

# United Nations Development Programme - Pakistan

## Outcome Evaluation 1998-2004

Outcome: *“The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices”*

with specific links to poverty reduction  
and gender mainstreaming.

**Islamabad, May, 2005**

Prepared by:  
Dennis Fenton  
Amara Saeed  
Mohammad Zafarullah Khan  
Chaudhary Laiq Ali

## **Acknowledgements**

The Evaluation Team wishes to acknowledge the support and insights provided by the many stakeholders involved and consulted during the evaluation. Firstly, the Ministry of the Environment and the Economic Affairs Division both provided leadership in terms of initiating the evaluation and supporting its implementation. Secondly, the UNDP Pakistan Country Office provided a very pleasant working atmosphere, strong logistical support and professional guidance. The team was impressed by the commitment and energy of the Country Office. Thirdly, in the many meetings held across the country, the Team was impressed by the availability of stakeholders to contribute to the evaluation and by their overall interest in the evaluation process. Insights provided by the Ministry of Environment, Provincial governments, and the FERTS and MACP project teams proved particularly valuable. Finally, the international team member particularly appreciated the friendliness and hospitality of the Pakistani people.

The Team acknowledges the important but challenging nature of ‘outcome evaluations’ and of ‘results-based-management’ in general in the development sector. The Team acknowledges the great efforts made by UNDP, both globally and in Pakistan, in this regard. The Team hopes that this report, in some small way, can contribute to the overall operationalisation of results-based-management.

## **Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements .....	2
Table of Contents .....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
I Introduction .....	7
Context .....	7
Scope of the Evaluation.....	7
Methodology .....	9
II Progress towards the Outcome .....	10
Integrating environmentally sustainable development into policies and plans.....	10
Integrating environmentally sustainable development into projects .....	11
Integrating environmentally sustainable development into practices .....	11
III Factors affecting the Outcome .....	12
IV UNDP contribution to the Outcome .....	14
General Findings .....	14
The UNDP Approach to the Environment and Energy Sector.....	14
Policy Support .....	16
Demonstration and Piloting.....	17
Upscaling.....	19
Capacity Development and Institutional Strengthening.....	20
UNDP Country Office Capacity .....	21
Implementation Modalities .....	22
VI UNDP Partnership Strategy .....	23
Description of the Strategy .....	23
Achievements .....	23
Recommendations .....	24
VI Poverty Alleviation and Gender .....	25
Poverty Alleviation .....	25
Gender .....	26
VII Monitoring and Evaluation.....	27
VIII Review of Ongoing Country Programme.....	28
IX Millennium Development Goals .....	29
X Summary of Main Findings and Recommendations .....	30
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	33
Annexes .....	34
Annex 1 Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.....	35
Annex 2 Review of Outcomes and Indicators .....	41
Annex 3 Methodology .....	45
Annex 4 List of Documents Reviewed .....	47
Annex 5 List of Interviews held/People met.....	49
Annex 6 Ratings for Outcomes and Outputs .....	52
Annex 7 Issues addressed by the Evaluation Team .....	54

## **BOXES**

1. Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector Projects (FERTS)
2. Small Grants Programme (SGP)
3. Mountain Area Conservation Project (MACP)

## **Executive Summary**

Pakistan faced increasing environmental challenges during the 1990's, including land degradation, air pollution, water pollution, declining water supplies and biodiversity loss. One conservative estimate put the cost of environmental degradation in 1998 at 4.8% of GDP. The poor, especially poor women, are known to bear a disproportionately high amount of the costs of environmental degradation. In response to this growing challenge, the government, civil society and NGOs developed national strategies, developed the national institutional and legal framework and undertook many demonstration activities.

In this context, the UNDP First Country Cooperation Framework (CCF), 1998-2003 established poverty eradication as the over-arching objective for UNDP support in the period. In line with the CCF Framework, UNDP set out to address environmental challenges through the poverty and environment nexus at two levels: the local level by responding to community needs, and more broadly by addressing global environmental concerns in the context of Pakistan.

