverty research centres in a developing country. Second, it was felt that unlike the Oslo Centre, poverty research should be located in a developing country. Third, Brazilian President Cardosa was strongly supportive during the time when the location was first being discussed. At a later point, the strong contacts of the IPEA Director Pedro Paes Ibarro with President Luis Inacio Lula da Silva's poverty programmes was considered another positive factor. The launch of the Centre was delayed and until the Director assumed his position in February 2004, the Centre had essentially been operating with only a Deputy Director. Consequently operational strategies and work programmes have not yet been developed and it is too early to assess progress.

The International Poverty Centre is located in Brasilia and has four assigned UNDP positions. It will cooperate closely with IPEA, which is headquartered in Brasilia. It will use the triangulation approach to integrate academic poverty research findings with the evaluation of social programmes and helping decision-makers to use the findings of this research. A budget of $4,144,000 was approved under GLO/02/515 for an initial period of two years. Approximately 36% of the budget was allocated for personnel and mission costs, 46% for training and capacity development, and 15% for reporting costs, publications, web sites, etc.

The Team visit to the Centre at the end of January coincided the same day with the arrival of the Director who had just been appointed. Consequently it was too early to discuss proposed strategies and work programmes. However, in an informal discussion with the Deputy Director he outlined some of the initial ideas. The strong links with the Brazilian Government and IPEA provides the Centre with access to some of the leading South poverty researchers. It is also hoped that locating the Centre in Brazil can build on the Group of Three links that are being developed by Brazil with South Africa and India. Several potential models of international cooperation are being considered: (i) exchanges between the countries on areas where one has strong experience. For example South African experience with quotas for different excluded groups; (ii) areas in which all countries wish to conduct further research (for example assessing the quality of educational service delivery. Two or three countries could work together to fill gaps. The findings could then be applied in other countries; and (iii) joint cooperation packages which could be offered to other countries.

One goal is to improve the use and dissemination of experiences, particularly through South-South contacts.

186. At the time of the field visit to Brazil in January 2004 the International Poverty Centre in Brasilia was still getting fully established and the Director had just been appointed, so it was too early to make a judgment on the Centre's potential contribution to GCF policy work on poverty.

187. Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada.
UNDP's main assets and advantages are: its very detailed country knowledge, trust by most stakeholders, perceived impartiality - compared to World Bank and other donors - promotion of pluralism in discussions and alternative visions. It is hoped that these advantages can be built into the design and modus operandi of the Poverty Centre. Areas in which it is hoped the Centre will excel include: (i) presenting a broader vision than the PRSPs, which tend to be rigid, promoting the same formula for all countries and working within the same macro-economic conditions for all countries; (ii) going beyond conventional conditional transfer programmes through public agencies to provide a broader vision of how to eliminate rather than reduce poverty. At the same time recognizing that resources are limited; (iii) UNDP could assess the impacts of relaxing some of the currently non-negotiable conditions; (iv) MDGs can be used to promote a sense of direction and programme officers are responsible for a number of different areas in addition to poverty, so that the amount of time they can devote to using material produced under GCF is often quite limited (and even more so for gender).

Human Resources. As of November 2003, the Poverty Group (PG) had 16 poverty advisers and one vacant position funded under GLO/01/001 (Table F.1). Five poverty specialists were located in New York and the others were out-posted to the SURFs. In addition, five gender and development advisers were also working with PG, one in New York and four in the field.

In Asia, the Katmandu SURF has two poverty practice specialists - one on Gender and Development and another on Poverty Reduction Strategies/pro-poor policies. There was no one covering these subjects in the Bangkok SURF since early 2003. In the Arab region, the Beirut SURF had 2 specialists in 2003 - one designated as a macro-economist/ poverty reduction specialist, and the other designated as poverty reduction specialist. Both of the African SURFs have poverty specialists. LAC has one macro-economist for the Caribbean and one position approved but vacant for the Panama Office.

UNDP Country Offices: Most UNDP COs have a professional designated for work on poverty, who often also covers MDGs. Where there is no separate gender coordinator, this function will also usually, but not always, come under the poverty programme officer. However, the field visits found that most programme officers are responsible for a number of different areas in addition to poverty, so that the amount of time they can devote to using material produced under GCF is often quite limited (and even more so for gender).

Financial Resources. During 2001-3, the PG had a total budget\(^{188}\) $24,558,765 of which $6,515,693 was core funding, $3,722,607 cost sharing and $14,320,465 from Trust Funds.\(^{189}\) In addition over 20 policy advisers are funded under GLO/01/001

Global Projects: The Poverty Group obtained $7.3 million in funding from 11 Global Projects (see Table F.2). These permitted the PG to conduct research, prepare publications and support conferences, workshops and other networking activities in the areas of globalization, trade, gender, support to poverty reduction, social development and micro finance.

Thematic Trust Funds: In 2002 a total of $11,124,195 of TTF financing was approved for four service lines (Table F.3). This enabled PG to support a total of 73 activities in the four service lines given in the table. The funds were allocated among the regions as follows: Africa: 39.2%, Arab States: 7.6%, Asia and the Pacific: 19.6%, Latin America and the Caribbean: 11.7%, Europe and the CIS: 11.7% with the remaining 10.2% allocated to global projects. The two main donors were the Netherlands ($ 7.1 million) and Germany ($ 3.4 million).

---

**TABLE F.1 POVERTY POLICY ADVISERS FUNDED UNDER GLO/01/001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POVERTY GROUP POLICY SPECIALISTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa [being transferred to Pretoria or Dakar]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katmandu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1 (vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Most of these positions are funded under GLO/01/001.
2. Poverty Group Policy Advisers have a number of different titles including: Macro growth and structural policies; employment for poverty reduction; poverty specialist; poverty assessment, measurement and strategies.
3. One Gender Policy Adviser is located in Port of Spain but reports directly to HQ.

---

188. GCF-II budget information is taken from the Budget for the Second GCF 2001-2003 provided in the Briefing Book prepared for the Team by the Evaluation Office. However, these figures are often inconsistent with information provided by BDP staff, suggesting there may have been significant modifications in the budget as the programme progressed.

ANNEX F: METRICS ON PRACTICE AND CROSS-CUTTING AREAS

F.2 ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

EEG's practice structure has supported WSSD initiatives through 4 'WEHAB' sub-practices under a 4x4 Matrix including water, energy, land management and biodiversity along cross-cutting themes: 1) environmental governance, 2) climate change, 3) mainstreaming environment and 4) community based initiatives. Due to some delays in implementation, a full assessment of the impact of the practice outputs and results will be finalized by the end of 2004. However, in Kenya the Team was informed of a pilot Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) to link up with the UN Millennium Project Task Force on MDG 7 indicators that UNDP is formulating with UNEP. A key partner, DFID/UK as well as the DDC policy specialists, provided corroboration for this innovative program. The 2003 ROAR review showed a fairly heavy under-reporting of GCF-II EEG and other activities, as these were not captured due to their non-TRAC funding base. This may be due to some confusion in COs about the inclusion of non-core activities in the reporting mechanism.

Following WSSD at the end of 2002, the EEG practice area was extensively restructured to more precisely reflect the Secretary General's WEHAB priority areas, and to focus EEG's activities and programs on achieving the MDGs. This restructuring also brought UNDP's GCF II-funded and GEF-funded programs into close alignment to allow for fuller complementarity between core and non-core sources. A practice manager was introduced in September 2003 to provide oversight of the process. A yearlong recruitment process for nine posts in 2001 resulted in numerous delays to the start up of program activities.

The energy global programme area encompasses 4 service lines: 1) enabling activities to enhance access to energy for sustainable development, 2) providing access to rural energy services to reduce poverty, 3) promoting sustainable energy technologies to lower greenhouse emissions and 4) helping to mobilize access to new financing modalities.

---

TABLE F.2 FUNDING FROM GLOBAL PROJECTS FOR THE POVERTY PROGRAMME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/615</td>
<td>Globalization, Liberalization and SHD</td>
<td>309,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/00/516</td>
<td>Trade and SHD</td>
<td>579,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/318</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>862,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/319</td>
<td>Investing in Women: Linking FFD with WSSD*</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/615</td>
<td>Globalization, Liberalization and SHD</td>
<td>1,179,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/G07</td>
<td>Integrated Framework – Djibouti*</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/515</td>
<td>Global Poverty Centre (Rio Centre)</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/518</td>
<td>Support to Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>324,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/703</td>
<td>Policy Dialogue and Social Development*</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/515</td>
<td>Policy Advice for Economic Alternatives</td>
<td>485,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/517</td>
<td>Improving the Quality for UNDP Micro finance Programmes</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,320,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Separate reports have been prepared on each of these 3 GLOs (see Section 4.3.2 of this report)

---

TABLE F.3 THEMATIC TRUST FUND SUPPORT FOR POVERTY BY SERVICE LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE LINE</th>
<th>NO. OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1: Benchmarking and Monitoring Poverty</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7,571,957</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2: Participatory Processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>560,200</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3: Pro-Poor Policies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,027,618</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4: Piloting and Innovation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>964,420</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,124,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

F.2 ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

EEG’s practice structure has supported WSSD initiatives through 4 ‘WEHAB’ sub-practices under a 4x4 Matrix including water, energy, land management and biodiversity along cross-cutting themes: 1) environmental governance, 2) climate change, 3) mainstreaming environment and 4) community based initiatives. Due to some delays in implementation, a full assessment of the impact of the practice outputs and results will be finalized by the end of 2004. However, in

---

190. These figures, taken from the list of GLO projects provided by the Evaluation Office.
The UNDP global staff survey rated Energy and Environment as the second highest practice group in providing services. At the global level, EEG has pushed UNDP’s policy envelope to a considerable level through preparation of a number of knowledge products. To illustrate, the Energy sub-practice has generated a Clean Development Mechanism User’s Guide that received peer review for publication. The document represents a good example of sharing of best experiences and offers COs a hands-on-tool. A larger examination of the global literature on energy, government policy initiatives and multilateral GEF and other documentation perhaps should be conducted to determine the policy impact and outcomes of the Energy products.

BDP has benefited from its partnership in the GEF and the MP (Montreal Protocol) and responsibility for Capacity 21 in achieving fairly high visibility on the Environment within the donor community and developing countries that were the beneficiaries of over $1.5 billion allocated. There continues to be a strong demand for UNDP support and services across the broad spectrum of post-WSSD partnerships that are being mined for innovative relationships at the local, national and regional levels, such as the Global Village Energy Partnership (GVEP) now operational in 15 (out of 32) country programs. EEG partners with a wide assortment of donors: IFIs (e.g., WB, IMF); bilaterals (e.g., USAID); UN (e.g., UNEP) as well as advancing public/private relations with industry in 6 countries (China, Vietnam, South Africa, Ghana, Honduras) and building knowledge centers of excellence in collaboration with regional institutions (e.g., EDRC in South Africa, AFREPERN in Kenya).

**Human Resources.** It appears that BDP’s allocation of policy specialists to EEG, only seven out of the initial 50 SURF posts (14% of the total for one of UNDP’s 3 major practices), was insufficient from the outset, especially since two Bureaus, RBAS and RBEC opted not to have any energy and environment staff among the 50 posts in their regional SURFs. This lack of coverage in two regions and low level of coverage in the remaining three regions was particularly problematical for EEG in light of the severe downsizing of headquarters environmental staff that was underway in 2001. EEG’s staff capacity has been further constrained in 2003 and 2004 because even after a severe reduction of EEG staff down to a total of 9 approved EEG headquarters posts during the 2001 restructuring, 3 of those 9 posts (33%) have been retracted. This is especially challenging for EEG after WSSD when UNDP is exhibiting global leadership in its energy and environment areas and there are multiple opportunities for expanding its work and impact. The Team received validation of this perception during its field visits. For example, the three out-posted policy specialists based in Nairobi are required to cover 56 countries in Africa and the Middle East and strongly voiced their concern that there are not enough specialists to service UNDP’s global presence. Despite EEG’s highest percentage of non-core contribution to BDP, the EEG’s reported insufficient number of staff has meant that all service lines could not be comprehensively implemented, and that, until recently, certain regions received inadequate coverage. To address the fact that COs need more implementation capacity than is available from the SURF policy specialists, RBAS, for example, is to be serviced on a 50/50% basis by the Drylands Development Center (DDC) policy specialist based in Beirut and by GLO/01/001, RBEC will now benefit by the transfer of one Environmental policy specialist from Nairobi to Bratislava. It was noted that the transaction costs (e.g., communication) to achieve integration between HQs and field-based policy specialists are very high.

Organizationally, the introduction of the matrix management model has caused some problems. Line authority of BDP remains unclear on reporting and accountability of policy specialists with other Bureaus. Another perception is that policy specialists have been misused in support of corporate goals that have little relevance to their specific terms of reference resulting in loss of the best use of skills sets.

