

# UNDP's engagement in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers



## ***POLICY NOTE***

August 2002

### Executive Summary

---

Policy Notes are intended to strengthen UNDP's upstream policy advice on key issues and priority themes. This note recognises the fact that a growing number of Country Offices (currently over 60) are engaged in supporting the preparation, implementation and monitoring of PRSPs. PRSPs offer improved prospects for real progress on poverty reduction provided that the appropriate conditions are in place. The note highlights how UNDP support can contribute to the creation of those conditions. It draws on the views on PRSPs conveyed by colleagues in Country Offices through individual communications and through a lively debate conducted on the virtual Poverty Network. The note has also benefited from views from other UN agencies, especially during discussions held in the UN Development Group. (A UNDG Guidance Note on PRSPs has been developed). The note focuses on PRSPs rather than on poverty reduction strategies. "Choices for the Poor: Lessons from National Poverty Strategies" (UNDP, 2001) offers a comprehensive evaluation of UNDP's recent experience in supporting PRSPs in a large number of countries (<http://www.undp.org/dpa/publications/choicesforpoor/ENGLISH/index.html>).

## Contents

---

1. Background: the origins and nature of PRSP
2. Relationship among PRSP, CDF, PRGF, PRSC, CAS, CCA, UNDAF and CPO
3. UNDP's view of PRSPs
4. UNDP's potential contributions
5. UNDP services and interventions
6. Country experiences: UNDP support in the formulation of PRSPs
7. Selected references

## 1. Background: the origins and nature of the PRSP

---

In December 1999, the Executive Boards of the IMF and World Bank approved a new policy instrument, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), designed to serve as a framework document for concessional lending. Specifically, PRSPs were intended as a basis for external debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative, begun in 1996 and 'enhanced' through more generous terms in 1999, and also as a pre-condition for financing from the IMF under the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) and from the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) concessional lending facility. In effect, the PRSP has replaced the Policy Framework Paper (PFP) and the PRGF has replaced the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF).

The major features of the PRSP were defined by the World Bank and IMF to comprise an analytical and comprehensive framework, integrating macro-economic, structural, sectoral and social considerations and laying out a set of poverty reduction measures and policies. They are intended to be nationally owned, and developed through a participatory process. They should be results-oriented, particularly with respect to the Millennium Development Goals, and they should span an initial three-year time frame, but be conceived within a longer time horizon.

PRSPs are subject to scrutiny and approval by the IMF and World Bank Boards, following a Joint Staff Assessment, which examines the:

- nature of the participatory process
- quality of the poverty analysis
- use of targets and monitoring systems
- quality of the macroeconomic framework
- nature of the structural, sectoral, social policies

The PRSP was initially intended for the 41 HIPC countries, for which a two-stage process of debt relief had been anticipated: at the so-called 'decision point' and the 'completion point'. Subsequently, the World Bank and the IMF have extended potential PRSP coverage to all of the 77 low-income countries eligible for PRGF assistance on the basis of their per capita income and IDA-eligibility (countries with per capita income of less than US\$885 in 1999).

Given the complexity of the task of preparing PRSPs, including the need for a fully participatory process, however, it was soon recognised that an adjustment to the process was needed to enable countries to benefit from interim debt relief. As expediency, therefore, it was agreed that Interim PRSPs would be produced. I-PRSPs would not be subject to the same rigorous criteria, but they would bring countries to the decision point under HIPC. Full PRSPs would then be produced, not less than one year later. In the case of HIPC countries, PRSPs are intended to bring them to completion point, and allow reductions in their external debt.

The content of an I-PRSP is intended to comprise: (a) a statement of commitment to poverty reduction by the government, preferably indicating its commitment to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals; (b) an outline of the nature of the poverty problem, its extent and pattern, and the main elements of existing government strategies and programmes to tackle it; and (c) a timeline and process for preparing a PRSP in a participatory manner, including the international assistance requested, together with a three-year policy matrix and macroeconomic framework.