The period of the CCF has been one of experimentation and transition for the UNDP Country Office (CO), as UNDP Country Offices in all countries have moved to operationalise 'results-based-management'. A key aspect of this is that, for each sector, in each country, the CO determines a small number of coherent national Outcomes, and all UNDP activities and projects in the sector are to support achievement of these Outcomes. UNDP, along with national and development partners, commits itself to achieving the Outcomes within a given timeframe.

In the environment and energy sector in Pakistan, in consultation with UNDP Headquarters, UN agencies and government, the CO devoted a great deal of thought to determining the national Outcomes that it supports related to environment. A single Outcome was selected. The Evaluation Team feels the most appropriate articulation of the Outcome supported by UNDP in the environment and energy sector is '*the principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices*'. This Outcome implicitly encompasses poverty reduction and livelihood improvement, and it accounts for gender mainstreaming.

This report assesses UNDP work in Pakistan during the period 1998-2004 and its contribution to this national Outcome. Within the UNDP CO, support to this Outcome comes particularly from Senior Management, from all the work of the Environment and Energy Unit, from several projects in the Sustainable Livelihoods Unit and from the Small Grants Programme. Specifically, the scope of the Evaluation was to assess:

- Overall progress towards this Outcome in Pakistan in the period 1998-2004;
- The factors external to UNDP affecting this progress;
- The contribution of UNDP to this Outcome during the period;
- The effectiveness of UNDP's partnership strategy in the period.

The Evaluation first considered to what extent environmentally sustainable development has been integrated into policies, plans, projects and practices in all development sectors in Pakistan. The Evaluation finds that overall progress has been impressive with respect to policy and planning. However, with respect to projects and practices, progress is incomplete, and much more should be done to integrate environmental concerns in the coming years.

The Evaluation next identified a series of important external factors affecting progress towards the Outcome. These are all beyond the influence of both the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and UNDP. These factors include political changes, physical insecurity, cultural capacity and the often-fragmented nature of development activities.

The Evaluation then set out to assess UNDP's contribution to the Outcome. UNDP contributes to the Outcome through a series of inter-related strategies:

- Directly supporting policy;
- Demonstrating approaches and practices at the local level;
- Upscaling successful approaches and practices;
- Developing individual and institutional capacity.

Hence, the Evaluation assessed UNDP's success with these strategies as a proxy to assessing UNDP contribution to the Outcome.

Overall, the Evaluation finds that UNDP support made a significant contribution towards the Outcome and, ultimately, to slowing environmental degradation in Pakistan. UNDP projects and activities have been relevant to national needs and priorities, generally well-conceptualised, appropriately innovative and well-timed. In some ways, the UNDP Pakistan Environment and Energy Programme can be considered a model programme – notably on the involvement of NGOs and on the efforts to address livelihood and poverty concerns in environmental projects.

Some of UNDPs contributions have included:

- advocating to the Government of Pakistan on the importance of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). This contributed to the Government's firm embracing of these Goals;
- supporting policy and legislative developments, and strengthening the consultative process to prepare policy;
- demonstrating successful technologies, practices and approaches in both rural and urban areas at many sites in Pakistan. In general these have directly contributed to improving livelihoods, and some have successfully demonstrated gender mainstreaming;
- providing intellectual support across the sector;
- directly supporting the Ministry of Environment and considerably strengthening certain aspects of its performance.

Although most of UNDP's support was through projects, the CO staff also provided other services – including advocacy, resource mobilisation and policy debate. These tireless efforts to non-project activities played a critical role in support of the Outcome.

