OUTCOME EVALUATION 2002

DECENTRALISATION POLICIES

Report submitted to UNDP Pakistan

By

Dr. Mohammad Waseem
Shandana Khan Mohmand

24 February 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

ADPB – Area Development Programme Balochistan
CAR – Committee on Administrative Restructuring
CCBs – Citizen Community Boards
CIDA – Canadian International Development Agency
COs – Community Organisations
DC – Deputy Commissioner
DCIC – District Citizens Information Centres
DCO – District Coordination Officer
DFID – Department for International Development
EDOs – Executive District Officers
EIROP – Essential Institutional Reforms Operationalisation Programme
G3 – Good Governance Group
GIS – Geographic Information System
GoP – Government of Pakistan
GEUP – Gender Equity Umbrella Programme
LFO – Legal Framework Order
LGP2000 – Local Governance Plan 2000
LGO2001 – Local Governance Ordinance 2001
LIFE – Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment
MACP – Mountain Areas Conservancy Project
MNA – Member of National Assembly
MoWD – Ministry of Women and Development
NARIMS – National Reconstruction Information Management System
NCHD – National Commission on Human Development
NEAP-SP – National Environmental Action Plan – Support Programme
NGOs – Non-Governmental Organisations
NORAD – Norwegian Agency for Development
NRB – National Reconstruction Bureau
GoNWFP – Government of NWFP
PO2002 – Police Order 2002
PARAGON – Participatory Action Research and Governance Options Network
PARADIGM – Pakistan Action Research for Development in Governance and
                            Management
RRHA – Rehabilitation of Refugee Hosting Areas
SAP – Social Action Programme
SDC – Swiss Development Corporation
SDRB – Support to Devolution Reform Balochistan
UNDP – United Nation Development Programme
VCC – Village Conservation Committees
W3P – Women's Political Participation Programme
WB – World Bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The context for this outcome evaluation is provided by UNDP's support for governance-related programmes in Pakistan, with a focus on decentralisation of authority and management. Its main objective is to take stock of the progress on conceptual and operational issues within the overall framework of devolution of power as enunciated by the Local Government Plan 2000. Following are the major findings of this outcome: that the UNDP-supported process of decentralisation has moved ahead beyond the stage of legal and policy formulation; that it is too soon to give the final verdict on the success or failure of this process, considering that the new local government apparatus is facing challenges from the elected governments at federal and provincial levels; that UNDP's partnership strategy is operationally productive; that certain negative factors have adversely affected the outcome, such as slow implementation of LGP2000, lack of financial devolution, delay in civil service reforms, and non-institutional allocation of resources under the post-October 2002 political set-up. UNDP's contribution to the outcome has been operationalised at the levels of policy formulation, institutionalisation, capacity building and community empowerment. The evaluation recommends greater sensitivity to political change, improvement of linkages between various levels of government, carrying out output evaluations, sharing of financial information with partners and initiating small grants to support councillors. Overall, UNDP has been successful in building national ownership and community participation in projects.

INTRODUCTION

The present outcome evaluation of decentralisation policies in Pakistan aims at judging the performance of various stakeholders, donor agencies and government departments within a comprehensive and result-oriented framework. The focus of the outcome evaluation is on institutional reform, change in policy and, in general terms, capacity-building of institutions and groups involved in various projects dealing with issues such as environment, national conservation, information, gender and poverty alleviation. The framework of the evaluation is broadly defined in terms of objectives, strategies and targets provided in CCF. Keeping in consideration the timing and scope of this evaluation, the UNDP-supported projects that contribute to the outcome fall into the following three categories:

1. In some cases, projects have barely taken off. This includes the Rehabilitation of Refugee Hosting Areas programme (RRHA) and the Support for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals programme (referred to here as NCHD). Here, the scope of evaluation is obviously limited to an analysis of resource input, because very little time has passed since their inception. The contribution of these projects to the outcome is, therefore, constrained in terms of measurability as well as result-oriented evaluation.

2. A more meaningful measurement of the contribution of certain projects was possible, since these have passed the initial phase of conceptual lay-out, institution-building and community mobilization in pursuit of the targets spelled out in the UNDP programme. However, there have been significant delays combined with a slow process of networking. This makes the current evaluation

problematic due to the fact that giving a final verdict on the findings is somewhat premature. Here, it is the potential of projects such as EIROP and SDRB to contribute to the outcome, rather than their current achievements, which becomes the focus of this enquiry.

3. Some projects have reached a stage in the achievement of their outputs that makes it possible to quantify and interpret their contribution to the outcome. This category includes projects whose outcome is relatively more liable to objective and precise judgment in terms of time, scope and the result. This includes projects such as G3 and GEUP.

We can outline three major aspects of the wider decision-making framework for the UNDP programme for good governance in terms of the political environment. First, when the programme started in the mid-1990s, the Social Action Programme (SAP) was occupying the major space in the world of ideas and practices relating to development. In this sense, the governance programme largely overtook the SAP in terms of rethinking about the need to mobilise and empower the wider public to play a role in defining developmental targets and setting priorities. In this sense, there was a shift of focus from service delivery to community participation as the primary approach. The idea was that UNDP should support the government of Pakistan in the direction of:

- making governance an all-pervasive theme in the development programme,
- decentralising the patterns of authority away from the federal level to provincial and district levels, and
- cultivating the national ownership of the programme by mobilising the community for participation in projects at all levels.

Second, the UNDP's evolving focus on good governance found a fertile ground with the change of government in October 1999. The new government embarked on an ambitious programme of institutional reconstruction with a focus on devolution of power and decision-making. This provided the right context for a meeting of minds between UNDP's governance programme and the government's programme for institutional and policy reform. The government created a new institution, National Reconstruction Bureau (NRB), for conceptualising and implementing major institutional reforms, and UNDP supported this initiative by providing technical assistance. During the last three years, LGP2000 has been operationalised through elections for union and district councils, which also provided 33 per cent representation for women. In addition, the Police Order 2000 provided for women's representation in Public Safety Commissions at the national, provincial and district levels. UNDP supported this process by initiating projects for institution building, awareness-raising in the community and capacity-building by way of expanding the outreach of projects.

Third, after the October 2002 elections for the National and provincial assemblies a process of government formation set in, which has the potential to challenge the general mode of operation of the governance programme. For example, during the weeks and months before and after the elections, the national agenda appeared to be shifting its focus from governance as policy output to the input function of electing governments at the two levels. There is an emerging sense of rivalry between members of the National

and provincial assemblies on the one hand and district councillors on the other, based on competition for development funds and patronage.

This evaluation looks at two types of programmes: (1) programmes that are directly linked to LGP2000 of the Government of Pakistan. Interventions under these have been in the form of direct assistance to the formulation of the plan, institutionalisation and capacity building; and (2) programmes that empower communities through a decentralised and participatory approach to programme management.

The evaluation team was able to collect considerable findings on the stage of output of each programme, and has made recommendations on the basis of lessons learnt. The evaluation has been done with regard to the location of each project on the continuum of the level of contribution to the outcome. It is expected that the outcome evaluation will be used for learning about enhancement of institutional efficiency and potential for delivery, especially with reference to a higher level of exchange of information as an input into policy-making. This outcome would also contribute to UNDP's self-positioning at a more productive level in pursuit of governance activities. Since the current exercise in evaluation encompasses the whole country as a unit of enquiry, it is the overall capacity of the institutional and policy framework of the state, which underlies the present outcome evaluation as a reference point.