By the end of 2001, some 36 countries finalised a PRSP or I-PRSP; about 20 of which completed a full PRSP. Because of the initial emphasis on the HIPC countries, the I-PRSPs and PRSPs are concentrated mainly in sub-Saharan Africa. In early 2002, representatives from low-income countries, civil society organisations, donors and academia reviewed recent experiences in implementing the PRSP process. The key messages that emerged related to both the process and content of PRSPs, including:

- § allow for flexibility in line with different country circumstances;
- § temper expectations and set realistic targets;
- § prioritise policies and actions, and develop capacity and systems to enable this;
- § keep an openness to alternative policy choices in the PRSP process;

- § sustain efforts over the long term, with a corresponding commitment by countries and development partners; and
- § restructure and harmonise donor assistance, including multi-year budget support

## 2. Relationship among PRSP, CDF, PRGF, PRSC, CAS, CCA, UNDAF and CPO

---

The PRSP was introduced about one year after the emergence of another World Bank-initiated instrument, the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF). The CDF, which the Bank introduced in 12 pilot countries during 1999, was designed to be a framework for the strategic orientation of Government and development partner interventions around a country's main development priorities. The World Bank emphasises the complementarity between the PRSP and the CDF: the one indicating the principal anti-poverty development priorities, the other providing the strategy for interventions to address them. The CDF has been overshadowed by the PRSP, mainly because it is not associated with new funding opportunities. The World Bank uses the language of 'implementing the CDF principles': country ownership of PRSPs, government-driven aid co-ordination, and harmonisation of donor practices.

According to the IMF, "the core aim of the PRGF is to arrive at policies that are more clearly focused on economic growth and poverty reduction and, as a result of better national ownership, more consistently implemented." PRGF-supported programmes are derived from the PRSP. PRGFs, in contrast to ESAF-supported programmes, are intended to make poverty reduction a central goal, as opposed to a desirable by-product. PRGFs are also formulated differently from ESAFs. Formerly, Policy Framework Papers (PFP) were the basis of ESAF loan arrangements, and were prepared jointly by country officials and IMF and World Bank staff without broader consultation. Now, PRSPs, and thus PRGF-supported policy programmes, are intended to be country-led and to incorporate contributions to policy design from across society. PRSPs are subject to Joint Staff Assessments by WB/IMF, and because PRGF-related documents are circulated more widely than under the ESAF, programmes are likely to be more transparent, enabling other donors to use PRSPs as the basis for their support. With the greater emphasis on country leadership and closer collaboration with the World Bank, the IMF will focus its conditionality more on its core areas of responsibility. The two institutions will tailor assistance to fit their respective areas of responsibility in supporting the PRSP strategy.

One of the inherent tensions of the PRSP is the fact that it is intended both as a country-owned programming framework, and as a basis for World Bank/IMF lending, and scrutinised by their Boards. The Boards, it is argued, should be examining the means of support for the PRSPs, not the instruments themselves. The Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) is supposed to be the framework for all World Bank support to the PRSP. In 2001, the World Bank also developed a financial instrument of support, known as the Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC), initially in Uganda and Viet Nam (see box). The PRSC is conceived to cover several years, but is subject to an annual review. At present, it is not clear to what extent the PRSC programme will be in line with the anti-poverty focus of the PRSP or (I)PRSP. Conditionalities are not clear, but the development of the I-PRSP into a full-fledged PRSP is expected to be at least one of the conditions for continued access to concessional lending.

### PRSC in Viet Nam

The agreement between the World Bank and the Government specifies that the PRSC will be for a period of at least three years. The PRSC targets five broad areas: banking reform; state enterprise reform; private sector development; trade reform and public expenditures (transparency, efficiency and equity). The initial amount of \$250 million was approved in 2001 and will be disbursed in several tranches. A further \$150 million will be provided a year later, subject to a positive assessment of the reforms.