The Evaluation also identified several areas where future UNDP support to achieving the Outcome could be strengthened, where new opportunities can be exploited and where lessons from past experience can be applied. These include:

- the need for a more strategic approach to demonstration projects. The large number of demonstration projects in Pakistan, the diversity of implementation partners, and the weak capacity of government agencies, mean it is important to carefully consider what is being demonstrated, to who it is being demonstrated, and why. Likewise, more attention should be paid to ensuring there is no duplication or competition between demonstration projects;
- the need to pay more attention to strengthening the national institutional framework, building on previous work to enhance the MoE. This includes developing the horizontal and vertical linkages amongst institutions. At present, governmental institutional capacity is weak, and this endangers the usefulness of demonstration and the sustainability of successes. The weak capacity is perhaps the main barrier to achieving the Outcome;
- the need to further strengthen project implementation arrangements, in order to assure both appropriate ownership and expedient decision-making. In the past, projects have suffered from delays, and from an insufficient engagement of some concerned agencies;
- the need for more systematic efforts to mainstream gender. At the project level, in this sector, efforts to mainstream gender have been limited, and key opportunities have been missed.

The Evaluation then assessed UNDP partnership strategy. Clearly, given the scope of the Outcome, UNDP is unable to achieve it alone. The Outcome can only be achieved through strong partnerships and through the common and shared actions of development partners. At the project level, UNDP has paid considerable attention to building such partnerships, particular in order to mobilise resources and to use a diverse set of implementing agencies. At this level, the UNDP CO has built an impressive and broad range of partnerships.

However, there is an opportunity to develop more complete partnerships at the Outcome level. In the past, UNDP has acted as if the Outcome belonged to UNDP. In the future, development partners should select a common Outcome, and commit to achieving it collectively, with a full sharing of forces, responsibilities and actions. A unique partnership amongst like-minded national and international partners could be established in this sector in Pakistan.

Finally, UNDP's assistance in Pakistan is well aligned to the MDGs, and UNDP has played an effective role in mainstreaming the MDGs into the development process in Pakistan. At the national level, the MDGs can now be considered effectively mainstreamed. However, two specific challenges lie immediately ahead: developing effective capacity to monitor progress towards the MDGs in Pakistan; and raising awareness and understanding of the MDGs with decision-makers and influential people at provincial and lower levels.

This is the second Outcome evaluation undertaken by UNDP Pakistan. The Outcome approach remains relatively new to UNDP globally. The scope of this Evaluation included assessing the transition to the Outcome approach in UNDP Pakistan in this sector. Overall, it is felt that this approach has been adopted. It is guiding and influencing projects and activities in the environment and energy sector in Pakistan. Yet, some challenges remain, notably with regards to the different requirements from partnerships (see above) and with regards to monitoring. The office approach to adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation has not adapted to meet the increased demands of the Outcome approach.

# **I Introduction**

## **Context**

Pakistan faced increasing environmental challenges during the 1990's. These included land degradation, air pollution, water pollution, declining water supplies and biodiversity loss. The environmental impacts on human health and on economic production continued to rise during this period. A conservative estimate put the cost of environmental degradation in 1998 at 4.8% of GDP<sup>1</sup>. Importantly, environmental degradation is known to have a disproportionately high and negative impact on the poor, especially on women. In response to this challenge, during the 1990's, in Pakistan, the government, the civil society and the NGOs developed national strategies, developed the national institutional and legal framework and implemented on-the-ground demonstration activities.

In this context, the First UNDP Country Cooperation Framework (1998-2003) (CCF) established *poverty eradication* as the over-arching objective for UNDP support in the period. This was to be addressed through three programme areas: governance, gender and sustainable livelihoods. This latter programme area focussed primarily on addressing environmental degradation. In this context, the CCF addressed the poverty and environment nexus at two levels. First, at the local level, with interventions that responded to the needs of the community, particularly its disadvantaged members. And, at the global level, with interventions that addressed global environmental concerns in the Pakistani context. The CCF strategy was to address environmental issues from non-core funds. The CCF established a target of mobilising \$20,819,000 to this sector.

