



**Workshop on Local Government in Post-Conflict Situations:  
Challenges for Improving Local Decision Making and  
Service Delivery Capacities**

**ANNEX 18: Strengthening UNDP and National Engagement in Local Government in  
Post-Conflict. Group of UNDP Staff. Conclusions.**

**Oslo, Norway  
28-29 November 2007**

**January 2008**

**Bureau for Development Policy  
Democratic Governance Group  
Oslo Governance Centre**

## Improving UNDP's approach in Post-Conflict Situations

### 1. Challenges and obstacles

#### A. Government based:

- i. Lack of tools for integration
- ii. Political parties split ministries
- iii. Baseline information at local level lacking
  - 1. Contract local group to collect data
  - 2. Adds to program cost
- iv. Lack of leadership in government
  - 1. Leads to donor driven development
  - 2. New institutional arrangements continually introduced (No sustained partnership with the government)
- v. Local level orgs not familiar with process of programming
- vi. Institutional ambiguity reduces ownership of local interventions
- vii. Corruption
  - Donors make UNDP responsible as Trust Fund manager, which in turn affects relations with international community

#### B. Interagency

- i. UN works on its own to plan, implement interventions w/o central government ownership
- ii. Poor coordination between UN agencies in same area
- iii. Programming moves in different directions
  - 1. Development agencies have difficulty with joint programming
  - 2. Sectoral focus in needs assessment rather than territorial focus
  - 3. Conflict with DPKO short-term mission perspective
  - 4. DPKO leading process on strategy for move from peace keeping vs. peace building
  - 5. How can UNDP position itself to take on this role?
- iv. DPKO mission seen as political, which may produce government opposition
- v. Different administrative systems among UN agencies

- vi. Trust by government can be diminished because of link with DPKO political process

### C. UNDP internal

- i. How UNDP can be prepared to assess pre-conflict situation
  - 1. Analytical review
  - 2. Risk assessment
  - 3. Contingency scenario planning
- ii. Horizontal networking -- poorly connecting
  - 1. Sharing is not happening
  - 2. Coordination would improve the way we work
- iii. UNDP perverse incentives -- resource mobilization and delivery concerns can undermine local democratic processes
  - 1. HR system reduces motivation of local staff
  - 2. Procurement and recruitment benefits stay outside of the country
  - 3. Attracting expert personnel in conflict settings
  - 4. Two UNDPs: Headquarters and country offices
  - 5. Competition for ISS/DSS
  - 6. DEX ties CO hands, slows progress
  - 7. Procurement CAP process prevents delivery
  - 8. discourages cooperation with local governance

## 2. Solutions

- A. RC leadership
  - i. Sectoral groups
  - ii. UN sector work plans
  - iii. Coherent approach
- B. DPKO led clusters, with joint local area development program
- C. include local authorities
- D. A unified UN strategy
- E. A UNDAF common strategy
- F. Support the government as lead agency, with a translation of strategy into action

- G. Vertical knowledge networking
- H. Develop joint programs on local governance and service delivery
- I. Hybrid implementation modalities (Government or NGO rules)
- J. BCPR SERGE program (speed response to disaster)
  
- K. Country Offices need to be more vocal on HQ generated constraints
  
- L. BDP should restructure along lines similar to BCPR by giving staff oversight responsibilities for regions and countries
  
- M. UNDP can learn from DPKO procurement speed