UN instruments are also highly relevant to the PRSP process. A high-quality Common Country Assessment (CCA) can and should be an important analytical building block for the Government to draw on in formulating its PRSP, along with other reports prepared either by individual agencies or jointly (such as the MDG report). And just as the CAS may be perceived as the World Bank's 'business plan' for support to the PRSP, the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) can be seen as the basis on which the UN system supports poverty reduction in each country. The CCA and UNDAF guidelines, which are currently being updated, will indicate the linkages with the PRSP. Moreover, the planned outcomes in the Country Programme Outline (CPO) will be aligned with the objectives of the UNDAF, and therefore with the PRSP too.

### 3. UNDP's view of PRSPs

---

Addressing a World Bank-sponsored Seminar on International Development Targets in March 2001 in Washington, the UNDP Administrator stated that the UN "must applaud and support the PRSPs. [...] For us, that means using our own traditional strengths to help vest deep country ownership—such as our work in providing support for civil society consultation—ensuring that the poverty reduction goals are given maximum space in the macro-economic envelope and our technical assistance is used to help developing countries develop real choices, and where appropriate, real alternative views or analysis as they seek to map out their own development strategies." (<http://www.undp.org/dpa/statements/administ/2001/march/19mar01.html>)

The Administrator highlighted the important role played by the World Bank in respect of the PRSPs and the leadership of UNDP in supporting the monitoring of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), drawing on the unprecedented mandate given to the UN system by the Millennium Declaration of September 2000. UNDP's convening power and aid co-ordination role, its multi-sectoral approach, its normative role and its country presence are recognised as significant to secure country-level ownership of the PRSP and country-level monitoring of the MDGs. For country level reporting on the MDGs, UNDP is leading the UN Country Team's effort as 'scorekeeper' of the MDGs. UNDP has issued a Guidance Note on MDG reporting at the country level. Up-to-date information on MDGs is available at <http://www.undp.org/mdg/>.

UNDP expects to play a major role in maximising the potential of PRSPs to contributing to poverty reduction. Indeed, a recent review of UNDP Support to Poverty Reduction Strategies in PRSP Countries details support to the design, implementation and monitoring of poverty reduction strategies in 60 countries (<http://intra.undp.org/bdp/service/poverty.htm>). In order to maximise the potential contribution of PRSPs two principles of engagement flow from the Administrator's statement, and derive from our role as the 'development agency of the developing countries':

- Ø engage at the behest of Government and national partners in civil society, and
- Ø help to elaborate real choices, and where appropriate, alternative views and analyses, based on criteria of equity and human development.

### 4. UNDP's potential contributions

---

PRSPs have raised the priority of poverty reduction in a growing number of countries, and has had a valuable influence on policy-making by stressing pro-poor consequences. It has helped sharpen the focus on the poor and given a new urgency to reducing poverty by seeking to establish time frames, benchmarks and monitorable outcomes.

The extent to which PRSPs are able to make a real contribution to poverty reduction depends on a range of factors, including coherence with long-term human development criteria. UNDP support is essential in helping to create the right conditions by addressing substantive issues related to poverty reduction. Some of the important issues are outlined below:

- Build on existing work and previous experience: Many Governments have been engaged in the formulation of national poverty reduction strategies during the 1990s. In over 100 countries, UNDP has played a key role in raising awareness of poverty in all its dimensions and intensifying the policy debate on poverty eradication, especially through its National Human Development Reports (NHDRs). PRSPs need to build on this prior experience, even where (perhaps especially where) the PRSP counterparts in Government—usually Finance Ministries—are different from the Ministries which had been previously working on national poverty reduction strategies. While the PRSP process has in many cases enhanced the budgetary rigour of pre-existing national poverty strategies, it should ensure the collaboration of those parts of the public—and in some cases non-governmental—sector which had been previously engaged. Also, comprehensiveness must be balanced with realism, taking into account national capacities.
- Provide adequate time for consultation: Because of its links to debt relief and IDA lending, PRSP preparations are often undertaken with haste, limiting the time given to consultation with stakeholders, and inhibiting broad national ownership. Poverty reduction is a political challenge. It touches on critical but sensitive issues involving rights and entitlements. It is likely that pro-poor policies will meet opposition.