The period under evaluation has been a period of experimentation and transition for the UNDP Pakistan Country Office (CO). With guidance from UNDP Headquarters, all UNDP Country Offices have moved to operationalise 'results-based-management' and to make it the driving force for all planning and management. Within this context, in each sector, the UNDP COs identify a small number (often only one) of coherent, national Outcomes that all UNDP projects in the sector will contribute to. Moreover, as appropriate, some projects from other sectors may contribute to the Outcome. Finally, many non-project CO activities (e.g. advocacy, coordination, resource mobilisation – often referred to as 'soft assistance') also contribute to the Outcome. The Outcome is then used as a tool for planning all future UNDP activities.

In this approach, achieving the Outcomes is the over-riding goal of the CO in the sector. The success or failure of individual projects is of secondary importance. It is important to note that, by definition, UNDP cannot achieve Outcomes alone. The Outcomes are national, with national significance, and they can only be achieved through the effective contributions of several partners.

This transition could be characterised as a move from the 'project' approach to the 'outcome' approach. This movement has been accompanied by similar transformations in other UN agencies, and by efforts to further harmonise UN activities at the country level.

## **Scope of the Evaluation**

The UNDP Pakistan CO has now completed its transition to the Outcome approach. In addition, many environment and energy (EE) projects have been under implementation for several years - much experience has been gained and many lessons learnt. The UNDP CO believes this is a good time to consolidate the programme successes, to further strengthen UNDP's external partnerships and to strengthen the UNDP CO internal linkages. To facilitate this, the UNDP CO determined to undertake an independent, forward-looking evaluation of its activities. The evaluation covers the period 1998-2004 – a period corresponding approximately to the CCF.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figure quoted from UNDP Country Programme Action Plan, 2004-2008

UNDP's transition to the Outcome approach was conceived and initiated *during* the period under evaluation. During this period, there was considerable debate regarding the precise Outcomes to which the UNDP CO should contribute. This debate was largely between the CO and UNDP Headquarters (HQ), and amongst the UN agencies represented in Islamabad in the context of the UNDAF process. A number of Outcomes were identified and considered ([Annex 2](#) lists the various outcomes used by the UN and UNDP in the EE sector and associated indicators of success).

The Evaluation Team felt that many of the Outcomes listed in Annex 2 capture the spirit of UNDP assistance during the period being evaluated, and cover the range of projects being implemented by UNDP<sup>2</sup>. However, the Evaluation Team did not feel that any of the formulations for the Outcome in Annex 2 are fully appropriate, nor do they truly represent the range of activities, including projects, supported by UNDP. Hence, the Evaluation team, based on Annex 2, re-formulated the Outcome as "*The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices*".<sup>3</sup> This is the national Outcome to which UNDP support in the EE sector was focussed in the period 1998-2004.

It is noted that:

- This Outcome was defined *after* much of the period being evaluated and so is retro-fitted;
- This Outcome implicitly encompasses poverty reduction and livelihood improvement, and accounts for gender mainstreaming;
- This Outcome addresses both pollution control and the sustainable use of natural resources.

***Outcome: The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices***

With respect to the above Outcome, the Evaluation Team was mandated to assess the following (see ToR in Annex 1 for more details):

- i) Overall progress towards this Outcome, in Pakistan, in the period 1998-2004;
- ii) The factors external to UNDP affecting this progress;
- iii) The contribution of UNDP to this Outcome during the evaluation period;
- iv) The effectiveness of UNDP's partnership strategy in the evaluation period.

Fundamentally, the evaluation attempted to determine 'how effective UNDP support to the environment and energy sector has been'.

As can be seen from Annex 2, it has proven a challenge to identify useful indicators of progress in this sector. In fact, for the useful indicators listed in Annex 2, the Evaluation Team could not easily obtain baseline and up-to-date data. Hence, in order to measure progress towards the Outcome, the Team deconstructed the Outcome and considered progress on integrating environment into *policies* and *plans*, and *projects* and *practices* separately. Based on available information, the Evaluation Team was able to pronounce on whether these elements are being achieved in Pakistan.

Within the UNDP CO, UNDP's contribution to this Outcome comes particularly from the Environment and Energy Unit (EEU), Senior Management, from several projects in the Sustainable Livelihoods Unit (SLU) and from the Small Grants Programme (SGP).