A number of policy specialists did not feel that they were included in the global fabric of the policy mainstream and expressed discontent with often-unclear mandates and little funding to back up their work. They especially felt a need for clarity regarding their functional roles as SURF specialists and BDP technical experts. It was acknowledged by BDP practice managers that SURF policy specialists in Africa, Asia and Latin America have been important for backstopping in-country delivery and follow up. GCF-II by design provided limited financial resources to policy specialists. Reverting to BDP for travel and other administrative funding, they believe, has impeded their efficiency and effectiveness in responding to CO demands for policy support services.

**Financial Resources.** From 1992 through 2000, over one billion dollars in GEF, MLF and non-core funding was generated to support a wide variety of GEF and Montreal Protocol activities that clearly fuelled UNDP participation in the environment sector. EEG’s niche within the 2001 re-organization of BDP towards upstream policy support services rested on the need to catalyze policy frameworks, capacity building and other...
development considerations that could not be funded under strict GEF financial guidelines.

GCF-II introduced thematic coherence between core and non-core sources as an attempt to rationalize funding and eliminate donor fatigue. BDP noted however that this was not the case for GEF & MP as the resource mobilization method was not one of approaching donors. GCF core funding of $2.3 million was allocated for each of the two programs (Energy and Environment) and was viewed as catalytic resources to initiate and build global partnerships (e.g. Global Water Partnership, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Energy Sector Management Assistance Programme (ESMAP), Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF), etc.) in UNDP’s areas of focus in Energy and Environment and to maintain its global leadership in key negotiations and policy fora like the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the global environmental conventions on biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), World Water Forum, and ESMAP with the World Bank. Two TTFs were set up for each sub-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table F.4</th>
<th>EEG - RESOURCE MOBILIZATION POST-WSSD</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CATEGORY</strong></td>
<td><strong>DONOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>US$ (MILLION)</strong></td>
<td><strong>DONOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>0.03 (CWI)</td>
<td>0.05 (CWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.2 (TTF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.2 (TTF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>6.4 (TTF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty &amp; Environment Initiative</td>
<td>Country Level</td>
<td>5 (UNDP TRAC and bilaterals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB (WRR)</td>
<td>0.4 (parallel)</td>
<td>CI (Footprint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNEP (WRR)</td>
<td>0.4 (parallel)</td>
<td>TNC (Footprint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>UNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swiss (two programs)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>GEF (parallel financing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equator Partners</td>
<td>4.61 in cash (6 million in parallel)</td>
<td>UNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>SwissRe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>NOK 6.5 million= 0.919 US$</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Euro 1.01 million= 1.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>250,376.46 (euro)= 0.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50,000 (C$)= 0.37 US$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>US$ 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>UNF-CDM</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNF-CDM</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>(GEF/SGP)</td>
<td>15.0 (community forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>US$0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practice area. The Energy TTF successfully raised $12.5 million from five donors, a figure equivalent to resources secured by the Poverty practice area. The Environment TTF, however, was inactive.

To avoid duplication of TTF administration structures, it has been decided to merge the two TTFs under the 2005-2007 MYFF and to focus on the six E&E service lines of the MYFF. This decision also is intended, experience with TTFs did not meet expectations of either COs or BDP and that supply and demand could not be balanced despite the focus achieved in aligning funding to practice areas. According to the practice management for Energy and Environment, resource constraints led to less funding for global level activities and support for vital partnerships that give visibility to UNDP's policy credibility.

As assessed by one of the EEG TTF managers, UNDP should address whether or not the TTF mechanism is the most appropriate mechanism. It was opined that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>2002 (US$)</th>
<th>2003 (US$)</th>
<th>2002+2003 (US$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,824,708</td>
<td>1,824,708</td>
<td>Earmarked for Pacific Island Countries on regional and national energy policies and planning over 2004-2007 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>418,328</td>
<td>418,328</td>
<td>Allocated for GVEP activities with regional focus in West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,847</td>
<td>1,187,649</td>
<td>US$ 220,847 (received in 2003) are for GVEP activities globally; US$ 1,187,649 (committed) are for a project on renewable energy for rural areas in India over 2004-2007 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Unearmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,187,649</td>
<td>1,243,781</td>
<td>Earmarked for GVEP activities globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2,275,313</td>
<td>4,135,517</td>
<td>6,410,830</td>
<td>$1,414,428 of the amount received in 2003 is earmarked for 2004 activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>Total contribution from USAID (1.2 million) over 2004-2006 is for GVEP activities with a global focus. US$ 400K was received in 2003 with annual installments of US$ 400K expected in 2004 and 2005.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total | 6,367,341 | 3,812,357 |
Total      | 2,285,313 | 10,179,698 | 12,465,011 |

Source: 2003 Report on TTF on Energy for Sustainable Development

As evident from the Table F.5, under the Energy TTF, every dollar of core leveraged four dollars of non-core (4:1), which exceeded the envisaged 2 to 1 target set by BDP. The Environment TTF, however, was not operational in 2002-03.

---

191. The Global Village Energy Partnership (GVEP) is a post-WSSD multi-stakeholder effort on expanding access to rural energy services as a means to support poverty reduction.
F.3 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Table F.6 provides examples of the wide range of activities covered under each of the six service lines of the DG practice area. Given the size and complexity of the programme, and the large amount of published material on each area, it was not possible to assess the organization, implementation or impacts of each service line within the present evaluation. Consequently it was agreed between the Evaluation Office and BDP in January 2004 that the evaluation would examine in-depth two representative global projects, selected by BDP. The two selected projects were the Urban Management Programme (GL0/01/616)\(^{192}\) and the Democratic Governance Practice Project (GLO/02/618). The two projects are discussed in detail in Annex E and some of the key findings from the Urban Management Programme are presented below. Illustrative examples from the two projects are included in this annex.

The DG Practice attaches high priority to the promotion of cross-practice activity, as democratic governance is a basic development approach equally applicable in all sectors. The Governance team considers that the electronic networks have been one of their success stories in terms of cross-practice activity. During 2003, a total of 122 queries were posted on the DGPNet. Of these approximately, 20% were cross-posted with one or more of the other networks and the percentage is expected to be even higher for 2004. A number of cross-practice meetings were also held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance policy support</th>
<th>General support to programme development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish world-class legal advisory service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and publications on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social perception of accountability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minorities and development [followed by workshop];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>land and development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop 6 human rights action plans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen capacity of COs and provide support through UNVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produce practice note on electoral systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy advice on electoral assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral systems and processes</td>
<td>Establishing South-South cooperation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop sub-practice area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization and local government</td>
<td>Pilot participatory community and municipal based projects for delivering services to the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity development of local government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation of lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration reform and anti-corruption</td>
<td>Urban Management Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and disseminate practice note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing policy advice to COs and SURFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting best practice and good governance through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize Reconstruction and Corruption workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare anti-corruption policy note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish electronic network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing knowledge through network discussions and building community with donors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MAPs of intended results for DGG Service Lines 2001 - 2003.

Note: MAPS were only prepared for GLO supported activities so the table does not cover all DGG activities.

\(^{192}\) A similar approach was used for the other practice areas and cross-cutting sectors and a total of 10 global projects were analyzed. Three members of the Evaluation Team spent a week in New York in April 2004 to review these 10 projects.
The tendency of BDP staff to only concentrate on their own service line was counterbalanced by the matrixing and the programme review team methodologies employed by the DG practice. The team has been proactively, and they believe successfully, promoting cross-practice exchanges in all aspects of their work. The progress towards the UN-wide rollout of Huritalk as the network on human rights, is considered another example of where governance products are being promoted to a much broader audience. They acknowledge, however, that cross-practice activities are made more difficult by the current senior management focus on specialization.

An effective and well-received planning tool was the survey of Resident Representatives in Asia that mapped their attitudes to the six service lines and to the overall design of the Governance Practice Area. Most Resident Representatives consulted with government and partners before responding. Many indicated that they found the instrument very useful and they planned to replicate it for other service lines.

The Urban Management Programme: The project includes six service lines: (1) Strengthening legislatures, (2) Electoral systems and processes, (3) Local governance and decentralization, (4) Access to information, (5) Access to justice and human rights, and (6) Public administration reform. The project included some 15 intended outputs (building and populating knowledge networks, direct support to country offices and SURFs, conferences and events, provision of policy advice etc); and some 70 distinct activities. A summary of some of the key points from the analysis are presented in this section. This provided support to urban local governments in four thematic areas: (1) Urban poverty reduction, (2) Urban environment management, (3) Participatory urban governance and (4) HIV/AIDS at the local level.

The following initial indicators of outcomes and impacts of the programme/project were proposed by the Practice Team:

a) The project has helped to establish the democratic governance practice. The knowledge codification and networking, policy development, policy advisory and alignment aspects of UNDP in this area were all largely supported by this project. In the opinion of the Team this is confirmed by the fact that Governance is now a dynamic practice area.

b) The programme has helped to shape the more assertive stance that UNDP is taking as an advocate for democratic governance, particularly as a key means to achieve the MDGs. For example, the project has helped to leverage partnerships so as to extend the reach of the project and obtain access to a wider pool of expertise, and developing practice notes for each service line that have reached CO staff as well as external audiences.

c) The project has helped leverage global funding for cost-sharing programmes that advance the same aims.

d) The practice area has also been successful in promoting cross-practice and cross-network cooperation.

e) Democratic governance is probably the practice area with most success in developing external partnerships that have involved both significant cost-sharing and collaborative development of programmes.

No systematic evaluation of the UMP outcomes and impacts has yet been conducted although extensive documentation is available on the implementation of the activities conducted in each city and region. A Mid-Term Evaluation and Forward-Looking Assessment of Phase IV was conducted by the Development Planning

193. The DG team cited a large number of examples where they had successfully promoted cross-practice exchanges. From Decentralization and work with HIV/AIDS, localizing MDGs, to work with Poverty (Bergen Seminars, Joint Practice Note on Poverty and HR, PAR and Pro-poor Fiscal Policy). Human Rights cutting across practices with the HRBA to development - upcoming training of donors in The Netherlands with Dasa Silovic and Thord’s team – PPP on Water Governance, joint work with ICT4D on eGovernance and A2I until the merger, Corporate Social Responsibility with BRSP Strategic Partnerships, and of course the whole run-up to Bergen and initiatives on Transitional Justice including preparing the SG’s report to the SC on Rule of Law, with the Crisis Practice, there have been numerous elements of cross-practice work”.

194. There was agreement in principle to replicate the survey with RBEC in the Europe and CIS country offices but this been postponed at least temporarily due to 2004 budget cuts.

195. In the opinion of the Team this is confirmed by the fact that Governance is now a dynamic practice area.

196. Examples of how this has been achieved include leveraging partnerships so as to extend the reach of the programme and obtain access to a wider pool of expertise, and developing practice notes for each service line that have reach external audiences as well as CO staff.

197. For example $1.6 million from Germany and Norway for the DGTTF and $1.5 million from Sweden for the Hurist project.

198. As indicated earlier, an analysis of the DGPNet over the last 12 months found that of the 122 queries posted on the DGPNet from 1 January- 30 December 2003, 25 or approximately 20% were cross-posted with one or more other networks and the figures are trending higher so far for the DGPNet for 2004.

199. See Annex C-3 for a discussion of the partnerships developed by the Urban Management Programme.
The urban management programme is one of the few GCF programmes to have developed a clearly defined exit strategy and this experience should be carefully monitored to draw lessons for other programmes that have a planned completion date. A number of challenges were identified: (1) the short time frame makes it difficult to assess progress towards the long-term and ambitious goals set by UNDP for this practice area; and (2) the changing expectations within UNDP as to what a practice area should be make it difficult to plan and to assess performance. Although the primary objective of the project is to promote global objectives, there are continual pressures to respond to country and regional priorities. A constant challenge is to define and maintain the balance among these competing demands.

According to several SURF advisers, the demand for the municipal management programme support has steadily increased as experience has shown that many issues previously considered to be purely technical in fact involve important questions of governance. One of the challenges that UMP faces in Africa and perhaps some other regions, is the continuing distrust by many government agencies and academics of the private sector. This is an added challenge for involving the private sector in the management and delivery of municipal services. A further complicating factor is that UNDP only records private partners when funds go directly through UNDP, so there is a significant underreporting of the level of private sector participation. A further challenge in Africa, and some other regions, is that unstable political situations mean that much institutional development and capacity-building work is lost - or put on hold for long periods - due to political breakdown or radical changes.

In Latin America it has proved a challenge to interest COs in decentralization programmes, as staff are overworked and this is a low-priority area. As a result, many TTF and PPPUE funding opportunities have not been taken up by COs. Decentralization has traditionally received low priority in smaller countries as there is a strong tradition of highly centralized government and they do not see the need for decentralization.