Contrary to common belief, poverty reduction is not universally perceived as a common good. Pro-poor policies are likely to interfere with the interests of groups in society that exert more power and influence than what the poor can muster. Patient and inclusive dialogue is needed, not necessarily as a road to consensus, but in order to promote understanding of the hard choices involved. Thus, national ownership implies that key stakeholders are consulted and have an understanding of the trade-offs involved, even if they are not necessarily in agreement with the policy choices. It is necessary to reconcile Government's desire for haste for debt relief and IDA lending with an adequate social dialogue.

- Ensure coherence and pursue a longer-term perspective: In building on past experience, UNDP support can also help ensure coherence between PRSPs and other planning instruments, such as five-year Development Plans, longer-term Vision Statements, National long-term Planning Strategies (NLTPS) and National Strategies for Sustainable Development. UNDP, which has been a partner for many countries in the development of frameworks and instruments of planning, can help to ensure that PRSPs are compatible with these instruments, and in this way also bring in the longer-term perspective necessary for the achievement of the MDGs. While a three-year period of the PRSP corresponds to the time frame of World Bank and IMF lending, it is manifestly too short to engender significant progress in poverty reduction. To address coherence and ensure a longer-term perspective, some countries will seek to develop a single all-encompassing planning framework, which responds to the challenge of poverty reduction. In most others, there will be several instruments. What is important is that these different frameworks are mutually consistent in terms of policy prescription, and that they promote, rather than detract from, institutional harmony in implementation.
- Promote two-way consistency between poverty reduction and macro-economic policies: The PRSP needs to take account of a country's macro-economic context, including the positive and negative consequences of globalisation. Equally, the PRSP's impact on poverty will be limited unless the macro-economic framework, including monetary and fiscal policies, are re-examined in light of their impact on the poor. It is not uncommon to find PRSPs that do not explicitly link the macro-economic framework to poverty reduction. Targets are set for inflation, budget deficit and current account deficit without assessing how they will impact on the poor, or whether different targets would impact differently on poverty reduction.
- Incorporate equity as a core anti-poverty strategy: An anti-poverty strategy that overlooks equity concerns is deeply flawed. This is not an argument against growth; economic growth has an obvious role to play in poverty reduction. Equity not only matters for poverty reduction, but also for growth. Recent research makes it increasingly difficult to build a case that inequality is good for growth. On balance, evidence offers more support for the view that inequality is harmful to growth than the opposite view, which has prevailed in development economics for decades. The growing consensus that high inequality slows economic growth invalidates the conventional argument that an equity-driven anti-poverty strategy will merely lead to the sharing of poverty—not of wealth. Equity is good for the poor because it is good for growth and for distributing its benefits across the population, including the poor. High inequality inhibits growth, contributes to poor policy-making and delays pro-poor reforms.
- Address trade issues as they relate to poverty: It is also vital to incorporate into PRSPs, considerations of trade and the external economic environment. In most PRSP countries, exports account for more than a quarter of GDP (and imports for a higher proportion). Trade is often a key determining factor of the pace and pattern of economic growth and distribution. In recent years, however, many poor countries have been caught in the scissors of declining primary commodity export prices and rising import costs. There are other concerns associated with the globalisation process, including the volatility of external capital flows and the uneven spread of foreign direct investment and technologies. Under the Integrated Framework (co-sponsored by UNDP, WB, IMF, UNCTAD, ITC and WTO), UNDP works to 'mainstream' trade concerns into PRSPs. A major UNDP/UNCTAD project is addressing the concerns of programme countries with respect to globalisation issues.
- Translate anti-poverty strategies into operational programmes: Time and efforts invested in the preparation of a full PRSP should be managed carefully. Their opportunity cost in terms of formulating sectoral development plans (such as SWAPs—Sector-wide approaches) will be high. Sectoral plans offer more space for analytical work and discussions about specific policy options and trade-offs. A PRSP is a