A 3-pronged methodology was employed in this evaluation: (1) review of written material. This included government publications, UNDP programme documents and annual reports, workshop reports and newspapers (for a list of documents reviewed, see Annex 3); (2) detailed interviews conducted with government officers, donors, stakeholders and other UNDP staff; and (3) field visit (Peshawar).

This outcome evaluation is relevant for taking stock of progress towards achievement of the outcome as well as reviewing, redefining and repositioning the role of UNDP, GoP and the donor community in general.

THE DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Concern about the need for decentralisation has emerged from two parallel strands of thinking: first, there was a realisation that the centralised bureaucracy had failed to serve the developmental goals of the country because of its top-down system of the flow of authority and information. Second, there was a feeling that the prevalent political system did not provide any room for community participation. Together, these issues surfaced from time to time throughout Pakistan's history. While the former took the form of a series of efforts at administrative reforms, the latter found expression in the form of relatively empowered and well-institutionalised local government apparatuses under Presidents Ayub (1958-69), Zia (1977-88) and Musharraf (1999-). Underlying these reform efforts was the rampant criticism of the fact that effective power of sponsoring and funding developmental activity lay in the hands of the centrally recruited, trained, encadred, appointed, and promoted bureaucracy. Similarly, there was criticism of the

reduction of elected district and union councils to the role of mere disbursement agencies for developmental work, apart from their occasional input in preparation and formulation of projects in the locality. Service delivery typically remained under the control of the district administration, in fields such as education, health, employment, industry, agriculture, forestry, fishing, works and services.

The issue of administrative reform was addressed at various levels. In 1998, the World Bank's report on civil service reform in Pakistan held the bureaucracy responsible for lack of good governance in the country. It criticised its centralised character, inappropriate skills, financial burden on the treasury and absence of an effective mechanism for accountability. A major initiative in the direction of bureaucratic reforms, partly in response to the 1998 WB report, came in 1999 in the form of the report of Committee on Administrative Restructuring (CAR). Continuation of the cadre system remained the centrepiece of this report, while issues such as technical competence and downsizing were highlighted. Subsequently, NRB adopted the agenda of bureaucratic reform, although its final outcome is still awaited.

On the other hand, NRB's initiative LGP2000 empowered the local government apparatus beyond anything experimented before, especially by replacing the Deputy Commissioner (DC) by an elected mayor (nazim). This 'de-constructed' a century-and-a-half old system of district management. Previously, the local government and bureaucratic institutions functioned on parallel lines, except when tendering and approving development projects respectively. LGP2000 linked the two at the district level by making the local bureaucracy formally accountable to the elected district nazim. NRB pursued a two-fold objective of: (a) promoting community participation in the district administration, and (b) bringing about bureaucratic reforms.

Governance has been a central focus for UNDP's work globally. In Pakistan, the organisation put in place an active Governance Unit, which had established links with the GoP prior to 1999. After the military coup, the new government approached UNDP for support of its institutional reconstruction programme carried out by NRB. UNDP found it promising for its own governance objectives. This new NRB-UNDP partnership aimed at institutionalising community participation.

UNDP subsequently developed a number of initiatives around the issue of decentralisation and community participation. Some programmes that were already dealing with institutional reform were revised to operationalise the GoP's new initiative LGP2000. These initiatives were implemented through cost-sharing partnerships with various actors, including EAD, Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Women's Development of the GoP, and donors, such as DFID, CIDA, SDC and NORAD. The programmes were implemented through a number of stakeholders. These programmes aimed at benefiting various groups and communities, among them union councillors, especially women councillors, the local community in various parts of NWFP and Balochistan, residents of squatter settlements in Islamabad, and the society in general by putting in place public representatives at the grassroots level.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Status of the outcome

As mentioned earlier, it is too soon in the process of decentralisation in Pakistan to give a final verdict on the achievement of the stated outcome. However, satisfactory progress has been made in this direction. As far as the formulation of a legal and policy framework for decentralisation is concerned, this has been achieved in the form of LGP2000. This was followed by institutional reform in the realm of governance at the local level, which was later operationalised through local bodies elections 2000-1. On the other hand, implementation of this framework in terms of capacity building of the new institutions and policy measures in the direction of transfer of decision-making authority to the district administration has been slow and far from complete. Nevertheless, the following achievements in the field of devolution can be highlighted:

- Mobilisation of the general public which elected more than 100,000 union councillors;
- Bringing the government closer to people by dividing the electorate into small constituencies and, thus, enhancing the representative character of local bodies;
- Boosting women's representation at the local government level by electing more than 40,000 women councillors;
- Exposing the unwillingness of religious minorities to accept the separate electorate system as the basis for electing minority seats in the local bodies, as demonstrated through the boycott of 97% minority seats in Balochistan, 91% in NWFP, 73% in Sindh and 70% in Punjab. Only 88 out of 957 minority seats were contested. All this led to replacement of the separate electorates system by the joint electorate system, and thus, formally brought minorities into the mainstream politics; and
- Electing a district mayor (nazim) and making DC accountable to him/her in his/her new capacity as district coordination officer (DCO).

LGP2000 has generally enjoyed a high level of acceptability by UNDP partners. In addition, LGP2000 attracted wide acceptance in the local community, which soon developed stakes in the evolving system in terms of its envisioned empowerment.

2. Factors affecting the outcome

The following factors have affected the outcome:

Positive factors:

1. **Public ownership of LGP2000:** UNDP's support to the formulation and implementation of LGP2000 through the Support to Good Governance Group (G3), PARADIGM, PARAGON, EIROP, Lachi, SDRB, and GEUP has been linked to the main national priority during the last three years, i.e., decentralisation. This mega product (LGP2000) was projected through massive publicity, which led to cultivation

of comprehensive national support. LGP2000 had the following three attributes: (1) Pakistan-wide scope; (2) High profile; (3) Acceptability and ownership on behalf of the Government of Pakistan. The outcome benefited from these attributes to a significant extent.

2. **Partnership strength and coordination:** Interviews with partners and stakeholders clearly brought out the natural leadership position of UNDP. The wide acknowledgement of the leadership profile of UNDP in terms of coordination, networking and initiation of projects can be considered a vital resource that has facilitated UNDP's work.

Negative factors:

3. **Slow implementation of LGP2000:** While an institutional framework of local governance was formalised and laid out, the process of its implementation was noticeably slow. This process included the preparation, publication and distribution of manuals, categorisation and codification of responsibilities of various public office holders, and formation of CCBs. In addition, local patterns of authority and service delivery systems have not been clearly defined. EIROP staff identified delays in NRB's activities and the consequent political uncertainty at the district level as the main factors responsible for the slow implementation of their projects. Further delays were caused by public activity surrounding the referendum and the elections in 2002.

4. **Lack of financial devolution:** Financial devolution, which is a crucial part of LGP2000, has yet to be implemented. Some mechanisms have been put in place but these are limited in scope. For example, the NWFP Provincial Finance Commission has been formed and the criteria for allocation of resources to individual districts have been developed. However, real financial responsibility is far from being transferred to the district government. This situation has created general confusion regarding the mandate of various office holders. Some project staff commented on the ineffectiveness of the decentralisation process due to the lack of financial devolution and, therefore, the lack of resources available at the local level.

5. **Delay in civil service reforms:** LGP2000 was built on the premise of comprehensive civil service reforms. However, during the process of implementation of this plan, the bureaucracy demonstrated its unwillingness to relinquish control in favour of elected representatives at the local level. This continues to pose a challenge to the decentralisation process.