The electronic networks seem to be an effective way to strengthen cross-practice cooperation on urban management, both within and outside UNDP and this approach should be strengthened. The networks are particularly important in areas such as urban management where the programme is working with over 140 cities and where it would be very difficult to develop communication in any other way. However, effective networks are staff intensive as it is necessary to provide active facilitation of discussions and rapid feedback to queries. The COs proved critical as an expert source of advice on local and regional political and economic contexts and it is essential to provide incentives to ensure their continued participation.

The city consultation on solid waste management resulted in the finalization of the action plan using a participatory consultation process.
Note on the Oslo Governance Centre

The Oslo Governance Centre (OGC) was established as part of UNDP’s global policy support network for democratic governance in March 2002. The Centre exists institutionally as part of the Democratic Governance Group of the Bureau for Development Policy and financially within the framework of the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund or DGTTF (which is funded by Netherlands, Norway, Germany, and Finland). It has an important, distinct role in democratic governance knowledge and practice development, knowledge codification, learning and fellowship, and external partnerships with a specific focus on a few strategic areas of the DG practice (Justice, Human Rights, Governance and Civil Society, Conflict and Governance). Furthermore, the OGC provides policy support services to the entire DG practice of UNDP, by developing policy support tools, knowledge and good practice. The Centre hosts several annual strategic initiatives of the Democratic Governance practice such as the Bergen Seminar Series workshop on ‘Justice and Security Sector Reform’.

The OGC also established the Fellowship Program designed to support the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-based organization by encouraging all staff members to enhance their governance related skills and strengthen organizational knowledge. It is somewhat similar in purpose to the SURF ‘Mutual Support Initiative’. While the ‘fellows’ report positive feedback, time will tell whether the substantial investment in this program will pay off, or whether there may be more cost-effective means of increasing staff skills and broadening experience in governance or other practice areas.

Any and all of the above initiatives may be seen as advocacy, or more simply seen as policy dialogue, expanding awareness and understanding of issues. To be sure, any of the conferences, workshops or seminars might have been sponsored or initiated by the governance practice based in New York. The relative cost-benefit of running and funding such initiatives from a BDP Oslo base as opposed to NY base is a question that might be explored.

TABLE F.7 TTF SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE BY SERVICE LINE 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE LINE</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>% OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL ALLOCATED (US$)²</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1 Parliamentary Development</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3,719,000</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2 Electoral Systems and Processes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,172,000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3 Access to Justice and Human Rights</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7,681,000</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4 Access to Information and E-Governance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,751,000</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5 Decentralization, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8,940,000</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6 Public Administration Reform and anti-Corruption</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3,772,000</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29,035,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 Funds approved for the period 2001-03 but only allocated for 2002 and 2003.
2 The new names for the service lines are used.
3 This figure is taken from the May 2003 report as the updated total allocation of $31,780,000 is not broken down by service line in the May 2004 report.
4 This figures is taken from the 2003 TTF report (May 2004). It is not disaggregated by service line in the report. This is less than the reported $33 million as costs are not included.

innovative and practical knowledge and policy advice to UNDP. The second area is to establish and strengthen partnerships with governments and research institutions with a global reach. The third area is to advocate priority global issues.

**Human Resources.** As of April 2003 the Governance group had 14 professionals and 3 support staff based in HQ, 15 SURF-based and 8 professionals and 3 support staff in the Oslo Centre.

**Financial Resources.** During 2001-03 the Democratic Governance Programme mobilized approximately $33 million through the Governance Thematic Trust Fund, $3.5 million from 7 global projects and also leveraged significant additional funds through cost sharing. These were complemented by $8,886,000 in core funding. Some service lines were funded exclusively from TTFs or global projects, while others, such as Electoral Systems received funding from both sources. The TTF is intended to fund shorter-term innovative and catalytic activities while the Global Projects are intended to support longer-term processes. The assessment found that the two sources of funding were combined in a clear and logical way to support a coherent development strategy for the practice.

The Democratic Governance practice area mobilized $33 million, inclusive of costs in trust funds. This was more than all the poverty, ICT, energy and HIV/AIDS trust funds combined. The funds were allocated among six service lines: decentralization, local governance and urban/rural development (30.8%); access to justice and human rights (26.4%); public administration reform and anti-corruption (13%); parliamentary development (12.8%); access to information (9.5%); and electoral systems and processes (7.5%). Some $4.7 million was allocated to global programmes to operationalize service lines, develop programme tools, support key events, implement the public information, partnership and advocacy strategy and for planning and policy support to COs as part of the BDP global network. The remaining $28.3 million was allocated to country and regional programmes. According to the July 2003 TTF progress report, the flexible funding mechanisms were particularly effective for responding to critical moments in politically volatile environments. The TTF also enabled GCF to mobilize other donor resources and create new partnerships.

Seven global projects received a total of $3,516,993 (Table F.7), with the two largest being the Democratic Governance Practice Area (GLO/02/618) that received $1,429,920 and the Urban Management Project Phase 4 (GLO/01/616) which received $900,000.

### Table F.8: Global Project Funding for the Governance Group Under GCF-II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT #</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLO/97/617</td>
<td>Global umbrella programme on governance</td>
<td>90,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/97/627</td>
<td>LIFE Participatory Local Government</td>
<td>227,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/99/620</td>
<td>Global decentralized governance programme Phase II</td>
<td>168,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/99/621</td>
<td>Establishment of a legal resource unit</td>
<td>680,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/616</td>
<td>Urban management programme Phase IV</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/605</td>
<td>HURIST</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/02/618</td>
<td>Democratic Governance practice area</td>
<td>1,429,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,516,993</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The “approved budget” figures represent GCF funding. In most cases, non-core resources increase the total budgets significantly. For example, the Urban Management Programme leveraged approximately $6.5 million in additional resources.

The UMP (discussed above) was able to leverage an additional $6.5 million from the U.K., Switzerland and Sweden. The UMP also coordinates closely with the Public-Private Partnership for Urban Environment (PPPUE) based in Pretoria and many of the participating cities have also been able to access PPPUE grant funding.

### F.4 HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS became UNDP’s fifth practice area in 2001, as a response to the growing epidemic, priorities identified by Resident Representatives, and expectations of development partners. HIV/AIDS was a Special Initiative within BDP between 2001 and 2003, and was established as a Group only in 2003. UNDP's HIV/AIDS Corporate Strategy and service lines were developed through a series of internal and external consultations at global, regional and country levels.

The UNDP Executive Board approved UNDP’s HIV/AIDS strategy in February 2002, and in 2003 the...
Executive Board endorsed UNDP’s 2004-2007 MYFF document and the three HIV/AIDS service lines.207

The HIV/AIDS practice facilitates implementation of a broad spectrum of support under UNDP’s corporate strategy and three service lines (1) Leadership and Capacity Development, 2) Development Planning, Implementation and HIV/AIDS Responses, and 3) Advocacy and Communication.208 A number of phase one programmes were reported to have been completed in all countries over a nine-month period that included at least three sessions held on leadership capacity development, and ongoing action. The documented outcomes include breakthrough initiatives, building capacity nationally, partnership building and institutional actions.209 This strategic process focuses on connecting sectors and producing results. Indeed, the practice group is very proficient in collecting and

---

**BOX F.2 HIV/AIDS – SCALE-UP STRATEGY IN A COUNTRY**

Leadership for Results is about scale and strategic influence. It is designed to address scale from year to year 3-4. In addition, various components reinforce one another - the “arts and media” generating a multiplier effect, “development planning” creating an enabling policy environment, and “community conversations enhancement” and “leadership development programmes” inducing resonance. Moreover capacity transfer initiatives, like the one under way in Ethiopia, scale up strategies since they aim at expanding national capacity to deliver LDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES FOR YEAR 1</th>
<th>OUTCOMES FOR YEAR 2</th>
<th>OUTCOMES FOR YEAR 3-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment, Ownership, Partnerships, and Breakthroughs</td>
<td>Consolidation, Intensifying Capacity transfer, and Involving Special Sectors</td>
<td>Scale-up Nationwide, South-South Collaboration and UNDP Exit Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Through Leadership Development Programme (LDP), developing partnerships among high level ministers and 150-200 influential decision makers from all sectors who define and act on HIV/AIDS agenda</td>
<td>- Deepened LDP to institutionalize organizational capacity development at all levels of society and capacity built for 10-15 local LDP coaches</td>
<td>- 1,000 top decision makers acting on HIV/AIDS agenda, through LDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National change agents developed as practitioners of development who have a sphere of influence in government and civil society</td>
<td>- 350-450 influential decision makers acting on HIV/AIDS agenda</td>
<td>- 200 innovative breakthrough initiatives undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoting community decision making and action through training 25 national trainers and 5,000 individuals reached (by CBOs) through CCE Programmes</td>
<td>- Through CCE, 25 national CCE trainers developed from year 1 reaching 25,000 individuals. Quality assurance activities initiated</td>
<td>- Leadership for Results activities adapted by Governments as their own platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involving Arts and Media to bring into the public domain (radios and other media) stories of leadership from all levels and advocating for gender equality and PLWHA rights</td>
<td>- 150 most influential arts and media “movers and shakers” involved in UNDP resource-building activities and undertake breakthrough projects. 30-fold increase in coverage (from baseline) of leadership stories and advocacy for gender and PLWHA rights</td>
<td>- Through CCE, 1,000,000 individuals reached by CBOs and fully-functioning coalitions of CSOs and CBOs undertaking CCE Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20-fold increase in print and electronic coverage,</td>
<td>- 75 innovative breakthrough initiatives undertaken and mainstreaming of gender, equity, and human rights into planning and executive processes as well as into the media</td>
<td>- Community and LDP concerns mainstreamed into government planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30 + Innovative breakthrough initiatives undertaken and documented by participants of LDP, CCE, key planners and policy makers, and artists and media practitioners</td>
<td>- Dialogue to set-up coalitions external to UNDP to take on Leadership for Results programmes initiated and partnerships forged</td>
<td>- Fully-functioning coalitions of artists and media and 40-fold increase in coverage (from baseline) of leadership stories and advocacy for gender and PLWHA rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HIV/AIDS advocated for as a development issues and enrollment of all stakeholders, national and UN partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishment of national coalitions to take on Leadership for Results and fully functioning and locally-supported resource network of experts in all key UNDP programmatic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership for Results programmes applied to selected MDGs and other practice areas (e.g., governance, poverty, gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Exit strategy for UNDP with mechanisms for quality assurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


208. HIV/AIDS Group; 2004; Committed leadership can reverse the course of the epidemic; BDP, UNDP; HIV/AIDS Group; 2003; HIV/AIDS Group Workshop on Country Support; BDP, UNDP; HIV/AIDS Group; 2003; Information pack for country offices: The Answer Lies Within; BDP, UNDP.

209. Please see document: Key references for the HIV/AIDS Group.
The HIV/AIDS Group has convened two global meetings with UNAIDS and co-sponsors on development planning in 2003 and 2004, and invited regional bureaus to participate. Under this SL, regional work was done with RBEC on National Strategic Planning in Poland and in Ukraine; two regional meetings on development planning were convened in Delhi. In addition, the HIV/AIDS Group and the Governance group conducted joint work on decentralization in Nepal. In the Dominican Republic work is being done on decentralization, and in Bolivia a community-based response was developed. In Southern Africa, the HIV/AIDS group is supporting sub-national planning. Support to the GFATM is a key area under this service line. In Africa, the regional programme is reported to have also done extensive work in this service line. UNDP support to preparations for the Barcelona AIDS conference held in 2002 enhanced UNDP's global advocacy role.

The practice group's self-assessment provides a wealth of material and documentation for examination of HIV/AIDS programme support that suggests the outreach of the small staffing complement goes beyond the usual parameters. However, the challenge remains to capture the results and the scale of support for attribution in country progress reporting, reflecting both upstream policy influence and downstream technical support activities. Policy specialists noted that a better M&E mechanism should be implemented to assess impact. A common UNAIDS M&E system exists, called the Country Response Information System (CRIS). Lesotho, for example, utilized UNDP support to scale up downstream activities into a national policy framework.

The programme has demonstrated potential for replication as illustrated by UNAIDS' request to partner with UNDP to implement the LDP jointly in five countries and ILO's approach to UNDP to implement the LDP jointly in two countries. The CCE has been implemented in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malaysia, Senegal, South Africa and Swaziland. The National AIDS Council in Congo has decided to implement the programme and has requested UNDP assistance. In Ethiopia, the HIV/AIDS Community Conversation schemes' programme is now going nationwide.

The Trinidad SURF was reported to be supportive on the regional (six countries) initiative in the Caribbean, viewed as strategically scaling up UNDP's response to HIV/AIDS in Barbados/OECS, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago. The project is being implemented closely with the CARICOM Secretariat and other regional partners in a region that has the second-highest prevalence globally after sub-Saharan Africa.