general statement of intent that can address trade-offs in terms of priority setting and policy-making; but it is unlikely to turn into a specific plan with detailed policy measures. SWAps are the channels through which the PRSP will eventually be implemented. Indeed, the term 'poverty reduction' is not an operational concept; it has to be broken down in meaningful and practical programmes backed by appropriate resources allocations and policy reforms. That can only happen at the sectoral level, not at the aggregate level in the abstract. SWAps should be developed for the priority areas that will yield the greatest impact on poverty—such as agriculture, transport, education and health. More sectors may need to be covered but it is unlikely that the civil service will have the capacity to handle more than 3-5 SWAps simultaneously.

## 5. UNDP services and interventions

---

UNDP Country Offices are best placed to determine the precise nature of the services and interventions which can help to improve the coverage and quality of the issues addressed in the PRSP. Below are suggested areas of support in defining both the PRSP process and its contents. The Thematic Trust Fund on Poverty Reduction is available to cover part of the costs associated with UNDP's support to PRSPs.

- **Poverty assessments:** It is indispensable that each PRSP be predicated on a sound analysis of poverty in its many dimensions and causes. UNDP has a strong track record in supporting poverty surveys and participatory assessments. It also needs to help ensure that in the formulation process; the many dimensions of human poverty as well as the considerations of key stakeholders are taken fully into account. Among the poverty-related concerns that UNDP considers as critical are: respect for and promotion of human rights; equity and gender equality; and the vulnerability of specific groups. Therefore, disaggregated data are essential to identify the main characteristics of the poor and the vulnerable; such as gender, ethnicity, location, education, etc. and any combination thereof.
- **Pro-poor policy options:** UNDP must encourage a pro-poor focus in the policies that lie at the heart of PRSPs. This means advocating public finance policies (covering both revenue and expenditure and in line with the 20/20 Initiative) that favour human development concerns and are not entirely driven by short-term economic expediency; access to land, credit, and other key assets that favour the poor; policies that enhance empowerment. Gender issues are integral to policy analysis and the resultant strategies to eradicate it. Gender sensitivity implies the need for positive provisions for women's rights and the elimination of gender discrimination, and the securing of their sustainable livelihoods and social protection.
- **Consultation with key stakeholders:** building on our political neutrality and the breadth of our mandate, many UNDP Country Offices already enjoy close interaction, on both operational and policy matters, with civil society and NGOs. Consultations cannot be done in haste. UNDP has helped to establish new forums and consultation mechanisms, by building on existing institutional mechanisms, including Parliaments, regional and local assemblies where they exist. (A separate policy note deals with UNDP's engagement with CSOs). UNDP can help to foster dialogue on poverty reduction. A recent example is the National Poverty Forum in Uganda—which UNDP helped to create, and which it co-chairs with the Government. A principal objective is to open opportunities for civil society—including women's and indigenous peoples' organisations—as well as the private sector, to participate in public debates, to ensure that the interests of the poor are taken into account in the design of poverty strategies. The Secretary General's 2000 Global Compact also provides opportunities for further strengthening ties with the private sector. In fragile situations, UNDP should help to ensure that PRSPs are sensitive to conflict prevention, and contribute to building social cohesion.
- **Monitoring PRSP implementation:** UNDP can support the monitoring of the impact of national poverty reduction strategies. In its role of MDG scorekeeper, UNDP can help build local monitoring capacity, and stress the use of the MDGs, but which are contextualised in line with national priorities and disaggregated by gender, ethnic, geographical, rural/urban and other distinctions that characterise the poor. The National Human Development Report is a relevant depository of data. Since the purpose of monitoring PRSPs is to determine their short-term impact and effectiveness, periodic national household surveys will not be sufficient. In addition to detailed household surveys (which UNDP is actively supporting in the Latin America and other regions), UNDP should encourage the development of more frequent surveys and rapid assessments of the poor and by the poor themselves and help to ensure that the results of these surveys are

fed back in a timely way to policy-makers and community leaders. This is one of the goals of the poverty 'observatories' in some francophone African countries. The active involvement of NGOs and local community organisations in the monitoring of PRSP performance is an area where UNDP can make a difference.