---

<sup>2</sup> See [Annex 1](#) for the complete ToR of this evaluation. The list of UNDP projects covered under this evaluation is attached to these ToR.

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that the Evaluation Team did not modify the substance or the spirit of the Outcome. They only modified its *formulation*. This approach by the Team is in line with the '*Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*', which recognise that some Outcomes may be weakly formulated.



Finally, in initial briefings, the Evaluation Team was informed that the evaluation should be forward looking. A principal aim of the evaluation was to draw lessons from the past in order to improve future service provision by UNDP. Hence, the Evaluation Team focussed on answering ‘how could UNDP be more effective?’ as much as ‘to what extent has UNDP been effective?’ The evaluation provided the UNDP CO, in particular the EEU, with an opportunity to self-reflect and to build on past successes.

## **Methodology**

The evaluation was an independent, external evaluation. However, to the extent possible, the evaluation was participatory, involving not only UNDP staff but also UNDP closest partners. The participatory approach was adopted in order to maximise lesson learning in the UNDP CO, and to ensure the Evaluation Team had full access to information and reasoning.

Following on from the selection of the Evaluation Team, the evaluation included the following steps:

- Determination of the general scope of the evaluation and re-formulation of the ‘Outcome’;
- Consideration of indicators and available data, and ‘deconstruction’ of the Outcome;
- Identification of a comprehensive list of ‘issues’ to be explored during the evaluation. This list (see [Annex 7](#)) guided all subsequent information collection;
- Data and information collection. The principal means of data collection were:
  - Documentation review;
  - Interviews with stakeholders. These semi-structured interviews with a broad cross-section of stakeholders were the main source of data. Interviews were held at federal level, in all provinces and in a limited number of districts;
  - Limited site-visits. A rapid visit to five projects, and a short visit to two projects;
- Reflection, clarification and consensus building amongst the Evaluation Team, to develop a common perception and agreement on the key issues;
- Report writing, in an iterative, consultative manner.

Given that the main task for the Evaluation was to develop an understanding of UNDP’s performance in the EE sector, most questions, interviews and information collection focussed on this.

The Evaluation Team did not undertake a thorough, systematic evaluation of all UNDP’s activities and projects. To do so would have been considerably beyond the scope and resources of the Evaluation. The Team did undertake a thorough review of documentation, met key stakeholders from almost all related UNDP projects, and reviewed the findings of previous independent reviews and evaluation. In most cases, the Team encountered conflicting viewpoints or conflicting evidence. UNDP’s impact has not been uniform across projects. However, through this broad approach, the Team was able to develop a balanced perspective of UNDP’s achievements in the EE sector, and it was able to validate this perspective through follow-up investigations.

The Team recognises that the Evaluation was not equivalent to the comprehensive, systematic evaluations that can be undertaken at project level. However, the Team feels that the findings are equally valid, particularly in terms of being a useful guide to UNDP (and other stakeholders) on how to develop and implement future activities.

The UNDP CO requested the Evaluation Team to provide specific feedback on ongoing projects. The Evaluation Team did this, with the reservation that it did not have the resources to truly evaluate projects, and so any project-specific feedback should be considered very tentative. For these reasons, this project-specific feedback has not been included in this report.

The Evaluation Team recognises that UNDP’s work in the EE sector in Pakistan is comprehensive and complex. The Evaluation Team accepts that there will be specific counter-examples to the general

findings in this report. However, the Team remains firmly of the opinion that this report represents a balanced viewpoint on UNDP's work in this sector in the period being evaluated.

More detailed information on the methodology is provided in [Annex 3](#). The list of documents reviewed and people met are provided in [Annex 4](#) and [Annex 5](#) respectively.

Evaluations of this nature are restrained by a lack of quantifiable measures of success. The Outcome, even after its reformulation, is difficult to measure quantifiably. Measurement was further hindered by the fact that the Outcome was defined *after* the start of the period being evaluated - it had not been possible to collect baseline information prior to the evaluation mission. Finally, it is generally acknowledged that data and information collection in Pakistan is quite weak. For these reasons, a fully quantified analysis of the Outcome would have required resources beyond the scope of the Evaluation Team and would probably not have been very revealing.