A regional workshop for artists and media from six countries was held in South Africa, with participation from Lesotho. The workshop supported the creation of positive and empowering images and messages related to women and PLWHA to address underlying causes of the epidemic and scale-up action through the media. South African participants went on to hold the first ever HIV/AIDS Arts, Film and Media Festival in Johannesburg in October 2003.

The group was found to be adept at fostering relationships with NGOs, CSOs and other civil society entities within all regions. The leadership development programme being implemented in 20 countries appeared to have generated interaction and results at the country level. Over 400 innovations and initiatives have resulted from the programmes in just 2 years, reaching large numbers of people and institutions, and improving the functioning for UN Country Teams. With overstretched staff capacity, both within the practice area and in the COs, UNDP needs to invest in increasing human resources at country, regional and global levels. The uniqueness of this method is that it generates self-sustaining action.

The Team's field visits to southern Africa were limited to Botswana and Lesotho, where the programmes started in late 2003, and therefore did not allow for validation of this aspect.

At the global level, UNDP management of a sizable GFATM package demonstrates one partner's trust in UNDP capacity and credibility, as does UNAIDS' partnership.
funding commitment over the next biennium. But in a highly competitive sector that generates massive resources, UNDP will need to take a corporate decision as to whether to carry out its own internal scaling up regarding the crisis in order to ensure new and vibrant partnerships to support its comparative advantage.

**Human Resources.** In 2003, HIV/AIDS became a separate goal under the UNDP MYFF with three service lines. Consequently, the group missed the initial allocation of 75 policy specialists under GLO/01/001. However, in recognition of the fact that nine of the 10 highest HIV prevalence countries are found in southern and eastern Africa, one policy specialist was out-posted to Pretoria to cover all of Africa, and a second policy specialist was placed in Asia. In addition, in 2004, two regional policy specialists were placed in Bratislava and Egypt, jointly funded by the regional bureaus and BDP from other resources. The staffing base has expanded (four policy specialists at HQs but not funded under GCF-II core resources) sparingly in 2004. But, as the practice manager points out, the limited number of staff in the SURFs and at HQs cannot fully address the practice area's range of substantive issues.

The HIV/AIDS Group appeared to be one of the few areas that organized its structure and support in terms of GCF-II dimensions and to have actively promoted and catalogued goal setting around globalization, participation, growth and crises. HIV/AIDS policy specialists/advisers are jointly funded by BDP and Regional Bureaus and are responsible for both regional projects as well as BDP services in RBAP, RBEC and RBAS.

**Financial Resources.** The Group received $800,000 in core GCF resources in 2003 and has had limited success in mobilizing donor funds under the global HIV/AIDS TTF set up in 2002 to support the then 5 service lines, now 3 (as codified in the 2004-07 MYFF). Allocations are based on criteria that track the geographical prevalence of the disease and LDC status with priority given to sub-Saharan Africa (60%). $2 million was allocated to the Leadership project in 2003 but due to BDP hitting its cash-flow ceiling, about $1.1 million was released and approximately $830,000 of that amount spent. Installation of the new ATLAS system has caused problems in accessing funds and created delay in reconciliation of accounts.

Dutch funding for the HIV/AIDS TTF (2001-2003) amounted to close to $8.9 million. No new TTF funding has been identified for 2004. While COs generate some direct funding by donors, the significant cutback by the Netherlands demonstrates the dangers of dependency on a single donor and the potential jeopardy to sustaining service delivery. It should also be noted that tranche one proposals were funded at a low level, indicative of their demonstration or pilot nature.

UNDP co-sponsorship of UNAIDS is another source of funding ($7.4 million for 2002-03 to support the three service lines). However, UNAIDS Secretariat is expanding its implementation role and appointing country coordinators, which could confuse and complicate UNDP negotiations with donors for new resources. UNDP is Principal Recipient for GFATM resources in 20 countries and manages a total of $200 million in projects funded by the Global Fund. Many of these countries like Haiti have governance or accountability issues and UNDP collects a management fee as well as provides capacity development support for national GFATM machineries, including procurement. There has been a major improvement in the resource picture from GCFI to GCF II with the most significant improvement seen in the contribution from UNAIDS, which has grown from support to funding one professional post, to $9.3 million over the current biennium.

**F.5 GENDER**

In past, gender was one of the six pillars of UNDP, in essence one of the core practices. Gender was subsequently moved to the former SEPED and then classed as a sub-practice area under the Poverty Group. Although it is structurally under the Poverty Group, in reality the Gender Group operates in a cross-practice mode providing services to all practice areas, regional bureaus, Office of the Administrator and all other units.
According to the Gender Thematic Trust Fund\textsuperscript{218} UNDP's activities/goals for the gender area include:

- Promoting an enabling environment for the inclusion of gender equality objectives into national policy and strategy.
- Mainstreaming gender concerns across all programme areas (‘Engendering UNDP’s Agenda’).
- Fostering networks and partnerships and the creation of a wide community of knowledge to share good practices.
- Coordinating the UN response to country demands with strategic and high impact interventions that bring UN agencies and development partners together around the CCA/UNDAF and Millennium Development Goals.
- Although not stated as an objective of the TTF, another important goal for UNDP's Gender work under GCF-II was “Building the capacity of Country Offices to use the methodologies and tools developed in the Gender field”. In the opinion of the Gender Team this is the main objective of UNDP's work on gender.

A number of important global gender initiatives have been launched, particularly in the areas of MDGs, gender budgeting and mainstreaming gender in the PRSPs and poverty alleviation strategies. Although there are a number of indications of interest on the part of governments and Country Offices (see for example Annex E for the potential impacts of the 'Investing in Women' project) in many of these activities, the Team was not able to identify any evaluation studies that had been conducted on these activities, or systematic evidence of their contribution to global gender objectives.\textsuperscript{219} So while it is clear that there is a strong and growing demand for support for integrating gender into areas such as the MDGs and poverty reduction, it is very difficult on the basis of currently available evidence to assess how much impact the GCF has had.

It is the plan that the MDGs will provide an opportunity to promote the mainstreaming of gender in all development sectors. However, the recent UNDP report on "MDGs: National Reports - A look through a gender lens" points out that progress has been "patchy, with discussion around gender issues restricted primarily to the obvious sectors of women's empowerment and maternal mortality". While there is a somewhat greater visibility around poverty issues this was found to be often limited to some general references rather than to substantive analytical work. However, evidence from the Team's country visits found that there is great enthusiasm and support for MDGs and that this is a potentially important gender intervention point. It should be emphasized that gender issues in the MDGs are addressed by most policy specialists, certainly those working on poverty and HIV/AIDS, so the responsibility for gender mainstreaming does not just rest with the gender advisers.

The main partner for gender in most regions is UNIFEM. However, while relations between the SURFs and UNIFEM were generally found to be positive, UNIFEM's professional resources were reported to be very limited and it remain focused on the delivery of its own programmes unless UNDP subcontracts the services in areas where UNIFEM has accumulated experience. UNIFEM's limited capacities are thus limiting the potential for cooperation with the SURFs on more than a few projects per region. A number of bilateral partners have supported the gender programme including: JICA (joint projects funded through the Japan WID Fund, annual joint workshops), DFID (funding for MDG/Gender programme), and GTZ (joint global mapping of gender sensitive budget initiatives). UN and multilateral agencies include: the World Bank (MDG/Gender workshop), UN/DESA (Asia/Africa Parliamentarians Forum), UN Regional Commissions (ECLAC and ECA in particular) and CSOs. WEDO (gender budgeting) and BRIDGE, the gender research institute at IDS/Sussex, have also been actively involved. The limited number of SURF gender policy advisers has limited GCF's ability to develop cooperative relations with other agencies in the regions where there is no Gender specialist.

Gender networking was also promoted through the practice network, visits to country offices, participation in workshops, etc. Expert referrals and responses to queries through the SURF practice networks were found to be an important support activity. Initially there was no gender network as it was seen as a sub-component of poverty, but the gender network evolved spontaneously from e-mail exchanges. By the time the gender network was formally launched there already

\textsuperscript{218} UNDP Thematic Trust Fund page 2.

\textsuperscript{219} The Team was given various reports considered to be examples of assessments of the effectiveness or impacts of UNDP’s gender programmes, for example: “Transforming the mainstream: gender in UNDP”. This provides a strategy for what needs to be done and includes many interesting examples (mainly in boxes in the text) of what women have been able to achieve (for example, the increasing number of women elected to the Moroccan Parliament, and the success of women’s capacity building in India) or what agencies are doing (for example the types of loans UNCDF is giving to poor women). However, reports such as this do not assess the impacts of UNDP's gender mainstreaming but rather point to areas where progress is needed: in this case commitment, resources and staff.
was a network had about 450 members in early 2004, and was tied with governance for second place (after Management Practice) in terms of subscribers among the 12 networks).

**Human resources.** There are three full-time professional staff working on gender at BDP/HQ: a Senior Gender Adviser (core staff), a Gender Adviser (GCF funded) and the Japan WID Fund Programme Manager (funded by Japan). The SURF offices in Katmandu, Pretoria, Dakar and Port of Spain each have one Gender Policy Adviser. The remaining four SURFs that do not have a Gender Policy Adviser indicated the need for an Adviser in this area, and many of the Country Offices also felt the need for support in this area. In fact, quite a few Country Offices have their own gender specialist and in some cases BDP and the SURF are working with the respective Country Office to make this person available as a resource to other countries in the region. BDP managed to leverage funding for a gender adviser in Bratislava paid by RBEC and working closely with to Gender Team in BDP to support COS and build capacities within UNDP and in the region. The Regional Centre in Beirut has reprofiled one of its policy positions into a dedicated position for a Gender Policy Specialist. The gender knowledge network facilitator is located in the SURF office in Port of Spain because of the ceiling of posts allowed at HQs. This is not an ideal situation as the network is potentially marginalized and the arrangement should be reassessed. The country visits conducted during the evaluation revealed that most SURFs had been able to provide only very limited gender mainstreaming support at the country and regional levels. The main reasons were that only three of the eight SURFs had a gender policy adviser and the small number of HQ gender staff meant that little backup could be provided from New York. Even for the regions that do have a gender adviser, the Team learnt that it was a challenging task for one person to provide specialized technical support in all practice areas and for so many countries. Consequently, some of the gender advisers seemed to focus on only one or two areas (e.g. in Southern Africa where the focus is HIV/AIDS).

**Financial Resources.** Gender receives a very low financial priority within BDP. In fact GCF is the only financial resource allocated specifically to the BDP Gender Team, and there is no BDP core funding for Gender. During 2001-3, GCF allocation for Gender was set at US$500,000 per year for 3 years. A total of 10 GLO projects with a total value of $4,451,985 were approved for gender activities (Table F.10). Approximately one-third of the funding came from Japan and a further 16% from Sweden.

A Gender Thematic Trust Fund was planned under GCF-II, with an indicative target of $15 million to be raised from donors. However, no resources were committed and the fund was never launched, even though it still appears on the UNDP web site. One of the issues raised by some donors was why UNDP should launch a gender trust fund when support was already being given to UNIFEM. Donors also expected UNDP to use its own core funds to integrate gender rather than rely on specific external funds although some donors have agreed to match funds raised by the Gender Team from the Poverty Practice. The response was not as negative as it may seem as some donors, notably Japan, were already supporting UNDP’s gender initiatives through their own trust fund.

During 2001-2003, UNDP supported 30 projects under the UNDP/Japan Women in Development Fund, which is managed by the Gender Programme Team/BDP, in the total amount of $7,846,279. Table F.12 summarizes the activities supported under the largest GCF global gender project GLO/03/318.

### TABLE F.10 GLO FUNDING FOR GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AMOUNT US$</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>EXECUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/318/B/11/31</td>
<td>Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>1,450,400</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/319/A/11/31</td>
<td>Investing in Women: linking FFD with WSSD</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/316/B/11/40</td>
<td>LDC Pre-Conference on Gender</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNDESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/317/B/11/01</td>
<td>Africa/Asia Women’s Forum</td>
<td>397,776</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNDESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/317/11/A/77</td>
<td>Gender and the Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/01/315/B/11/31</td>
<td>Japan Women in Development Fund</td>
<td>187,700</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/M09/PG/A/77</td>
<td>Gender and Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/G23/F/3W/31</td>
<td>Energy and Gender Opportunities</td>
<td>706,203</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/03/316/B/11/31</td>
<td>Gender Sensitive Budgets</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO/98/315/F/11/31</td>
<td>Japan Women in Development Fund</td>
<td>202,406</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,451,985</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Mainstreaming Gender'. The strategy was to allocate the funds in relatively small amounts to support a significant number of activities in as many regions as possible. Annex E contains a more in-depth analysis of project GLO/01/319 'Investing in Women'.