- UN Country Team support: UNDP has a clear mandate to provide leadership on poverty reduction within the UN Country Team. Individual agencies contribute to poverty reduction in their respective areas of specialisation: UNICEF on the well being and rights of children; WHO on health issues; FAO and WFP on food security; UNFPA on maternal health, and so on. As they have already demonstrated in several countries, UN Country Teams—and UN Theme Groups—offer the opportunity to combine expertise in support of PRSPs that are truly integrated and gender-sensitive. The principal vehicles for this support are the Common Country Assessments (CCAs), which can feed directly into the process of PRSP formulation, and the UNDAF which should be the main programming framework for UN support in the implementation of the PRSP. The UNDG Guidance Note on PRSPs outlines the relationship among these different instruments, as well as with the MDG reports.
- Resource mobilisation: UNDP can play an important role in helping Government to mobilise resources in support of PRSPs. Some Country Offices already made poverty reduction strategies the focus of Round Tables and in-country donor consultation meetings. These exercises must not be centred on a list of specific project proposals, but on realistic projections of the resource needs—both domestic and external—required to accomplish the goals of PRSPs. This matching of resources, moreover, must take into account future obligations as well as present needs. UNDP should caution against a new round debt accumulation.

6. Country experiences: UNDP support in the formulation of PRSPs

AREAS OF FOCUS	NATURE OF PROGRESS REPORTED	ILLUSTRATIVE COUNTRIES
Substantive inputs into PRSP policy document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Supporting national PRS and development plans upon which the I/PRSP are based</li> <li>§ Provision of technical assistance in PRSP preparation, integrating lessons from pilots, commenting on drafts</li> <li>§ Studies linked to preparation of PRSP (e.g., expenditures on basic social services, determinants of poverty/inequality; review of previous PRS)</li> <li>§ Enabling the incorporating of various thematic linkages for effective PRS, such as governance, gender, environment, HIV/AIDS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Central African Republic; The Gambia; Ghana; Guinea-Bissau; Madagascar; Malawi; Mozambique; Senegal; Uganda; Zambia; Cambodia; Mongolia; Sri Lanka; Bolivia; Yemen; Georgia</li> <li>§ Angola; Benin; Bangladesh; Cameroon; Madagascar; Mauritania; Niger; Rwanda; Sierra Leone; Tanzania; Cambodia; Lao PDR; Viet Nam; Honduras; Nicaragua; Yemen; Armenia; Kyrgyzstan</li> <li>§ Guinea-Bissau; Malawi; Rwanda; Viet Nam; Bolivia; Honduras; Nicaragua</li> <li>§ Burkina Faso; The Gambia; Mauritania; Uganda</li> </ul>
Human development and pro-poor policy emphases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Ensuring that human poverty and human development – including rights-based approaches - are taken into consideration and encouraging pro-poor policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Lesotho; Madagascar</li> </ul>
Macro-economic policy framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Developing macroeconomic framework, preparation of guidelines and background studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Angola; Benin; Ghana; Lesotho; Cambodia; Lao PDR; Viet Nam; Bolivia; Nicaragua; Georgia; Kyrgyzstan</li> </ul>
Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Incorporating international trade considerations (including the Integrated Trade Framework) into PRSPs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Burundi; Ghana</li> </ul>