6. **Provincial autonomy revisited:** The recent elections of October 2002, followed by installation of federal and provincial governments, have increased the potential of clash between the two for the ownership of LGP2000. Between October 1999 and 2002, the four provincial governments at Karachi, Quetta, Peshawar and Lahore operated as mere extensions of the federal government. Therefore, provinces could not pose a challenge to the formulation and implementation of LGP2000 by Islamabad. Now the scenario has changed after the emergence of elected provincial

governments. In the latter's view: (a) local government has been traditionally under the jurisdiction of provincial governments; (b) provincial governments have themselves been clamouring for financial autonomy and a greater share in revenue raising authority vis-à-vis the centre. Not surprisingly, they are shy of further disbursement of funds to local governments and moving towards decentralisation of power, given the fact that their own share in the national revenue is at a mere 8-9 per cent; (c) as Punjab is understood by smaller provinces to take away the lion's share out of the national revenue, the latter have challenged the very basis of allocation of funds. For example, Sindh has been demanding a change in the basis for disbursement of funds from population to revenue-raising capacity, based on its claim that it alone contributed almost 70% of the national revenue. Thus, it argued that the financial award to Sindh needed to go up from the current 23.28% to 70% (Kunwar Idris, "A Fair Slice of the Cake", Dawn, Jan. 19, 2002); and (d) already the local bodies ordinance has been amended by GoNWFP to provide for dismissal of district nazims by a simple majority of MPAs.

7. **Routing government funds through MNAs:** The new government has allocated Rs.10 million to each MNA as development fund for his/her electoral constituency (for at least 272 directly elected MNAs). This has two implications: (1) these funds are expected to put a dent in the financial input of the federal government into the whole institutional framework comprising local government bodies and their projects; and (2) the non-institutional flow of development funds from MNAs to citizens can undermine the effectiveness and credibility of local government institutions by creating a rival patronage structure and thus reducing the connection between citizens and the district government. This is counter-productive for implementation of LGP2000. However, the team has been informed that NRB is presently working on developing a mechanism for utilisation of funds by MNAs.

8. **Social conservatism**: Social and cultural conservatism in NWFP and Balochistan has constrained the scope and impact of activities aimed at women's empowerment in projects such as Lachi and SDRB.

9. **Limited community response:** There is a relatively slow response from the community in terms of utilising the opportunities opened up by institutional reforms. This phenomenon is rooted in: (a) the low level of communication and information in the localities, partly due to an extremely low level of literacy, especially among women; (b) the traditional mistrust of government-supported initiatives; and (c) the countervailing influences of extra-governmental and anti-governmental identity-based groups.

10. **The post-September 11 scenario:** Some projects complained that the instability and insecurity brought on by the international crisis after 9/11 limited the field visits and training activities due to security concerns.

3. UNDP contributions to the outcome through outputs

UNDP's contribution towards the outcome of an effective legal and policy framework for decentralised authority and management has been articulated at four levels:

1) Policy formulation
There has been a series of inputs by UNDP into the formulation of a legal and policy framework for decentralisation, which significantly contributed to the achievement of outputs. These, together with UNDP coordination efforts with other partners and stakeholders, contributed to the progress towards the outcome. UNDP provided technical advice, including consultants, for shaping and making laws, which incorporated the emerging legal framework of decentralisation over the last three years. This legal framework underlined the conceptualisation as well as operationalisation of LGP2000. UNDP's support to G3 has enabled NRB to formulate policy, interact with policy-making apparatus of the GoP and arrive at a consensus document within a period of 15 months (March 2000 – August 2001). This policy-level intervention also had a decisive input in the formulation of the Police Order 2002.

UNDP also provided policy level support through GEUP, which led to the National Programme for Women's Political Participation, as drafted and formulated by the Senior Advisor on Gender. Such legal support will be buttressed by specific initiatives at the policy level, such as gender-responsive budgeting that will in turn be built into NRB's fiscal devolution plan.

At a parallel level, UNDP's regional programme on governance, PARAGON, extended support to NRB in line with its objective of supporting decentralisation reforms. This support took the form of policy advice during the conceptualisation phase of LGP2000.

2) Institutionalisation
In addition to policy formulation, UNDP effectively contributed to creation of an institutional apparatus to translate the concept of devolution into reality. Under EIROP, It has offered technical assistance for institutionalisation and operationalisation of the devolution plan in NWFP through the Provincial Decentralisation Task Force. To facilitate this process, EIROP established a "Capacity Building Advisory Board" as a coordinating body between government agencies, local government bodies, donor agencies, NGOs and academia, in order to coordinate and integrate all on-going capacity building programmes to avoid duplication and make all interventions more targeted and effective.

An important aspect of UNDP's pursuit of the decentralisation process was the cultivation of links with civil society and the initiation of a process of networking between various actors. Through G3, UNDP not only contributed to establishment of the local government, but also looked beyond it in terms of restructuring the whole management and law enforcement system at various levels, including measures to facilitate access to justice at the local level.

3) Capacity building

A large part of UNDP's contribution to the outcome has been through capacity-building interventions in operationalising LGP2000. GEUP stands out as an important capacity building programme that facilitated the implementation of LGP2000 through its flagship programme, Women's Political Participation Programme (W3P). This programme trains women councillors on issues such as gender sensitivity, gender-responsive allocation of budgetary resources, advocacy and gender-specific agenda setting. Under this programme, women trainers trained women councillors. Already, 80 per cent of women district councillors have been trained by GEUP. The W3P module has been passed on to NRB to be included in its larger training module, under which 130,000 men and women councillors would be trained.

Another UNDP capacity-building intervention is EIROP. This programme seeks to develop capacity of the government of NWFP and the new local governments at the district level in the province in order to facilitate the implementation of LGP2000. Its main output is in the form of organisation of training workshops and gathering recommendations for making laws and by-laws, as well as translating government documents (such as the Local Government Ordinance 2001 and the Police Order 2002). Additionally, EIROP works on the development of information management systems. It has developed a concept of creating DCICs, which has already been planned for 5 districts in its initial phase (Bannu, Dir, Peshawar, Abbotabad, D.I. Khan). A GoNWFP website is also under production.

Outside NWFP, UNDP has taken up a comprehensive capacity-building programme in Balochistan, SDRB, which was previously called the Trial District Management Programme. The main method of capacity building employed by this programme is to mobilise and organise communities, and link them to service providers which are generally line departments. It also collects data through GIS to enhance the work and effectiveness of these service providers. GIS is also employed by LIFE in squatter settlements in Islamabad to build the capacity of government departments, specifically CDA, in dealing with the demands of residents for recognition and rehabilitation.

Another UNDP programme that looks at capacity building through training and the building of linkages between levels of governance, though with more of a poverty alleviation than a governance focus, is Lachi. The programme claims to have brought about attitudinal change within the communities in which it works. Once again, the training workshops have focused on the special needs of women. This programme seeks to institutionalise LGP2000 by converting its Community Organisations (COs) into CCBs, and through them, to introduce its own participatory methodology into the operationalisation and institutionalisation of LGP2000. It concentrates on building linkages and networks between nazims, line agencies, COs and other local actors.

Capacity building has been supported by PARADIGM through research studies, such as a baseline survey of access to justice at the local level. Another significant output has been a social audit of citizen perceptions of LGP2000, service delivery systems and access to justice. This was initially started in 10 districts but was later picked up by a UNDP

partner CIDA and extended to the remaining 87 districts. This initiative was implemented together with PARAGON, as was the formulation and establishment of the Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment (DTCE), which seeks to operationalise CCBs.