F.6 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (ICTD)

As of November 2003, there were a total of six ICTD for Development Staff: two in New York and one each in Dakar, Beirut, Bratislava and Panama. In late 2003 the decision was made to convert ICTD from a Practice Area, which it had been since the launch of GCF-II, to a cross-cutting theme, the change to be effective 1 January 2004. This implied some organizational changes in HQ where one of the two ICTD Policy Advisers was transferred to the Governance Group (as an e-governance specialist) and the other to the Poverty Group (as an e-poverty specialist). It also led to the conversion of the ICTD policy specialist post in the Beirut SURF into an Environmental post. It created uncertainty in the field offices where at least one Adviser was informed that the 3-year contract had been reduced to 2 years. It also created confusion as to the continuity of the ongoing activities and the funding for these activities. At the time of the assessment, a number of activities had more or less come to a standstill as a result of these changes and uncertainty as to the funding situation for 2004.

220. Five of these projects (indicated by **) were included under GCF II while the remainder were administratively separate from GCF II although managed by the same gender team in DG. The Japanese cost-sharing activities were more focused on country level programme activities than the kinds of policy level support and capacity development funded by GCF.
With the termination of the ICTD practice area, the Poverty Group, which inherited one of the two HQ based specialists, is planning to develop e-strategies in 3 or 4 defined areas including, but not necessarily limited to: (1) Pro-poor policies: focusing on employment creation, particularly through SMEs, (2) aid, trade and debt. Some of the possible areas of focus include: the impacts of the WTO on national and local ICTD industries; opportunities for fair trade; impacts of e-commerce (does government lose tax revenue?); and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>AMOUNT (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002: Approximate total</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership meeting on gender sensitive budgeting</td>
<td>36,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional gender mainstreaming workshop in Ecuador</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development workshop in Chile</td>
<td>30,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on gender in post-conflict situations</td>
<td>2265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of country level gender tools</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender analysis of ROAR</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform the mainstream: gender in UNDP</td>
<td>34,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheet on women in environmental decision-making</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of gender policy kit for financing development into French, Arabic and Russian</td>
<td>4,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Intranet development</td>
<td>6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing gender web-site</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term consultant</td>
<td>31,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>9,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission costs for attending meetings etc</td>
<td>30,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection consultants</td>
<td>11,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous and communications</td>
<td>5,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2003: Approximate total | 268,489 |
| PRSP workshop in South Africa | 31,960 |
| RBEC gender strategy setting meeting | 8,982 |
| RBLAC Gender strategy setting meeting | 9,900 |
| Gender and MDG workshop in Washington DC | 40,000 |
| Gender and MDG review | 9,000 |
| Publication “Transform the mainstream” | 10,108 |
| Gender network (salaries and travel) | 54,833 |
| Contribution to UN Women Watch web-site | 12,000 |
| UN expertise scan [consultant] | 5,000 |
| Support to East Timorese women | 25,000 |
| Support to expert group meeting on role of men and boys | 2,268 |
| Mission costs for attending meetings etc | 47,018 |
| Consultancy | 8,000 |
| Administrative assistance | 4,400 |

| Planned expenditures for 2004 | 213,500 |
| Global review of MDGR from a gender lens | 50,000 |
| Gender and MDG kit for country offices | 30,000 |
| Support to CSW on the role of men and boys | 3,500 |
| Conference on African women’s rights and legal reforms | 30,000 |
| Module developing gender mainstreaming for UNDP COs | 30,000 |
| Mission costs | 40,000 |
| Short-term consultants | 30,000 |
promoting the privatization of telecommunications, and (3) MDGs.

According to information obtained during interviews with BDP staff, during 2001-03 the ICTD programme mobilized about $1.4 million to finance 8 Global Projects. The largest projects were for the development of the global ICTD programme, support to WSIS (World Summit on the Information Society) and research publications and applied development policy. However, this information is inconsistent with other sources provided to the Team221 indicating that during 2001-03 the ICTD programme mobilized $3,206,150 to finance 13 global projects. Of this amount $2.4 million, was core funding, $357,034 was cost sharing from Japan and NGO International/Ma and $454,151 came from trust funds.222

To date, the ICTD Trust Fund has attracted almost $10 million, inclusive of support costs.223 The most important contribution has come from the Government of Japan ($7 million) and this was complemented by $300,000 from the Government of Ireland and $14,000 from the Government of the Republic of Korea. In 2004, an additional amount of $2.4 million (Euros 2 million) was received from the Government of Italy for e-governance programmes, and will be transferred to the TTF for Democratic Governance.

During 2002-03, a total of 256 proposals were received from 105 countries and regions, with a total value of $41.5 million. At the time of preparation of the 2003 Progress Report a total of about $2.1 million had been disbursed through the First and Second tranches.

The funds were earmarked for five services lines (disbursements under first and second tranches indicated in parenthesis):

Service Line 1 e-strategies, National and regional ICT for Development strategies ($1,232,5000).
Service Line 2 e-initiatives, Strategy implementation and capacity development ($515,000).
Service Line 3 e-governance, ICT for Democratic Governance ($105,000).
Service Line 4 e-grants, Digital Grants initiative ($305,000).
Service Line 5 Advocacy, awareness promotion and stakeholder campaigns ($25,000).

UNDP’s objective is to help countries put in place the necessary policy, human and physical infrastructure to take advantage of the new information technologies, and to help them adopt measures to ensure equitable access and widespread capacity to make use of ICTD.224 The Second Multi-Year Funding Framework includes ICTD as Service Line 1.8 "Making ICTD work for the poor"225 and states:

"Feedback from programme countries over the past few years has shown that national counterparts are increasingly requesting UNDP support in helping them to harness the power of information and communication technology for development (ICTD). This is not surprising given the enormous potential for such technologies to enhance transparency and efficiency in the public sectors, connect people to, transfer knowledge and skills, and enable countries to benefit from a globalize world. As a technological resource that can benefit the whole gamut of development programmes, ICTD services will be mainstreamed throughout the five MYFF goals."

The second-largest service line, e-initiatives, absorbing 23% of the first two tranches provided support to strategy implementation and capacity development. One example was found in the South Africa CO where staff were trained in e-procurement in order to implement a large government project. The third-largest area was e-grants (digital grants) absorbing 14% of the first two tranches. In Panama, for example, the SURF had provided technical support to government with several initiatives to introduce e-banking, e-payments and enhanced access to public services.

As with the other practice and cross-cutting areas, national awareness, promotion and stakeholder campaigns have also been a feature of service delivery. ICTD has been assisting NEPAD in the organization of e-governance awareness campaigns throughout Africa. One of the most effective has been the organization of national e-governance days that have now been held in a number of countries. ICTD for democratic governance (e-governance), which cuts across various areas of governance, received 4.8% of the first two tranches. For example, in Benin the SURF has been assisting to set up an e-governance system for the national congress. At present this only serves Congress

221. Briefing book Annex IV.
222. The source of the TTFs are not specified.
224. ICTD Thematic Trust Fund note pp. 1-2.
225. This is included under Goal 1 "Achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty".
226. Second MYFF, paragraph 35.
but it is intended to have outreach functions to involve citizens in the democratic process.

**F.7 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

Four functions of the new CDG include: (1) capacity development, R&D, reports, publications, tools, methods and to tap into the international trends on capacity development; (2) operations and procedures (manuals) linked to UN harmonization and simplification initiatives, as well as OECD/DAC, plus some training; (3) PPP for urban environment (which is a carry in from an existing programme); and (4) Capacity 2015 (previously called capacity 21).

As an indication of the continuing evolution of the global programme, capacity development was lately classed as a 'cross-cutting' theme. A separate Capacity Development Group (CDG) was recently set up in BDP. That capacity development is now given recognition as a cross-cutting area is simply a belated recognition of the assertion that it had always been one of the main - if not the main - businesses or services of UNDP in supporting programme countries.

The only GCF project managed by the CDG and funded with support from the Netherlands is devoted to reforming technical cooperation by drawing conclusions and formulating advice and advocacy from a rich pool of knowledge. Based on figures provided by BDP, the CDG has 27 professional posts, 11 of which are based at headquarters and the other 16 at SURFs. The GCF also approved support for PPPUE in the amount of $750,000 in 2003, and for C2015 in 2004 ($1.5m) as well as the continuation of the RTC project mentioned above (called the Capacity Development Innovation Facility, CDIF, $500,000 in 2004).

The Team did not conduct a review of the capacity development area or CDG performance; however, the perceptions of many UNDP staff interviewed showed appreciation for the work done in these areas. It is the view of CDG management that the professional staff should be classed as knowledge workers or policy specialists and should be funded from the GCF (they are currently funded by a variety of sources including GCF, and two separate TTFs). Capacity development was noted as a major global issue (e.g. under OECD-DAC, other donors) and hence might merit more formal consideration in GCF design and programming. The greatest challenges in capacity development continue to be at the programme country level, particularly in sustaining development changes.

Capacity development, like some of the other thematic and cross-cutting areas, need to find a policy niche in UNDP in terms of policy and programming priority, application and funding. The relative importance or weight of the varying cross cutting and practice areas should be clearly defined in the GCF. There may be some argument that cross cutting areas should be given equal weight and management attention as are given to practice areas.

a) In terms of funding, there has been a suggestion to set up a 'capacity development innovation facility' (perhaps as a global programme) where COs could submit proposals to fund local initiatives.

b) There are overlaps or linkages with KM and other areas, and these linkages should be defined, and then factored into the MYFF in terms of performance reporting.

---

227. The Team did not ascertain the previous label applied by UNDP to capacity development - other than it had always been a main developed focus of country and regional programmes.

228. One major issue is that although capacity development is still high on the UNDP agenda, there has been a shift, perceived by some programme countries, from capacity development for the host country to capacity development for the staff within UNDP (and this is indeed reflected in the shift of more GCF programme funds to building internal UNDP capacities). This is seen by some as a blow to developing countries, because other donors generally do not support in-country capacity development. Developing countries relied on UNDP support in this area and appreciated it. They are now concerned about the change in UNDP's target group for capacity development and would like to see a return to the earlier emphasis on in-country capacity development.

229. The head of the CDG is also funded by the GCF as a 'policy specialist' through GLO/01/001.

230. The term 'knowledge workers' was mentioned on only a couple of occasions throughout the review. To some, the term is a misnomer, as it would imply that anyone who is not officially seen as a 'knowledge worker' would be viewed as somehow inferior. As a term describing a position or class of positions or workers, it should in any event be avoided.
As stated in the EB document, the GCF-II "will promote a state-of-the-art knowledge network by moving UNDP policy support capacity out of headquarters to the sub-regional level to ensure that the best available advice can be given when and where it is most needed - at the country level." (DP/GCF/2, paragraph 1-c). This was to be accomplished in large part by "… drawing on the global network of policy specialists" (paragraph 27). The main funding programme as noted in Section 3.2, was GLO/01/001 that funded the recruitment of the 75 policy specialists, of which 50 are out-posted.

The Team was informed that other GCF funded programmes and projects have also recruited policy specialists and experts, adding to the overall complement of BDP personnel (which may be seen to include both staff as well as short-term professionals recruited under the various programmes and projects). Based on information provided by the HR unit in BDP, 419 personnel have been recruited through multiple funding sources, including the 75 policy specialists recruited through GL0/01/01. In terms of the GLO/01/001 funded policy specialists, approximately 60 of the 75 posts are staffed (about 15 vacancies).

From Table G.1, which does not include BDP 'core' posts located in NY, it can be seen that about half are located in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>BASED IN NY</th>
<th>FIELD-BASED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The argument can be made that the implementation of GCF-II was very much and remains a UNDP staffing and human resources management operation -- not only to support organizational transformation but also to support the delivery of policy-related services. Outside of the TTFs, it was felt that the majority of funds had been expended on UNDP personnel of one type or another. The recruitment and deployment of the 50 policy

231. It is interesting to note that a UNDP audit of global and inter-regional programmes in 2000 revealed that 60% of BDP staff were funded from the global programme (See: UNDP-OPAR, 'Audit of Global and Inter-Regional Projects', Report # IAS0057, 16 May 2000, paragraph 12).
specialists to the field (with another 25 based in New York) was one of the primary means through which the GCF-II objectives were to be reached.232

The Team was informed of an initial debate within UNDP concerning which policy specialist model would best serve the interests of UNDP: (1) should the policy specialists be senior and highly experienced, recruited to more permanent senior management equivalency posts, or (2) should they be moderately experienced professionals recruited at the mid- to senior-project levels for limited periods? While both models have advantages and disadvantages, the final decision was to pursue the second model in part because a greater number of 'advisers' could be recruited within the funding levels, and short-term contracts would ensure that this resource base could be replaced and replenished in the quickly evolving disciplines.

The Team was informed that the recruitment of policy specialists was highly problematic, and indeed, resulted in a major delay in the launching of the programme requiring subsequent extension of GCF-II. Many of the initial problems have since been corrected or are in the process of correction, but issues remain. These are highlighted below. The remaining sub-sections highlight the main issues from the policy specialist and corporate perspectives.