Promoting consultation, stakeholder participation in the PRSP process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Fostering stakeholder awareness and inputs through Poverty Forums, seminars and workshops</li> <li>§ Creating high-level institutional mechanisms for participation such as multi-stakeholder advisory committees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Angola; Cameroon; Guinea; Lesotho; Niger; Tanzania; Uganda; Zambia; Bangladesh; Cambodia; Nepal; Pakistan; Bolivia; Honduras</li> <li>§ Lesotho; Tanzania; Honduras</li> </ul>
PRSP Monitoring Indicators and Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Strengthening PRSP monitoring capacity - development of disaggregated indicators, data, training at national and local levels as well as poverty observatoires</li> <li>§ Facilitating poverty surveys and assessments, especially at grassroots level, to feed into policy formulation</li> <li>§ Monitoring progress towards MDGs as benchmarks in determining progress in poverty reduction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Benin; Burkina Faso; Cameroon; Chad; Ethiopia; Guinea; Lesotho; Malawi; Rwanda; Tanzania; Uganda; Cambodia; Mongolia; Nepal; Bolivia; Haiti; Honduras; Nicaragua; Armenia; Tajikistan</li> <li>§ Benin; Chad; Ghana; Malawi; Mauritania; Niger; São Tomé and Príncipe; Tanzania; Pakistan; Viet Nam; Bolivia</li> <li>§ Viet Nam</li> </ul>
Co-ordination and Implementation Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Co-ordinating UN Country inputs into PRSP formulation and ensuring consistency and closer linkages between PRSPs and the CCA/UNDAF</li> <li>§ Improving alignment of the principal planning bodies and instruments, and ensuring PRSP compatibility with other PRS, development plans.</li> <li>§ Advising government on strategy and processes for PRSP formulation and implementation</li> <li>§ Strengthening institutional (national government) capacity for PRSP implementation</li> <li>§ Strengthening local government capacity for PRSP implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Ghana; Guinea-Bissau; Kenya; Malawi; Mauritania; Tanzania; Uganda; Armenia</li> <li>§ Ghana; Kenya; Lesotho; Mozambique; Cambodia; Viet Nam; Bolivia; Guyana</li> <li>§ Angola; Burundi; Chad; Côte d'Ivoire; Ghana; Kenya; Lesotho; Madagascar; São Tomé and Príncipe; Bangladesh; Cambodia; Pakistan; Viet Nam; Haiti; Djibouti</li> <li>§ Madagascar; Malawi; Mauritania; Tanzania; Zambia; Cambodia; Mongolia; Nepal; Viet Nam; Nicaragua</li> <li>§ Lesotho; Uganda; Cambodia; Lao PDR;</li> </ul>
Resource mobilisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Helping governments mobilise resources in support of PRSPs through Round Tables and other in-country donor consultation meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Angola; Mali; Laos</li> </ul>

## 7. Selected references

---

- UNDP support for poverty reduction strategies in the PRSP Countries, September 2001. <http://intra.undp.org/bdp/service/poverty.htm>
- "UNDP review of the PRSP"
- World Bank web-site for Poverty Reduction Strategies and PRSP <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/index.htm>
- International Monetary Fund (IMF), August 2000, "Key Features of IMF Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility Supported Programs. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/prgf/2000/eng/key.htm>
- United Nations Development Group (UNDG), Guidance Note on PRSPs and Guidance Note on Reporting on the Millennium Development Goals at the Country Level. <http://www.undg.org>
- Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD), September 2000, "PRS – Poverty Reduction or Public Relations Strategies?", CAFOD Policy Paper. <http://www.cafod.org.uk/policyprs.htm>
- Institute of Development Studies (IDS), April 2000, "Poverty Reduction Strategies: A Part for the Poor?", IDS Policy Briefing Issue 13. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/publicat/briefs/brief13.html>
- Oxfam International, April 2001, "Making PRSPs Work: The Role of Poverty Assessments".
- World Vision, 2000, "PRSPs: Good News for the Poor?".