The UNDP initiative, ADPB, has taken up the approach of capacity building through "linkage-building" workshops. These workshops aim to make communities aware of the new roles of nazims and councillors and to inform them about citizens' concerns and developmental priorities in the area.

A new public-private partnership initiative, NCHD, sponsored by UNDP and GoP, focuses on building the capacity of line departments in providing health and education services at the district level. As a district support unit, it has started four pilot projects, one in each province. It coordinates stakeholders, EDOs, NGOs and district councillors under the leadership of district nazims. The programme is promising and addresses social development from a needs-based, localised perspective.

4) Community empowerment[1]
Together with interventions that are directly linked to LGP2000, UNDP has initiated a number of other programmes, such as MACP, NEAP-SP and ADPB, to empower communities by increasing their participation in the decision-making process. These programmes concentrate on citizens at the grassroots level and address their livelihood options. NEAP-SP presents a particularly interesting example of the value of UNDP's interventions with such programmes. When it was first transformed from the Environmental Advisory Board into NEAP, it looked mainly at environmental issues such as clean air and water, solid waste management and ecosystem management. UNDP's involvement brought in a focus on policy level restructuring and coordination, and more importantly, on grassroots level community participation. This community-focused restructuring of a government programme is a significant UNDP output.

LIFE is another unique intervention of UNDP that involves the direct disbursement of funds to local bodies and municipal authorities. It is demand-led, quick and simple. The adoption of this modality for other programmes can address partner and stakeholder concerns about the lengthy period of negotiations and cumbersome procedures involved in working with UNDP. Relevant to LGP2000 is the fact that many nazims have contacted LIFE directly for small projects such as improvement of sanitation systems in their respective districts. However, a lack of funds has limited LIFE's responsiveness to such demands.

The UNDP initiative, MACP, seeks to empower communities through their direct participation in livelihood decisions that affect them. Its objective is to establish a bottom-up, decentralised authority structure within the communities living in its programme areas, i.e. Chitral and Northern Areas. MACP focuses on organising Village Conservation Committees (VCCs), which can lead to more effective public participation within Union Councils.

---

[1] The project RRHA has not been included in this section because this project has been recently initiated, and it is, therefore, too early to discuss it in terms of outputs.

Another UNDP contribution to community empowerment has been through the Support to G3 programme. This support has ensured that the concept of CCBs and NARIMs were included in LGP2000, thus providing for a certain level of freedom of information and transparency at the local level.

In view of these observations on UNDP's contribution to the outcome in terms of its outputs of policy formulation, institutionalisation, capacity building and community empowerment, we can conclude that UNDP has been largely successful in using its resources to achieve outputs. This is done through resource mobilisation and cost sharing with other donors. UNDP's contribution to the outcome has been relevant either directly or indirectly, though external factors outlined earlier have impinged on the achievement of outputs. Finally, as far as the quality of outputs is concerned, the evaluators felt that independent verification of the project claims regarding the impact of workshops and research studies is required (see recommendations).

4. UNDP partnership strategies

UNDP's partnership strategy appears to be one of its strengths. It contributes to both its resource mobilisation efforts and its pursuit of the coordinated implementation of programmes. These partnerships are a key resource in the progress towards the outcome. The partners generally appreciated the efficacy of UNDP's partnership strategy inasmuch as it facilitated greater access to government-supported projects through UNDP's special relationship with the host government.

The activities led by UNDP have found a willing partner in GoP, which has generally facilitated the activities of all the foreign donors by coordinating with them and providing logistical support, as well as giving legitimacy to intervention by external actors. At the provincial level, especially in NWFP and Balochistan, UNDP has developed a close working relationship in terms of project formulation and execution with GoP.

However, donor partners typically described UNDP's financial accounting and reporting mechanisms as "undecipherable" and generally difficult to understand. This limits the element of information sharing, which was mentioned as problematic by most of them. Some partners have the impression of unwillingness on UNDP's part to share project details with them. Others blame this lack of information sharing simply on the complicated nature of UNDP's financial accounting mechanisms. Some other partners thought that UNDP did not follow up the progress of the programmes through a regular feedback system of information.

UNDP and its partners often view their mutual relationship on parallel lines. The partners feel that they are not given a sufficient role in project management, both in terms of information and decision-making. On the other hand, UNDP understands that under its agreements with partners it is the project management that has the primary role in micro-management of projects.

UNDP is also considered by some of its partners to be lacking in flexibility in its response to the changing circumstances. In their view, bilateral donors have instituted reforms to become more flexible and responsive, whereas UNDP is still following an older, more bureaucratic approach to project management. This discrepancy in the two approaches of UNDP and some of its partners emanates from the difference in the character and scope of their respective parent bodies: UN as an apex body of nation states on the one hand and the donor community on the other.

Overall, donors accepted the pre-eminent role of UNDP as the coordinator of shared programmes, as the prime facilitator in terms of communication and cooperation with the GoP, and as the initiator of ideas and concepts relating to development in general and governance in particular. However, one donor stressed the need for GoP to play a central role in coordination. Some partners pointed out that no meeting of the Coordination Group on Good Governance had been arranged by UNDP since the October 2002 elections.

EAD showed concerns about the alleged lack of transparency in the selection and hiring of outcome evaluators, and would like to have a role in selecting the team in order to bring out an independent and balanced evaluation. While EAD pointed to a lack of communication about the progress of some UNDP-supported programmes, it specifically mentioned GEUP as one project that takes a proactive approach to keeping EAD informed and involved in all project decisions.

UNDP has recently entered into a new and innovative partnership with NCHD, which is based on the principle of cost-sharing with the private sector for the first time ever in Pakistan. This partnership enjoyed a high profile from the beginning inasmuch as UNDP's contribution and partnership with NCHD was nationally projected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Greater sensitivity to political change:** New sources of legitimacy have emerged for public office-holders at the supra-district level after the October 2002 elections. There is need for greater sensitivity to new patterns of accountability of the executive to legislatures at various levels and the new patronage structures emerging from the electoral process rooted in constituency-based demands. The role of public representatives at the national and provincial levels in all projects relating to governance at the local level needs to be fully acknowledged. The project of local governance faces a challenge from the emerging patterns of parallel functioning of local and higher tiers of government. Therefore, UNDP must adapt projects and interventions to such changes in political realities. This will help lay the foundation for activities of projects like EIROP, which specifically addresses the issue of institutionalisation of LGP2000.

2. **Improving linkages:** UNDP needs to reformulate its approach to concentrate more on emerging challenges, such as the potential for conflict between local and provincial levels of government, and on improving coordination and cooperation between these two levels. Its work to date has concentrated on capacity-building and technical assistance in formulation of national plans. It must aim at improving links and partnerships between various levels of government, which received little attention during the formulation of LGP2000. This can be incorporated into future workshops and training activities. Specific initiatives can also be initiated through NRB to provide legal support to establishing such links. These measures will ensure sustainability of various UNDP projects related to decentralisation. This is specially relevant as a recommendation for projects such as EIROP, GEUP and SDRB.

3. **Output evaluation:** The team found a lack of independent evaluation of outputs such as workshops, research studies and GIS-based data collection. As far as output monitoring is concerned, it has been more quantitative than qualitative in nature. It is recommended that an on-going process of monitoring of the quality of events should be carried out. Project staff needs to be sensitised to the importance of quality and impact of outputs, and to the importance of following up on programme activities.