**Start-up Challenges**

The challenge in recruiting a large number of policy specialists was apparently under-estimated by UNDP.233 Even though BDP and the RBx had done some groundwork for the utilization of the policy specialists, several major issues arose.234

1. The nature of the operating and service agreements between BDP and the RBx on how the specialists would be recruited, deployed and managed were being worked out concurrent to the recruitment initiative (in other words, the organizational and accountability models into which the specialists were to be deployed were not finalized).

2. There was some initial confusion or disagreement over the reporting lines for the policy specialists, and the associated RCA (Results Competency Assessment).

3. There was some disagreement between the RBx and BDP on the role of the policy specialists, the profiles and job descriptions and levels. This lead to significant staffing delays in some bureaus. For example, RBAS agreed on the final TORs for a number of posts only late last year.

4. The large number of posts to be filled resulted in a very high volume of applicants, which lead to delays in vetting, short-listing, and interviewing (in some cases of a year or more).

5. Lack of agreement or consensus on the contracting modality, where some were recruited through ALD (Activities of Limited Duration) contracts, others through SSA (Specific Service Agreement) and others through 200 series contracts (into 'L' positions).

6. Some initial confusion or difficulty in selecting the execution modality for the GLO/01/001 project (agency execution using UNOPS, or UNDP DEX/direct execution).

7. The unexpected slowness in the reorganization of the T eam was informed that the recruitment of policy specialists to the field (with another 25 based in New York) was one of the primary means through which the GCF-II objectives were to be reached.232

"We perceived the specialists to be knowledge brokers rather than the primary source of expertise, tapping into internal and external networks to identify solutions to challenges."

Senior BDP staff member

232. There appears to be some confusion over the introduction of the title 'policy adviser'. The initial EB document (DP/GCF/2) refers to these posts as 'policy specialists' who, along with other components of GCF support would provide policy advice. Much of GCF documentation refers to these staff as either policy advisers or specialists, but it seems that 'policy adviser' is most commonly used. This report uses the initial term 'policy specialist'. Further, the Team was informed that different titles are used (policy adviser and policy specialist) and the distinction is established by corporate HR, not by BDP based on the level of the post. P/L5s were reported to be 'advisers' while P/L4s were reported to be 'specialists', and they appear to undertake similar or same functions

233. For example, in April of 2000 questionnaires were circulated by BDP to all Resident Representatives to help determine how best to redeploy the policy specialists to respond to policy needs of country offices. This resulted in the development of an overall "policy map" for the regions and a proposed configuration of BDP policy positions in each region. Reference: various e-mails and documentation provided by BDP; 14 July 2000 internal joint memorandum from A. Watanabe, Director, BDP and respective RBx Directors to Resident Representatives.

234. The fourth, sixth and seventh items were the only factors noted by the Administrator to have explained the delay in implementing GCF-II and seeking approval to extend for an additional year. See: Executive Board Document DP/GCF/2 Extension 1, "Extension of the second global cooperation framework - note by the Administrator", 29 May 2003, paragraph 9. Reference to the start-up issues and causes of GCF-II implementation delay were also made in the one and only meeting of the GCF-II Advisory Committee (see Meeting Notes Final Report of the Advisory Committee, New York, 28 April 2003, last bullet point in paragraph 6).
BDP, plus lack of adequate capacity within BDP to effectively handle the workload (i.e. through one out-posted HR specialist with some administrative support from the Bureau of Management). 235

8. Some concerns, delays or confusion in the setting up of the governance structures for the expanded SURFs (e.g. SURF Boards).

**Observed HR Issues**

One of the main themes that surfaced was the role or profile of the policy specialist. Most of those interviewed were of the view that the ideal specialist was a person who knows both UNDP and the development business. Synthesized from feedback, the ideal specialist was described as sensitive to and understanding of each of the "client" COs served -- operations, culture, strengths and weaknesses -- that is, the reality. The person is flexible and adaptable, ready and willing to help the CO develop its programmes, including assisting in preparation of programme documents, other backstopping, process facilitation, with 'advice' being provided to the CO (rather than the country). The ideal person developed relationships of credibility and trust with CO staff in order to be accepted. Such a person had strong 'generalist' experience in the practice area, with a good concentration of expertise and experience in one or two of the sub-practice areas (e.g. no one person can be a 'specialist', 'expert' or 'adviser' on governance or any other practice area, since each area is so broad). Finally, the ideal policy specialist would have a good idea of in-country policy direction, and acquire the country-specific expertise needed for advising the CO. 236

Position profiles and TORs for the policy specialists continue to be developed and refined by UNDP, in the pursuit of attracting and retaining the best personnel possible. Even though most policy specialist staffing actions have been completed or are under way, many concerns on general staffing policies and processes were raised by most of those consulted. These issues dominated the discussions and interviews at the field level, and are being addressed by corporate management or through the implementation of the new Regional Centres. However, it was felt that certain HR management and performance issues would persist, given past performance in HR management -- perhaps reflecting some underlying skepticism in the ability of management to resolve the issues.

**Recruiting by whom?** Most policy specialists and SURF coordination personnel perceived that there appeared to be too many people involved in the recruitment and staffing of policy specialists. The many and significant delays reported in staffing actions were seen to be due in part to: (1) too many layers and levels of management involved in the recruiting process, (2) confusion over relative roles and responsibilities in recruiting, (3) non-responsive from the HQ-based HR units, and/or (4) turgid staffing procedures. Most specialists expressed frustration with the recruitment and contract practices of the UNDP, as they added to uncertainty and tended to dampen motivation and morale. The current situation is also seen as a contributing factor to turnover. 237 In the absence of any specific suggestions for improvement, UNDP should look into ways of simplifying and speeding up the recruitment process. One step that might be taken is to have more dynamic feedback to applicants on the status of their application and explanations for reasons of delays.

**Recruiting for whom?** Some saw the staffing of specialists to be an intermediate staffing action in an underlying implicit strategy. In the case of RBAS, at no time did the SURF achieve a 100% staffing level - only three of the six posts were filled at any one time. Turnover had increased with the recent loss of two personnel to the Bureau. The local SURF had expended considerable effort and expense in recruiting these individuals. From the specialist perspective, some were reported to have seen the role as a 'stepping stone' to more permanent positions within UNDP.

'**Classes' of UNDP personnel.** The Team found an interesting paradox in the perceptions of policy specialists - from themselves and from CO counterpart staff. Some policy specialists saw themselves at first-class UNDP highfliers, while at the same time perceiving CO staff as somehow inferior or having limited capacities in their areas of policy/practice expertise. On the other hand, there were those specialists who saw themselves as second-class UNDP staff without a career path. Further, some of the out-posted specialists felt that they were not treated on equal terms as those posted at BDP HQ. In any case,

---

235 This raises the question as to what use BDP made of the 5% DEX fee, which is to be used to support the implementation of the project. More on this is discussed in Section 6.5 of this report.

236 However, due to the supply constraint, resulting in short country visits, it is difficult for policy specialists to acquire this capability for all the countries they are supposed to cover.

237 BDP subsequently explained that in view of the matrixing arrangements, BDP put in place in 2000 a selection process that included participation of the RBx, with a number of panels involved in each step. BDP reported that the number of panels is now significantly reduced, but the participation of the Regional Bureau and SURF continues to be essential.
the distinction between the groups of UNDP staff members was not considered helpful in fostering cooperation and corporate team spirit. It was noted that it is a requirement of UNDP that a graduate degree is required to fill the L-series position. It was felt by most that a graduate degree should not be mandatory, and rather experience should be the main criterion (especially in the area of governance and public administration).

**Position nomenclature.** The Team found a high degree of variability in position titles and the use of same on business cards. Most did not use the term 'policy adviser'. While this may seem an innocuous observation at best, the 'branding' of a person is as important as the 'branding' of the organization. The right brand or title can convey the right understanding of the person's position, level and function,238

**Contracting modalities.** The range and types of contracting and recruitment was reported to be confusing, creating disparities and inequities among the policy specialists and other personnel. The Team was informed that all contracts have since been converted to 200 series posts, but there are residual inconsistencies in terms of position levels, steps and associated salaries.239

**Mainstreaming.** Related to the above observation, some policy specialists and SURF coordinators did not feel that UNDP saw them as mainstream UNDP staff - with no career paths or potential. Consequently, many of those interviewed questioned UNDP's long-term commitment to the policy advisory role and the networked organization as a whole. Where UNDP has a policy in this regard, it is perhaps not well communicated to staff.

**Staff orientation.** Some staff reported that there was no orientation for people new to UNDP and that new staff simply had to find their own way around. On the other hand, BDP stated that it holds regular orientation workshops for policy specialists and also one for BDP support personnel (with BDP global personnel participating in the orientation). The last BDP induction course was held in Jan 2003. BDP also noted that most SURFs also have intensive in-house inductions of all new staff on processes, UNDP, KM, etc.

**Observed Performance Issues**

**Personal performance.** The concern was expressed by a number of policy specialists that few, if any, SURF staff were promoted during the 2003 RCA process, despite the very high ratings of performance from the COs. This has generated a perception among some specialists that promotions in UNDP are a matter of politics, quotas and 'who-you-know'. The countervailing observation was made that BDP is top-heavy in terms of position levels, steps and salary scales. The current RCA has also been a source of concern for those staff having two lines of reporting. Increasingly, SURF staff and specialists were working in a team context, thus presenting the opportunity or need for team-based training and team-based appraisal (especially practice teams).

**Workload and Time Management.** In the case of most SURFs, the demand for services has increased and the supply of specialists and supporting research capacity remains constrained. The workload of the individual policy specialists and supporting personnel has been noted to expand to the point where overall effectiveness may be jeopardized (i.e. through dilution, workload being spread thin, erosion of quality). Many of those interviewed reported working extremely long hours, with negative impacts on family life, potential for burnout and turnover. Many reported that corporate expectations of policy specialist performance were insensitive to personal and family needs. Some of those interviewed sensed that in UNDP 'time does not matter'. Policy specialists and other personnel did not record or report their time, even though most SURF operations see themselves as business-like. Without some reporting or control of time, it was difficult to set priorities, to plan or to allocate resources.240

**Regional distributions and Geographic Focus.** Concerns were expressed that the recruitment and deployment of policy specialists for each practice area to each SURF or Regional Centre did not reflect the reality of variations in country needs and demand across regions and sub-regions. If UNDP is indeed demand-driven, then the supply and deployment of policy specialists and supporting research capacity may be jeopardized (i.e. through dilution, workload being spread thin, erosion of quality). Many of those interviewed reported working extremely long hours, with negative impacts on family life, potential for burnout and turnover. Many reported that corporate expectations of policy specialist performance were insensitive to personal and family needs. Some of those interviewed sensed that in UNDP 'time does not matter'. Policy specialists and other personnel did not record or report their time, even though most SURF operations see themselves as business-like. Without some reporting or control of time, it was difficult to set priorities, to plan or to allocate resources.240

---

238. With respect to position nomenclature, BDP informed the Team that the general UNDP approach is define a 'post title' as inputted in the HR system, and the 'functional title' agreed to by Managers and used on business cards. IN any event, the Team noted inconsistencies and such inconsistencies can dilute the 'international' branding or character of UNDP, as reflected to such nomenclature.

239. The Team was subsequently informed by the HR unit of BDP that as per HR guidelines, the steps are determined on established formula, and uniformly applied, except when allowance has to be made to maintain not less than a difference of 5% net when converting from 300 to 200 Series. BDP noted that although there were concerns from staff about their 300 Series contracts, at the time of conversion to 200 Series, there was a preference amongst single staff to maintain the higher net pay of a 300 Series appointment and forego the usual entitlements structure of a 200 Series staff.

240. The Team was informed that BDP is currently considering the implementation of a basic reporting system for the policy specialists and other staff in the bureau.
specialists should correspond to demand -- otherwise, resourcing would be seen to be supply driven and a function more of UNDP priorities. Concerns were expressed that it may not be feasible that one policy specialist could reasonably service any more than four to six countries. It was noted by those interviewed that considerable time was required to develop and maintain relationships with CO personnel and national counterparts, and that this was not possible or effective if the countries served exceeded five to six.

Information saturation. Despite the positive advances of practice management, the practice communities, and knowledge networks, some of those consulted reported to be suffering from information saturation and overload. The e-mail burden alone was noted to consume valuable time. As more resources were devoted to producing 'knowledge' and related products, less time became available to consume such knowledge. This was seen by most to be a 'job hazard'.

GCF system of incentives. To many of those consulted, there appeared to be little in the way of incentives in GCF-II to promote and reward performance. It was noted by some that there were several institutional and operational incentives in the form of tools and facilities that encouraged staff to share information, to pursue or understand global issues, to become a networked organization, and to expand the concept of knowledge sharing (e.g. practice networks). However, when it came to performance, the pursuit of quality or excellence, some felt that there was limited corporate-wide recognition or little in the way of systems that would identify and propagate experimentation, innovation and good practice. This was seen to vary by practice area and by region, however.