4. **Directing project activities towards the intended outcome**: Project outputs should be transmitted regularly to the policy-making levels of government. A mechanism needs to be developed to transform the information gathering activities such as GIS, training workshops and research studies into policy inputs. There is a need for all project activities to be directed towards the intended outcome.

5. **Sharing of financial and other information:** It is necessary to rationalise the accounting system and monitoring mechanisms in order to develop a regime that is more easily understood by partners and stakeholders of UNDP. Also, a more deliberate effort is needed to share information. Even some of UNDP's own projects have attributed delays and a slow pace of implementation to the organisation's long and cumbersome internal procedures.

6. **Small grants for councillors:** UNDP can significantly empower union and district councillors and facilitate their developmental activities by extending its small grants modality to them. This low-cost, high-impact, direct funding approach can make UNDP demand-led and more responsive to the specific needs of councillors. The LIFE programme indicated that such requests have already been received from nazims.

LESSONS LEARNED

In dealing with issues such as decentralisation, an international agency must be sensitive to impending changes in political reality that transform imperatives, national needs and priorities. In extending support to NRB's LGP2000, UNDP should have kept in mind the Supreme Court injunctions that made transfer of power to elected representatives mandatory by October 2002. Thus, UNDP should have provided additional technical

advice that could have smoothly linked the impending macro tiers of government at the federal and provincial levels with the proposed third tier of government at the district level. Indeed, the whole programme of decentralisation faces the risk of lack of ownership and commitment on behalf of the new political set-up. In the long run, this can seriously limit the effectiveness of an intervention and its contribution to the outcome.

UNDP has been generally successful in building national ownership of its projects by GoP, such as the MoWD's ownership of GEUP's work and trainings and NRB's acceptance of G3. Similarly, there are best practices lessons to be drawn from the high level of community participation in the decision-making process of some UNDP projects, such as Lachi and ADPB. Other examples include the use of GIS by the projects such as SDRB and LIFE, as well as the coordination between state line departments and communities achieved by LIFE.

On the other hand, one can point to a less than positive factor inasmuch as UNDP has been constrained to function within a political environment characterised by legal and constitutional controversies surrounding the process of democratisation from October 2002 onwards. As LGP2000 has been perceived as a top-down insertion rather than an organic innovation, the new ruling set-up must be encouraged to develop stakes in the decentralisation project to make it viable and sustainable for a long period of time.

ANNEX 1: Schedule of Activities

Date	Day	Time	Activity	Remarks
06 Jan '03	Mon	10:30 to 12:30	1. Briefing to both consultants by DRR (D) & Unit Chiefs 2. Provide one set each of relevant documents.	
10 Jan '03	Fri		Project visit to Peshawar	
		10:00	Meeting with EIROP	H #45 St # 5 Defence Officers Colony Ph # 091-9213236
		11:30	Meeting with Lachi	SRSP HO. H # 129 St # 8 Defence Officers Colony Ph # 091- 285390
		14:30	Meeting with MACP	Conservator Wildlife NWFP, Shami Road Peshawar Ph # 091-9211479
11 Jan '03	Sat	10:30	Meeting with EAD	
18 Jan '03	Sat	09:00	Meeting with DG Environment	Javid Ali Khan (Ministry of Env.LG&RD) Old Naval Complex G 6
20 Jan '03	Mon		Meeting with donors	
		11:00	DFID (British High Commission)	GEUP & LPRP
		12:00	CIDA (H# 18, Bazaar Rd G-6/4)	GEUP & Support to G3
		13:15	NORAD	GEUP
		14:30	SDC (Swiss Embassy)	SDRB & EIROP
		16:00	PARAGON	Paul Oquist (Office)
		17:00	PARADIGM	Farhan Sabih (Office)
22 Jan '03	Wed		Meeting with stakeholders	NPD/NPM (Env. Unit)
		09:00	G3	Zafar Hayat Malik and Wasiullah
		10:00	ADPB	Dr. Rashid Javid
		11:00	SDRP	Ghulam Ali Baluch
		12:00	LIFE	Fayyaz Baqir
		13:00	PARAGON	Paul Oquist
		14:00	GEUP	Roohi Shoaib & Socorro
		15:00	MACP (IUCN)	Abdul Latif Rao
24 Jan '03	Fri	10:00	Meeting with NRB	Danyal Aziz Pak Secretariat Cabinet Block
		11:30	Meeting with UNDP	RR, DRR (P & O) & Unit Chiefs
25 Jan '03	Sat	11:00	Debriefing session with EAD	Tariq Bukhshi, Farrah Ayub & Nilofer Hafeez
03 Feb '03	Mon		Meeting with NCHD	Nasim Ashraf, Prime Minister's Secretariat
03 Feb '03	Mon		1. Draft report due 2. UNDP distributes the report to stakeholders for comments	
10 Feb '03	Mon		1. Stakeholders feedback due	Morning
17 Feb '03	Mon		Final Outcome Evaluation Report due	

ANNEX 2: List of People Interviewed

UNDP
Onder Yucer – RR
Lena M. Lindberg – DRR
Syed Ahmed Naqavi – Programme Resources Manager
Zafar Iqbal – ARR Progarmme
Chaudhry Inayatullah – Chief, Sustainable Livelihoods Unit
Abdul Qadir Rafiq – Acting Chief Environment
Naeem Ahmed – Programme Officer

PARAGON
Paul Oquist – Coordinator, Senior Governance Advisor for Asia
Asad Abbas Naqvi – Programme Analyst

PARADIGM
Farhan Sabih – Chief Governance Unit
Jessica Graf – JPO

LIFE
Fayyaz Baqir – National Coordinator LIFE/GEF
Shafiq Ahmed – Director Katchi Abadi Cell

GEUP
Socorro L. Reyes – Senior Advisor on Gender
Roohi Shoaib – Programme Manager

EAD
Nayyar Agha – Joint Secretary
Tariq Arshad – Deputy Secretary (UN)
Farah Ayub – Deputy Secretary (UN)
Tariq Bakshi – Assistant Secretary

Ministry of Environment
Jawed Ali Khan – Director General
Dr. Tehmina Roohi – Sub-Programme Manager (Grassroots Initiatives)
Dr. Murtaza Malik – Sub-Programme Manager (Policy Coordination and Environmental Governance)

NCHD
Dr. Nasim Ashraf – Chairman

EIROP
Mr. Zafar Hassan   National Project Director
Mr. Haroon Rashid   Project Manager

Miss Irma Malik   Research Coordinator
Mr. Altaf Afridi   Research Officer
Mr. Ashraf Khan   Research Associate
Mr. Zafar Hassan   National Project Director
Mr. Haroon Rashid   Project Manager
Miss Irma Malik   Research Coordinator
Mr. Altaf Afridi   Research Officer
Mr. Ashraf Khan   Research Associate

LPRP
Mr. Muhammad Azam Khan, National Project Coordinator
Mr. Ikramullah Jan, Programme Manager (HRD, SRSP)
Mr. Muhammad Maqsood, Acting Programme Manager
Mr. Khan Muhammad, Senior HRD Officer
Mr. Shakil Ahmad, Senior Credit Officer
Ms. Humera Ali Marwat, Assistant PMER Officer

MACP
Iqmael Shah – Regional Project Manager
Asad Lodhi – Project Manager (Protected Areas Management Project, Chitral)

ADPB
Dr. Rashid Javaid – Programme Coordinator

SDRB
Ghulam Ali Baloch – Project Coordinator
Ali Ahmed Khan – MIS/GIS Specialist

G3
Wasi-Ullah – Director General
Zafar Hayat Malik – National Project Manager

DFID
Jackie Charlton – First Secretary/Senior Governance Adviser
Malick Zulfiqar Ahmad – Programme Officer

CIDA
Mohammad Zaheer – Governance Advisor

NORAD
Alf Arne Ramslien – DHM/Counsellor
Mohammad Arshad Gill – Adviser Development
Saadya Hamdani – Gender Officer

SDC
Ruedi Hager – Resident Representative

Sohail Malik – Programme Officer

<u>IUCN</u>
Abdul Latif Rao – National Project Manager (MACP)
Amara Saeed – Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist (MACP)

ANNEX 3: List of Documents Reviewed

1. Government Gazette NWFP, June 18, 2002, Peshawar

2. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project, UNDP, Three Day Training Workshop on Orientation of Newly-elected Nazims/Deputy Nazims of Tehsil Lachi, May 8-10, 2001

3. EIROP NWFP, UNDP, Report on Visioning Exercise Regarding Integration and Coordination of Capacity Building Interventions in NWFP, March 05-06, 2002, Peshawar

4. EIROP NWFP, UNDP, Budget Management System Guide, Electronic Data processing Cell, Finance Dept. April 15, 2002, Peshawar

5. EIROP NWFP UNDP, Study Tour to Philippines, May 10-17, 2002, Peshawar

6. Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (Life) UNDP, Katchi Abadis and Some Viable Alternatives: A Case Study and Operational Guidelines based on the CDA Islamabad Approach 1998-2002, September 2002, Islamabad

7. Balochistan Trial District Management Project, Participatory Information System: Barija Union Council, November 10, 2002

8. EIROP NWFP UNDP, Provincial Finance Commission Award 2002: Working Paper for Workshop , no date (n.d.)

9. Government of NWFP, Finance Department, Provincial Finance Commission 2002: Summary of Recommendations, June 20, 2003, Peshawar

10. NWFP EIROP, Police Order 2002, August 14, 2002, Peshawar

11. Government of NWFP, NWFP: Local Government Ordinance 2001, NWFP Ordinance No.XIV of 2001, August 13, 2001, Peshawar

12. EIROP/ NWFP/ UNDP, Training Report: Workshops in Decentralized Functioning, Planning, Finance and IT Skills for Elected Representative and District Government Functionaries, May 2002, Peshawar.

13. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project (PAK/99/004) UNDP, Two day Workshop with Women Councilors of District Kohat, January 30-31, 2000

14. EIROP/ NWFP/ UNDP, One-Day Workshop for Women Councilors on Functions and Duties of Women Councilors in Local Bodies, Ministry of Local Bodies and Rural Development, Govt. of NWFP, Peshawar

15. Pakistan Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP) 1999-2006 UNDP, Project of Government of Pakistan and the Global Environment Facility, June 17, 1999, Islamabad

16. UNDP: Project of Govt. of Pakistan, MDP Extension: Pakistan Action Research And Development in Governance and Management (PARADIGM), April 5, 200, Islamabad

17. Pattan Development Organization, Research Study: Local Government Elections March 2001-Phase II, August 2001, Islamabad

18. Government of NWFP and UNDP, Project Document NWFP Essential Institutional Reforms Operationalization Programme, Feb. 27, 2001, Islamabad

19. Government of Pakistan and UNDP, Project Budget: Participatory Planning for Rehabilitation of Refugee Hosting Areas in Balochistan and North Western Frontier Provinces, Sept. 5, 2002, Islamabad

20. UNDP, Area Development Project Balochistan: Project Document, March 1999, Islamabad

21. Government of Pakistan / UNDP, Project Budget: Support for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals, Oct. 9, 2002, Islamabad

22. EIROP / NWFP / UNDP, Annual Project Report 2002, Peshawar

23. National Reconstruction Bureau, Good Governance Group / Government of Pakistan, Annual Project Report: January-December 2002, Islamabad

24. EIROP (UNDP), WKs Meeting with PG, Dec. 2003

25. NEAP-SP, Brief on National Environmental Action Plan, n.d.

26. Government of Pakistan / UNDP, Project Budget: Trial District Management Project Balochistan July 31, 200, Islamabad

27. Ministry of Environment, Local Government and Rural Development, Basic Programme/Project Information: Annual Programme/Project Report APR, 2002

28. NEAP-SP, Government of Pakistan / UNDP, Programme Document, National Environmental Action Plan Support Programme, October 2001, Islamabad

29. National Reconstruction Bureau (NRB) , Government of Pakistan, Local Government Plan 2000, August 14, 2000, Islamabad

30. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project / UNDP, Documenting Innovative Practices: Assisting Government in its Devolution Agenda, February 2002

31. UNDP PARADIGM, Annual Project Report: Pakistan Action Research for Development in Governance and Management , 2002

32. Government of Pakistan / UNDP, <u>Project Budget: Trial District Management Project, Balochistan</u>, July 31, 2003, Islamabad

33. Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE) / UNDP,<u> Accelerating the Pace of Development: A Case Study of the Lodhran Pilot Project</u>, 2002, Islamabad

34. UNDP Asia PARAGON Regional Governance Programme, <u>Parliamentary Policy Analysis</u>: Newsletter, n.d.

35. UNDP: Asia PARAGON Regional Governance Progrmame, Decentralization and Community Empowerment in Asia: The Case of Pakistan: Newsletter: Vol. II, Issue 2

36. NWFP EIROP UNDP, <u>Bridging Gaps between Citizen Sector Organizations and Local Governments,</u> Workshop Report, Sep. 18-19, 2002, Swat

37. UNDP Evaluation Office, <u>Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators</u>, Monitoring Evaluation Companion Series # 1

38. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project UNDP, <u>A Report on Working in Partnership with District Government</u>, LPRP-PAK/99/004

39. UNDP Pakistan, <u>Roar of Yore: January-November 2002</u>, Dec. 19, 2002

40. Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE), <u>Work Plan: May 2002-April 2003</u>

41. Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE), <u>Strategy for Phase IV of LIFE in Pakistan</u>

42. Government of Balochistan, Planning and Development Department / UNDP, <u>Support to Devolution Reforms in Balochistan: District Participatory Information System,</u> Quetta

43. Balochistan Trial District Management Project, <u>Gender Profiles: District Loralai</u>, n.d.

<u>44. UNDP, Project of theGovernment of Pakistan,: Support to Good Governance Group</u>, October 2, 1999, Islamabad

45. Government of Balochistan, Planning and Development Department, Gender Development Section: <u>Support to Devolution Reforms in Balochistan,</u> <u>Annual Progress Report for the Year 2002: Gender and Development Specialist</u>, Quetta, 2002

46. UNDP, <u>Annual Report 2001: Support to Devolution Reforms in Baluchsitan (TDMPB EXT)</u>, 2002, Quetta

47. UNDP, Gender Equality Umbrella Project (GEUP), <u>Annual Project Report 2002</u>, n.d.

48. Mountain Areas Conservancy Project: <u>PRIF (1995-1998): Maintaining Biodiversity in Pakistan Through Rural Community Development</u>, n.d.

49. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project UNDP, <u>Poverty Allevation and Support to Government in its Devolution Agenda, Peshawar</u>

50. Gender Equality Umbrella Project (GEUP): UNDP, <u>Project Budget Revision,</u> Dec. 27, 1999, Islamabad

51. EIROP, <u>Reflection on the Local Government Ordinance, 2001</u>, Report on District & Tehsil Level Workshop, 28-29 May 2002, Peshawar

52. Gender Equality Umbrella Project (GEUP), <u>Strategic Presentations on Policy Issues: Results and Actions Taken,</u> Jan. 8, 2003, Islamabad

53. Dr. Walter Kaelin, <u>EIROP: Report on the 4th Mission from 15 – 21 December 2002,</u> Dec 27 2002, Bern

54. Support to Devolution Reforms in Balochistan Project (Ext: TDMP), <u>Initial Reconnaissance Report: Wahwi Union Council,</u> n.d.

55. Balochistan Trial District Management Project, <u>Community Development Plan: Mekhtar, Loralai,</u> n.d.

56. Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE), <u>Work Plan: June 2001 – May 2004</u>

57. UNDP: Lachi Poverty Reduction Programme, <u>Poverty Alleviation and Support to Govt. in its Devolution Agenda,</u> n.d.

58. UNDP, Area Development Project Balochistan: <u>Report 2002</u>

59. UNDP, Area Development Project Balochistan: <u>Tripartite Review Meeting</u>, Jan-Dec 2002, Islamabad

60. NEAP-SP, Government of Pakistan / UNDP, <u>Tripartite Review Meeting for the national Environment Action Plan Support Programme (PAK/01/003),</u> December 2002, Islamabad

61. Lachi Poverty Reduction Project (PAK/99/004) UNDP, <u>Three-day Training of Women Councilors of District Lachi,</u> June 14-16, 2001

62. Sarhad Rural Support Programme, <u>Final Report on Training Courses Arranged for Nazims and Councillors in Kohat Region</u>, April 2002

63. President's Task Force on Human Development, Report, January 2002, Islamabad

64. UNDP / Government of Pakistan, Project Document: Democratic Governance Trust Fund Component of Support to Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment (DTCE), n.d. Islamabad.

65. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, UNDP: First Country Cooperation Framework for Pakistan 1998 – 2003, 15-19 September 1997, New York.

66. UNDP, Country Review of UNDP Cooperation in Pakistan, 1998-2001, 7 November 2001

67. UNDP, SRF/ROAR Outcomes and Outputs for Pakistan, 2002

68. Kanwar Idris, "A Fair Slice of the Cake", Dawn, Jan 19, 2002

ANNEX 4: Summary of Programme Contributions to the Outcome

Programmes linked to the Local Government Plan 2000

EIROP

EIROP is basically a programme that develops capacity of the government of NWFP and the new local governments at the district level in order to facilitate the implementation of LGP2000. It is needs-based, and responds to requests from partners. EIROP has offered technical assistance for institutionalisation and operationalisation of the devolution plan in NWFP through the Provincial Decentralisation Task Force. To facilitate this process, EIROP established a "Capacity Building Advisory Board" as a coordinating body between government agencies, local government bodies, donor agencies, NGOs and academia, in order to coordinate and integrate all on-going capacity building programmes to avoid duplication, and make all interventions more targeted and effective. EIROP has put in place a structure that can gather recommendations for making laws and by-laws and translate government documents (such as the Local Government Ordinance 2001 and Police Order 2002). Additionally, EIROP works on the development of information management systems. It has developed a concept of creating DCICs, which has already been planned for 5 districts in its initial phase (Bannu, Dir, Peshawar, Abbotabad, D.I. Khan). A GoNWFP website is also under production. A GoNWFP website is also under production.

EIROP has faced difficulties from frequent changes in management, and from the slow implementation of the LGP2000 in NWFP. EIROP staff identified delays in NRB's activities and the consequent political uncertainty at the district level as the main factors responsible for the slow implementation of their projects. Further delays were caused by the referendum and the elections in 2002. They are now expecting even further delays and problems because of the new MMA-led government's reservation about the devolution plan. Also, the shift in the programme's focus from good governance to devolution was abrupt. EIROP deals directly with the stated outcome but it is too soon to evaluate the programme in any sense, considering that it has been functional for only 11/2 years, has spent only 11% of its budget, and is planning to implement most of its activities in 2003.

G3

Through G3, UNDP not only contributed to establishment of local government, but also looked beyond it in terms of restructuring the whole management and law enforcement system at various levels, including measures to facilitate access to justice at the local level. UNDP's support to G3 has enabled NRB to formulate policy, interact with policy-making apparatus of the GoP and arrive at a consensus document within a period of 15 months (March 2000 – August 2001). It has provided consultants to help in the formulation of LGP2000. G3 has also contributed to community empowerment by ensuring that the concept of CCBs and NARIMs were included in LGP2000, thus providing for a level of freedom of information and transparency at the local level. This policy-level intervention also had a decisive input in the formulation of the Police Order 2002. G3 also facilitates links with civil society and initiates networking between various

actors. The programme claims to have enabled and supported the empowerment of people by transferring power to elected representatives at the local level. G3's future now depends on the new elected government's commitment to the devolution process.

GEUP

GEUP is mainly a capacity building programme that facilitates the implementation of LGP2000 through its flagship programme, Women's Political Participation Programme (W3P), which trains women councillors on issues such as gender sensitivity, gender-responsive allocation of budgetary resources, advocacy and gender-sensitive agenda-setting. Most trainings are conducted by women. GEUP hopes to have trained 700 "lead mentors" by the end of the programme, who will then go on to train the remaining councillors in order to meet the programme's aim of training 40,000 district, tehsil and union level women councillors. Of the 2000 women district councillors, W3P has trained 1645. The W3P module has been passed on to NRB to be included in the larger NRB training module, under which 130,000 men and women have been trained.

UNDP also provided policy level support through GEUP, which led to the National Programme for Women's Political Participation, as drafted and formulated by the Senior Gender Advisor. Such legal support will be buttressed by specific initiatives at the policy level, such as gender-responsive budgeting that will in turn be built into NRB's fiscal devolution plan. The programme also has a research component that wants to document the role of women as change agents within the political process. Like most other UNDP projects, this project lacks independent monitoring and evaluation of the quality and impact of various training activities and workshops.

SDRB

SDRB is essentially a capacity-building initiative that aims to demonstrate how the models of decentralisation work by improving public service delivery at the local level through decentralised management of services. The programme has a very specific and targeted emphasis on women and on making services more accessible to them. The programme looks specifically at the decentralised provision of services for efficiency and gender-sensitive accessibility by mobilising and organising communities and linking them to service providers. As such, it also seeks to improve and encourage community participation within the process. It concentrates on developing GIS-based systems of information to support decision-making and to enhance the work and effectiveness of the service providers. While MIS and GIS are admittedly essential to local councils' task of collecting data for their unions, there is as yet little evidence of how this data has been used to facilitate the task of local bodies or to make their decisions more relevant to the local context of unions and villages.

NCHD

A new public-private partnership initiative, NCHD, sponsored by UNDP and GoP, focuses on building the capacity of line departments in providing health and education services at the district level. As a district support unit, it has started four pilot projects, one in each province. It coordinates stakeholders, EDOs, NGOs and district councillors under the leadership of district nazims. The programme is promising and addresses social

development from a needs-based, localised perspective. UNDP's specific contribution to this initiative is the establishment of the commission's office and the funding of its operational costs.

PARAGON
PARAGON is a regional programme that works on governance issues in Asia with a particular emphasis on decentralisation. In line with this, it has extended support to NRB's reform programme. This support took the form of policy advice during the conceptualisation phase of LGP2000. It has also contributed to the process through the social audit and the DTCE, both of which are mentioned below.