Support/research personnel. In most SURFs, policy specialists used support personnel to assist in research and general back-stopping, as well as to support other services and products (referrals, comparative research). In one case, funds that had been set-aside for an IT specialist were used instead to fund two research officers. This was neither a formalized nor sustainable arrangement. In other cases funding was provided by the regional programmes used in part to hire research and support personnel.
The management of the GCF-II was found to be a daunting task. Considerable variability in management was found in different components of the GCF: some appeared to be better managed than others. However, in the aggregate, the overall management of GCF seems in need of major reform. The GCF is managed for the most part by BDP, but as components are increasingly decentralized, tighter management arrangements need to be developed. The GCF is also only part of the BDP mandate, and any improvements to the GCF must be done in the context of overall BDP management reform. At the least, the GCF and all of its components should be subjected to the same rigor and standards expected of regional and country programmes.

Along with the organizational changes currently being explored by BDP, a comprehensive capacity assessment of the Bureau should be carried out. This may result in the production of a strategic/capacity development plan for the organization, clearly demonstrating all the capacities (including personnel and financial resources) that would be required for the cost-effective management of the GCF.

Greater attention should be given to strengthening UNDP as a learning organization - that is, to invest resources in learning, professional development and to allow sufficient time for especially country office staff to familiarize themselves with ongoing policy debates, research, studies and analysis. A part of this would be to develop a corporate commitment, incentives and the means to strengthen the bridge building between its study initiatives and innovation of mainstream, corporate policy.

The presentation of the Team's detailed recommendations adhere to the findings of Section 6: oversight and accountability; monitoring, evaluation and reporting; human resources management; and financial management.

**H.1 Oversight and Accountability.** The concept of oversight has been debated in UNDP for some time, and no specific decisions or policies have been developed as to how it is to be implemented in the organization. Some suggestions came out of the general review and analysis of this aspect of GCF (and overall UNDP) governance.

a) The concept and implementation of oversight insofar as it applies to the GCF should be overhauled, streamlined and simplified. Special attention should be given to the linking or inter-relationships of oversight accountability among the various mechanisms. Future GCF
oversight should also include the recommendations of the recent UNDP 'Oversight Group'.

b) For the regional centres, serious consideration should be given to implementing standard oversight and governance structures across all regions, to ensure consistency in the investment and management of GCF-II resources across UNDP. The Bratislava and RBAP models appear to be the most advanced, the fundamentals of which should be adapted to all regional centres. The replacements of the SURF Boards should have representation from all COs in the region or sub-region, might optimally be chaired by a RR (on a rotating basis), should meet regularly, and should serve a meaningful oversight function.

c) At the corporate level, the Advisory Committee should either be disbanded, or be restructured to make it an effective contribution to the GCF and to UNDP (i.e. the right membership, regular meeting agendas, a meaningful mandate).

d) The TORs of the SMT and/or ET should be expanded to include a specific reference to oversight of the GCF as a whole (and not simply to selected components on an ad hoc basis).

e) The role and mandates of the PACs should be reviewed, with a view to making them more open, transparent and participatory. Decisions resulting from PACs should be formalized, and should be signed off by each member of the PAC. Further, as noted in Section 6.2, PAC submissions and review should address project inputs.

H.2 Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting. As discussed in Section 6.3 of this report, the present M&E systems cannot be considered satisfactory either as an internal management tool or for external accountability to donors and other stakeholders. The following recommendations are submitted for consideration in the design of subsequent stages of the GCF programme:

a) Future GCF evaluations should be based on detailed reviews or evaluations of the various GCF components. This 'component level' evaluation should be done before the GCF-II evaluation, managed and synchronized much as it was done prior to the review of GCFI. Evaluations should be done against objectives, outputs, results and outcomes that are clearly set in the design document, and that are measurable.

b) A standard reporting/monitoring system, such as the SRF should be introduced and actively used in future programmes. Indicators should cover: inputs, implementation processes, outputs and outcomes/impacts.

c) With respect to the SURFs and successor Regional Centres, the M&E system should be designed on the basis of participatory consultations with the SURFs, SURF Boards and possibly selected external stakeholders.

d) Progress reports should be prepared every six months on a sub-set of key indicators and longer reports should be prepared every 12 months. Each report should identify a limited number of key issues to be addressed and the proposed actions to be taken. Managers should be held accountable for the timely production of the reports and for the implementation of the follow-up actions.

e) Rapid and economical assessment mechanisms should be incorporated into the system to provide rapid feedback on problems and issues identified.

f) During every six-month period one in-depth assessment should be conducted for each of the practice areas to provide a thorough assessment of a critical component of each programme. Where appropriate these should involve visits to a small sample of countries (to meet with beneficiaries and external stakeholders as well as SURFs and COs).

g) Evaluation mechanisms should be built into the networks to provide regular feedback on their performance. These would combine e-mail surveys with face-to-face interviews with users in New York and the field. The purpose would be to obtain constant feedback on ways to improve the performance of the network services and to make them more user-friendly, as well as to obtain more concrete feedback from clients on how they have utilized services and how these services helped them. The evaluation methodology would also study a sample of intended users who do not use the services.

h) Periodic evaluations will be conducted to assess the extent to which GCF has contributed to policy formulation by governments, donors and civil society. These would identify and interview (in person, by e-mail or phone) a sample of policy

makers, planners and managers to determine how, and to what extent their decisions have been influenced by GCF - and how the GCF support could have increased their impact.242

i) A technical committee, with representatives from inside and outside UNDP, should be established to guide the design and implementation of the evaluation programme and to provide feedback on the evaluation reports produced.

j) The overall monitoring and reporting of the GCF also should be overhauled, streamlined and simplified, and aligned with reformed oversight and accountability structures. This could be done through the development of the new programming guidelines being developed by UNDP (i.e. 'prescriptive practices').

k) All GCF funded programmes and projects, irrespective of budget amount, should be subject to some form of evaluation or review in order to extract lessons learnt, best practices and other 'knowledge' (since the GCF is very much about transforming UNDP into a knowledge-based organization).

H.3 Human Resources Management. Section 6 of this report identified several issues concerning the management of GCF-II funded human resources. It was noted that the GCF is very much about the management of its personnel - the policy specialists and the many others recruited under various modalities. The main recommendations for UNDP are:

a) All policy specialists and advisers in UNDP - whether funded by core posts, by regional or global programmes, or by other means -- should be managed strategically, and not piece-meal. The GLO/01/001 funded policy specialists should be seen as one component of the overall BDP or UNDP 'policy specialist' human resources base and as regular staff with career chances similar or equal to those of all other UNDP colleagues. Such career paths may be in the specialist categories (thus creating opportunities for higher-level policy specialist positions) or in the management categories (as is currently already the case).

b) Consideration should be given to setting up a special fund or internal corporate account for the funding of the policy specialists, rather than using a GLO project mechanism.

c) The recruitment and distribution of policy specialists (50 to the field, 25 to BDP HQ) should be revisited. If there is greater demand at the field level, then a greater percentage of these resources should be decentralized to the field. This distribution should be made on the basis of the most cost-effective sourcing strategy (i.e. to recruit and pay for internal staff, and/or to contract out/outsourcing, and/or to have a mix of approaches, depending on the overall cost benefits, and adaptable to the unique needs of each region).

d) UNDP and BDP should determine aggregate capacity and strength in 'policy specialists', since many such specialists work with the other bureaus, and are funded by different programmes and instruments. The management of policy related professional services should cover more than just those funded under the GLO/01/001 project.

e) UNDP should carefully examine the 'strategic' needs associated with policy advice, and determine the cost benefit of recruiting and retaining policy specialists relative to other strategies whereby policy specialist and support services can be delivered (e.g. through knowledge-based systems, partners, outsourcing and so on).

f) In the new Regional Centres, serious consideration should be given to deploying policy specialist resources (i.e. in the form of policy specialist UNDP staff and/or budget and contract facility) as close to their client countries as possible, in numbers and practice areas proportionate to demand at the regional and sub-regional levels. For example, there may be sound logic for: (i) the deployment of governance specialists and/or financial resources to both the Kathmandu and Bangkok regional centres; (ii) the deployment of ICT specialists and/or financial resources to the Beirut SURF; (iii) the relocation of specialists and/or financial resources in Latin America from Panama to other countries, and (iv) the continued deployment of environmental specialists and/or financial resources in Nairobi rather than relocation to the Pretoria regional centre.

g) For those specialists that are recruited by UNDP, further analysis should be given to the role and particularly the 60-40 split between CO-based work and corporate based work. In the new

---

242. "Influential Evaluations" a report to be published soon by the Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank describes 8 case studies assessing the practical utility and impacts conducted in different countries and sectors around the world. It includes a detailed discussion of alternative attribution methodologies for isolating the impacts of a particular area of support in contexts where decision makers are exposed to many.
regional centres, the 40% of time allocated to corporate work will be particularly important to ensure policy integration and cohesion across UNDP, and support to corporate objectives associated with the transformation of UNDP into a knowledge-based and knowledge networked organization. There may be an argument to have a sliding apportionment of time where some specialists may devote more time to CO level work while others spend more time on corporate level work.

h) With respect to GCF-funded changes, staff surveys should ask questions designed to uncover resistance to change, employee burnout and cynicism. They should also be designed to assess change overload -- the point where too much change jeopardizes routine operations, internal and external relationships.

i) BDP staff should receive proper and standardized training in programme and project management, budgeting and reporting, and should be as capable in these areas as their CO counterparts.

H.4 Financial Management. Section 6.5 identifies the main concerns with respect to the budgeting and management of the GCF-II financial resources. For the most part, the Team was unable to get a good handle on the financial performance of the many GCF components, and hence cannot comment on cost-effectiveness or other financial performance matters. The findings lend themselves to several recommendations:

a) UNDP should carry out management, performance and financial audits of the GCF-II global projects, programmes and TTFs. Some emphasis should be given to 'value-for-money' audit in order to ensure that scarce global funds are utilized in the most cost-effective manner.

b) All global projects and programmes should be subject to standard corporate budgeting and financial management procedures and controls, as are applied, say, to projects at the country level. All project/programme budgets and inputs should be explicitly linked to outputs and results of the specific initiative as well as to overall GCF objectives, results and/or outcomes. All project/programme documents should contain a narrative description of the inputs. PAC approvals and minutes should include references to the inputs.

c) There should be routine, standard detailed financial and expenditure reporting for all GCF-II projects and programmes, and such reporting should be rolled up and reported by practice, by source of funding, by major GCF component, the GCF as a whole, and integrated with overall BDP financial, ROAR and MYFF reporting, with details on expenditures (i.e. where and on what the funds are spent).

d) BDP has indicated that steps are being taken to establish new mechanisms for financial management and reporting. The Team can only encourage BDP to proceed with these plans and to report progress of implementation to the SMT and/or EB as part of its reporting and oversight obligations.

e) It is recognized that GCF funds only a portion of the new Regional Centres. However, there should be a single and consolidated budget for each regional centre. All sources and applications of funds and budgets for the new regional centres should be rationalized and simplified. The many sources of funding should be clearly recorded and accounted for in the context of the single RC financial operation and financial statement, clearly identifying GCF components. GCF related financial performance in terms of all types of expenditure should be reported regularly in order to obtain a complete picture of the cost of the operation.

f) As part of a rational regional centre budget (funded from the GCF), there should be an explicit component for the research and analysis support functions (i.e. covering the referral services, comparative research, developing knowledge products, supporting practice networks - otherwise advancing the goal of transforming UNDP into a networked, knowledge-based organization).

g) Through audit, performance review or some other mechanism, the full costs of providing policy support and related services at the regional level should be determined. This would include all implementation and execution costs recovered by UNDP and COs in implementing GCF funded initiatives, and in other costs (such as those charged by COs for providing space, travel and other services to SURFs/Regional Centres). Further, systems should be implemented that can capture full costs (cost accounting) which could then support analysis and reporting on the cost benefit of such services as well as to support financial planning and forecasting.
h) As specific cases in point, an analysis should be carried out for each SURF, BDP HQ and other units in terms of the cost of travel and missions. It should be noted that many of the mission costs are paid from CO funds, and hence may be difficult to track. The cost-benefit of MSI missions should also be assessed.

i) Consideration should be given to setting up a discretionary policy expertise consulting budget for each regional centre.

j) There may be some potential for the CO to pay for the services it receives from the SURF. This would establish a more realistic market and value for services rendered. Free services are not especially valued in an MIC country. The exception to this would be the mission cost equalization practice, which would need further study.

k) Outsourcing of expertise or contracting the services of external policy specialists could be more cost-effective and flexible, allowing quicker access to a broader range of expertise as and when required by the CO (i.e. as drawn from the sub-regional and other consultant/expert databases).
I  BACKGROUND

In its decision 2001/7 of 5 February 2001 the Executive Board of UNDP approved the Second Global Cooperation Framework (GCF-II). The purpose of GCF-II is to contribute to UNDP’s global efforts to reduce poverty and promote sustainable human development (SHD).