PARADIGM
PARADIGM has a flexible modality for responding to requests from GoP. It has a capacity building approach and it initiates pilots, research studies and other innovative projects to advance governance options. LGP2000 has been supported by PARADIGM through research studies, such as a baseline survey of access to justice at the local level. Another significant output has been a social audit on citizen perception of LGP2000 and on service delivery systems and access to justice. This was initially started in 10 districts but was later picked up by a UNDP partner, CIDA, and extended to the remaining 87 districts. This initiative was implemented together with PARAGON, as was the formulation and establishment of the Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment (DTCE), which seeks to operationalise CCBs. PARADIGM has contributed to this by sponsoring a feasibility study, which has yet to be completed. These efforts have aimed at building capacity through information provision.

Programmes with decentralised, participatory decision-making processes

LPRP
LPRP is another UNDP programme that looks at capacity building through trainings and building of linkages between various levels of governance, though with more of a poverty alleviation than a governance focus. The programme claims to have brought about attitudinal change within the communities in which it works. Once again, the trainings have focused on the special needs of women. This programme seeks to institutionalise LGP2000 by converting its Community Organisations (COs) into CCBs, and, through them, to introduce its own participatory methodology into the operationalisation and institutionalisation of LGP2000. LPRP concentrates on building linkages and networks between nazims, line agencies, COs and other local actors. LPRP is contributing to the decentralisation process through its community organisation work, and lending this organisational support to LGP2000.

MACP
MACP aims to empower communities by enabling their direct participation in livelihood decisions that affect them. It seeks to establish a bottom-up, decentralised authority structure within the communities in its programme areas, i.e. Chitral and Northern Areas. It has a community-run project approach that is based on building ownership and

awareness on wildlife preservation within the communities. Although the link is not yet clear, the MACP approach of establishing Village Conservation Committees can organise communities for more effective participation within Union Councils.

LIFE
LIFE is a unique programme that involves the direct disbursement of funds to local bodies and municipal authorities. It is demand-led, quick and simple, and its small grants modality, if expanded and adopted by other programmes as well, could make UNDP interventions at the local level more effective and targeted. Many nazims have already contacted LIFE directly for small upgradation projects, such as improvement of sanitation systems, in their districts. However, a lack of funds has limited UNDP-LIFE's responsiveness to such demands. LIFE's approach to local level planning and implementation is characterised as low-cost, quick and simple, with a strong emphasis on community-government collaboration.

ADPB
ADPB has significantly altered its approach from community development to building capacity of the newly elected councillors and the community through "linkage-building" workshops. The programme functions through mobilising communities into COs that address issues of income generation and other livelihood-related issues. After August 2001, it organised workshops for these COs to build awareness about the new imperatives introduced by the LGP2000. On the one hand, ADPB attempted to make communities aware of the new role of nazims and councillors and how the community organisations could tie in with them. On the other hand, it aimed at informing the new councillors about citizens' concerns and developmental priorities in the area.

NEAP-SP
NEAP-SP is a project with a high level of support and commitment from both the government and UNDP to its six main programme areas. But it has yet to explore its possible links with local governments on issues of environmental protection. However, it presents a particularly interesting example of the value of UNDP's interventions with such programmes. When it was first transformed from the Environmental Advisory Board into NEAP, it looked mainly at environmental issues such as clean air and water, solid waste management and ecosystem management. UNDP's involvement brought in a focus on policy level restructuring and coordination, and more importantly, on grassroots level community participation. This community-focused restructuring of a government programme is a significant UNDP output.

ANNEX 5: Terms of Reference

SRF: Governance
Sub-Goal: Local Governance
Outcome: Effective legal and policy framework for decentralized authority and management

1. INTRODUCTION:

The Government of Pakistan has launched major reconstruction initiatives including the devolution plan that provides the policy framework for local governance in the country. UNDP is supporting several interventions related to policy, advocacy and implementation of the reconstruction and devolution initiatives through its ongoing and planned projects/programmes across the CCF thematic areas of governance, gender, poverty alleviation and environment. UNDP Governance Programme made a direct contribution to the design of the legal and policy framework for devolution through its support to the National Reconstruction Bureau (NRB), which was assigned the responsibility to design the reconstruction initiatives. UNDP is also supporting implementation of the devolution plan through capacity building system development and community empowerment. UNDP interventions are in all four provinces (less in Sindh) and in NA and AJ&K (FATA in pipeline under Rehabilitation of Refugee Hosting Area). UNDP also leads the donor coordination efforts in governance, which has contributed towards mobilizing donor support for the national reconstruction initiatives. The CO has thus selected to conduct the evaluation of the selected outcome in 2002.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION:

The Outcome Evaluation is a corporate requirement. New guidelines were issued in 2002 and are provided in the "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results". The overall purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is the measurement and assessment of performance in order to more effectively manage the outcomes and outputs known as development results. Traditionally, monitoring and evaluation focused on assessing inputs and implementation processes. Today, the focus is on assessing the contributions of various factors to a given development outcome, with such factors including outputs, partnerships, policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and broking/coordination.

The main objectives of today's results-oriented monitoring and evaluation are to:
- Enhance organizational and development learning;
- Ensure informed decision-making;
- Support substantive accountability and UNDP repositioning;
- Build country capacity in each of these areas, and in monitoring and evaluating functions in general.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION:
- Geographic Area: NWFP, Balochistan and Islamabad
- Relevance of the intended outcome in the context of development and governance issues in Pakistan;
- Contribution and effectiveness of ongoing UNDP projects (*list enclosed*) in achieving the intended Outcome. Identify factors that contributed to or adversely affected the achievement of outcomes;

- UNDP contribution towards intended outcomes through advocacy, partnerships and donor coordination;
- The effectiveness of partnership strategy as reflected in enabling the Government of Pakistan to mobilize broad based support for the design and implementation of the reconstruction initiatives;
- Sustainability and possible impact of the devolution process.

4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION:

Outcome Evaluation Report with findings, recommendations, lessons learned, rating on performance, and best practices. The guidelines in the *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators* should be followed.

5. METHODOLOGY:
- <u>Document Review (desk study)</u>
   Devolution Plan, Local Government Ordinance, Police Ordinance and other related reforms proposals. Strategic Result Framework (SRF), Result Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), Annual Progress Reports (APR), mid-year review of the Country Cooperation Framework (CCF), Common Country Assessment/UN Development Assessment Framework (CCA/UNDAF), respective project documents and reports
- <u>Interviews</u>
   Interviews with stakeholders
- <u>Field Visits</u>
   Peshawar. See schedule
- <u>Participation of Stakeholders and/or Partners</u>
   National counterparts including GOP officials both at the national and sub-national levels, NPDs, governance experts, concerned civil society partners as well as donors.

6. EVALUATION TEAM:

Two consultants, one a Team leader, with strong experience in cross-thematic issues particularly in governance and poverty; experience in design and evaluation of governance-related projects. The team, preferably gender-balanced, would comprise of experts with international and national experience with thorough knowledge of Pakistan.

7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

Deputy Resident Representative (Programme) will supervise the mission, while concerned Unit Chiefs will coordinate visit to projects.

8. CONTRACT:

<u>Contract Period</u>: Jan 6 to Feb 17, 2003
<u>Working Days</u>: 21 (for each Team member i.e. 42 person-days)

9. ACCOUNT CODE:

The Outcome Evaluation cost is to be charged to *National Capacity Building* project (NATCAP; PAK/02/019, BL 17.01)