The development objective of the GCF-II is to provide windows for developing countries to influence global trends and benefit from global knowledge on critical dimensions of human development in order to reduce national poverty and human inequity. The GCF-II is designed to help UNDP play a lead role in the global fight against poverty and support UNDP in its transformation to a globally networked policy advice organization focused on poverty reduction and sustainable human development.

Four development dimensions have been identified under GCF-II: globalization, participation, growth and crises. For the attainment of these goals, services of three types are undertaken: global advocacy and analysis, policy advice and support and knowledge networking and sharing of best practices.

While the GCF-II estimated the core resource allocation to be at least US$72.6 million for the period 2002-2003, the actual allocation was US$82.03 million, of which US$66.477 million was allocated to global activities (BDP) and the balance to the ODS, AO and HDRO. The GCF-II document also specified a non-core target of $115 million to be mobilized through the trust fund mechanism. This target has been surpassed, with a large portion of the non-core resources already programmed, including US$62 million pledged through the Thematic Trust Funds (TTFs) managed by BDP. Under GCF-II 46 new global programmes and projects have been initiated (full list of the projects are provided in Annex II).

The current phase of GCF-II ended in December, 2003. However, the Executive Board of UNDP approved a further extension of GCF-II for the period covering 1 January 2004 through 31 December 2004.

At the annual session of the Executive Board in June 2003, the Administrator of UNDP indicated that UNDP would undertake a forward-looking evaluation during the second half of 2003 to assess the effectiveness of the overall approach of GCF-II, the programme outcomes and policy services, with a view to providing strategic inputs into the preparation of the third GCF.
II RATIONALE

The GCF is designed to help UNDP play a lead role in the global fight against poverty and support UNDP in its transformation to a globally networked and knowledge based and learning organization. Significantly, GCF-II was expected to fulfill a key aspect of UNDP’s Business Plans 2000-2003 and to reposition UNDP and its interventions globally and at national levels as a key policy adviser to programme countries. The relevance and flexibility to global programming was expected to come from adopting innovative out-posted policy advisory delivery mechanisms and modalities, through Sub Regional Resource Facilities (SURFs) which are directly linked on the one hand to corporate policy units at headquarters, and on the other to the country offices to address 'on the ground' needs and priorities.

The differences of GCF-II from the previous GCFs includes: greater alignment between global programme and UNDP’s country Programmes, GCF-II priorities and addresses developing country needs and demands; dynamic networking supported by fifty new or reassigned out posted policy specialists; greater programmatic focus on areas in which UNDP has a clear comparative advantage; renewed emphasis on up-stream policy support, capacity development, and analysis of development issues; and more South-South cooperation.

In April 2003 the Advisory Committee of GCF-II reviewed its performance. It cited many positive aspects of the GCF-II and recommended that an evaluation be carried out to assess strategic importance, relevance and effectiveness of the programme. The Committee requested that the evaluation be conducted prior to the drafting of the next GCF and results, impacts and outcomes be made known to the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee felt that such an evaluation was necessary to ascertain - with statistics, indicators as well as examples, narratives and success stories - if the methods used were the "best" ways to use scarce resources. Moreover the approved GCF-II document foresees a final evaluation by the Evaluation Office, and this evaluation is being carried out within this context.

III IMPLEMENTATION

ARRANGEMENTS/DELIVERY MODALITY OF GCFI

The four dimensions that have been identified to frame the immediate objectives of GCF-II are: globalization, participation, growth and crises. The support services undertaken to achieve the objectives of GCF-II are: global advocacy and analysis, policy advice and support and knowledge networking and sharing of best practices.

The Director of Bureau for Development Policy (BDP), as designated by the UNDP Administrator is as the Programme Manager of GCF-II, is responsible for its overall implementation. The following specific implementation arrangements have been put in place to guide the GCF-II, global programmes and associated policy activities:

1. Delivery of policy advisory services and knowledge networking at the HQs as well as regional level:
   - BDP through its network of policy specialists based at the HQs as well the Sub-regional Resource Facilities (SURFs) undertook the work of global advocacy and analysis; knowledge networking and policy support at the regional and country levels.
   - The SURF Boards (comprised of representatives of BDP, UNDP Resident Representative of country offices of the sub-region and of the Regional Bureaux) have been tasked to identify and prioritize the regional and country level needs.
   - The SURF Board members are also responsible for supervision and matrix management of the global network of policy specialists.
   - At the HQs level, BDPs divisional structure was replaced by teams of policy specialists working on cross-thematic themes. (the Practice Areas)

2. Delivery of advocacy services:
   - Provided support to the Human Development Report Office (HDR) and the Office of Development Studies (ODS) for related activities. It further provided continuous support to the HDR as the flagship report of UNDP for development advocacy and for monitoring development trends. The ODS has been tasked to engage the services of the world’s leading development analysts and practitioners to produce suitable analytical tools and research outputs to improve access to global public goods.

3. Overall management, monitoring and evaluation:
   - Communities of practice were established across the organization, with membership covering professionals working at national, regional and global levels, to provide support to programme design and work-planning.
   - UNOPS played a significant role in the execution of the global programmes and projects under GCF-II.
An Advisory Committee has been formed to provide advice and recommendations to guide programme orientation, monitor progress and suggest strategic options for expanding the impact of relevance of global programmes.

The monitoring followed UNDP's ROAR process and included the Strategic Resources Framework (SRF) indicators.

A final evaluation of the GCF-II, led by the Evaluation Office, to examine the development results achieved was envisaged.

**IV OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will assess the overall programme performance and outcomes of GCF-II covering its scope and range, policy advisory services and knowledge management. Findings of the evaluation will provide inputs to GCF-III. Specific objectives of the planned independent evaluation of GCF-II are as follows:

1. Assess the achievement of the intended organizational goals and development results, highlighting key/major results, especially outputs and outcomes, lessons learnt and good practices.
2. Assess performance of GCF-II and specify the development results achieved in the area of policy advice, capacity development and knowledge management, the core results areas that the global programme has focused on, as well as assessment of the scope and range of strategic partnerships formed.
3. Based on the actual results, ascertain how the GCF-II has contributed to strategically positioning UNDP to establish its comparative advantage or niche as a major upstream global policy adviser for poverty reduction and sustainable human development and as a knowledge-based organization.
4. Assess the degree of innovation among the initiatives undertaken within the GCF-II programmed project portfolio, their value addition and contribution to generating and sharing knowledge within UNDP and with programme countries.

**V SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will focus on a sample of selected projects based on the following criteria:

i) Projects that represent a cross-section of four development dimensions of GCF-II namely, Globalization: Risks and Opportunities; Participation: Governance and Democracy; Growth: Equity and Sustainability; and, Crises: Knowledge for Prevention and Management;

ii) Projects that are of higher profile in terms of costs, and,

iii) Projects that are in very advanced stages of implementation.

The scope of the evaluation will cover four key areas inter alia:

a. Programme performance of GCF-II programme portfolio and development results achieved
b. Organizational strategy and modality/mechanisms of delivering service lines and their effectiveness
c. Overall institutional issues
d. Lessons learnt and future directions.

The Evaluation will also include an assessment of the HDRO and ODS in terms of the policy services that they provide to UNDP through BDP.

More specifically, the evaluation will examine the following:

1) Examine how GCF-II has addressed the four dimensions and the attainment of the immediate objectives.
2) Ascertain the strategic focus of GCF-II support and its relevance to the country and regional priorities, including relevance to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
3) The synergic relationships between various components of GCF-II (e.g. linkages between the four development dimensions leading to SHD).
4) Assessment of synergies and alignment of GCF-II support with other initiatives and partnerships, including that of UNDAF/Country Programmes, GCF, RCF, as well as cross-cutting or cross practice linkages. Such an assessment may also include examination of how GCF-II leveraged its resources and that of others towards achievement of results, the balance between various advocacy, analytical work and networking of GCF-II contributing to the achievement of the MDGs.
5) Assessment of the relevance and quality of SURF based services from the country/regional perspective; diversity and nature of demands from
Country Offices for policy advice and service and value added as well as cost effectiveness of the SURF mechanism in delivering GCF-II products.

6) Institutional arrangements of BDP for programming, delivery and monitoring of implementation of GCF-II at the HQ level, at the sub-regional level (SURFs) and at the country level.

7) The institutional components of GCF-II/BDP, such as HDRO and ODS, and the way these interface with each other and complement each others work, if at all, in supporting the goals and objectives of GCF-II.

8) Examine resource mobilization and funding mechanisms of BDP.

VI METHODOLOGY

The exercise will entail a combination of: comprehensive desk reviews and document analysis; consultations with key stakeholders; and visits to a sample of five to eight countries/locations. Triangulation of information and data sources will constitute the primary methodology for the assessment. The concept of triangulation refers to empirical evidence gathered through three major sources of information: perception, validation and documentation. Validation of the information and findings will be achieved through cross-referencing of sources. This means that document reviews will be supplemented by interviews and focused group discussions with key informants and/or stakeholders at both UNDP HQs and the country offices that will be visited. At least one rapid questionnaire and/or informal snap survey would be used to provide quick information on the programme. The evaluation team will consult with HQ-based specialists, members of the Advisory Committee of GCF-II, the main peer review group for this evaluation, in order to obtain a broad range of views. More details of the analytical and evaluation techniques to be used are given below:

Desk Reviews

A comprehensive HQ-based Desk Review comprising the following will be carried out in two phases:

1) Preparatory phase: During this period, programme mapping of the entire GCF-II and preparation of background documentation will be undertaken.

2) Desk work during the evaluation period: During this period the following will be undertaken by the Evaluation Team members:

   Review of the GCF-II, its constituent projects and other related initiatives and key documents to extract information, bring out key trends and issues, to develop key questions and criteria -- including a survey- -- for analysis, and compiling relevant data.

   Interaction with Country Offices and Regional Offices and other focal points for GCF-II activities.

Surveys

GCF-II’s work is meant to influence and impact country offices, other donors, Governments and other development partners and constituencies, particularly institutions in the South. A sample survey may be undertaken, if necessary, to ascertain the effectiveness of GCF-II ‘s work particularly in relation to policy advice, knowledge management and networking and its integration into UNDP’s work as well as to obtain the perception of key partners and clients on the outcomes and effectiveness of this approach.

Visits to sample of Country Offices and SURFS

Based on consultations with the HQ Units, a sample of at least five to eight countries and five partner institutions will be visited by the international team to validate the findings coming out of the HQ-based desk reviews and information and views from the interviews. Country visits will also be used to identify good practices and lessons for the future at both the country level and corporate levels.

The Evaluation Office will in consultation with BDP and RBx on selecting the sample countries based on geographical balance; importance of the country 243 and lesson-learning potential.

The international team will spend a total of three days per country and will be supported by a locally recruited consultant as necessary. 244 The main purpose of the field visits will be to (a) obtain on-site knowledge of how the GCF-II work links to country level priorities and vertical integration, (b) obtain the views of the government and national stakeholders and the UN country team, (c) bring some level of specificity and context to the assessment and (d) come up with contextual findings and recommendations that can complement the desk-based analyses.

Self-Assessment of individual projects by BDP

In addition to the above, BDP will undertake, as necessary, self-assessment of individual projects which

---

243. The selection will also be based on the extent of the use of GCF services by the countries.

244. A standard format will be prepared by the Team Leader for country level data collection.
will not be covered by the sample projects that will selected for an in-depth assessment.

VII TEAM COMPOSITION

An international team of consultants supported by local experts in 5-8 sample countries where SURFS are located will undertake the evaluation. The Team will comprise five consultants, one of whom will be the Team Leader. Local consultants at the field level will be recruited, as necessary, in selected sample field stations. The Evaluation Office will recruit the Team Leader and the other members of the Team.

The composition of the Evaluation Team should reflect the independent and substantive results focus of the exercise. The Team Leader must have capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice as well as the evaluation and management of complex programmes. The Team composition should also reflect cross-cultural experience in development and in evaluation, including expertise in poverty, governance, environment, crises management and gender.

X EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The Final Evaluation report, to be submitted in June 2004, should be at least 30 to 60 pages in length (excluding annexes), detailing key findings, good practices and clear recommendations for the next GCF, taking into account UNDP’s corporate priorities in MYFF and MDGs.

XI MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation process, provide backstopping support and ensure the coordination and liaison with concerned agencies at the HQ level as well as at the country level. The Evaluation Office will be responsible for the production of the Evaluation Report and its presentation to the Executive Board.