The following four sections of this report provide the Evaluation Team findings with respect to the four issues to be assessed (as listed above). The remaining sections provide important other findings with respect to the UNDP EE programme approach and achievements.

## **II Progress towards the Outcome**

The national Outcome is *“the principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices”*. This Chapter considers separately progress on integrating environment into policies and plans, then projects and finally practices.

### **Integrating environmentally sustainable development into policies and plans**

The environmental policy framework in Pakistan has been strengthened significantly during the evaluation period, mostly driven by the Ministry of Environment (MoE). For example, Pakistan has prepared a draft Pakistan Environmental Policy and a draft Forest Policy. These have both been submitted to cabinet for approval. In addition, the MoE has made progress towards preparing the National Sanitation Policy and the National Drinking Water Quality Policy. The recently introduced requirement for annual State of the Environment Reports is another step forward, and the Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency (PEPA) is currently preparing the first of these.

Another indicator of progress is the broad membership of Pakistan's highest-level environmental policy forum - the Pakistan Environmental Protection Council (PEPC). This now has members from civil society - organizations such as IUCN, WWF and LEAD. This is a positive step towards transparency in environmental management.

The policies listed above focus specifically on environment or natural resources. Additionally, Pakistan has also made progress in integrating environmental concerns into non-environmental policy.

A good example of this latter is the “Power Policy 2002”. This policy aims to encourage investment in the power sector. This policy is very well attuned to safeguarding the environment, for example by stressing the importance of renewable energy sources. The plans are to expand energy production from renewable sources from 17 to 880 MW in five years. This policy also addresses poverty issues by stressing the importance of human resource development and the participation of local engineering capacities.

Another good example is the integration of environment into development planning in the “Medium-Term Development Framework, 2005-2010” (MTDF). Whereas previous five-year plans did not address environmental concerns, the MTDF has more than 20 pages devoted to environmental protection. Through the MTDF, the total planned investment in the environmental sector over the next 5 years amount to approximately Rs. 21 billion, which equals 7% of total planned government

spending<sup>4</sup>. Planned allocations to the environment sector have approximately tripled in the previous three years. In addition, previous allocations were mostly on green issues, whereas the present allocation considerably addresses brown issues.

Another mark of progress is the fact that the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) have taken centre stage of the development debate in Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan uses the MDGs as a planning and monitoring tool. Given that environment is a key factor in the MDGs, the MDGs have been a vehicle for ensuring that development in Pakistan takes account of environmental issues. Finally, the importance of addressing environmental concerns is covered in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

To summarise, there is significant evidence to show that Pakistan has taken considerable steps to integrate environment into policies and plans.

### **Integrating environmentally sustainable development into projects**

This section considers to what extent environment has been integrated into large-scale private and public sector projects. Generally, progress has been made, but it is less impressive than progress at the policy and planning level.

The principal mechanism for integrating environmental concerns into projects is the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. The Environmental Protection Act of 1993 established requirements for EIA and the associated Initial Environmental Examination (IEE). Some of the steps taken to operationalise this during the evaluation period were:

- EIA guidelines were developed in 1997 by the PEPA in collaboration with key stakeholders including Provincial EPAs, Federal and Provincial Planning and Development Divisions, other agencies, NGOs, representatives of Chambers of Commerce and Industry, academicians and consultants;
- The consultancy sector developed considerable capacity to undertake EIAs;
- Further to a decision by the Planning Commission, the PC-1 (the initial appraisal document for *all* public sector development projects) format now includes a section covering the likely environmental impacts of a project, and a section for indicating whether an EIA is required;
- The PC-1 is a key appraisal tool for the Planning Commission. If the PC-1 states that an EIA is required, the Planning Commission will assure that one is prepared by a certified agency, and that it is reviewed by the competent EPA;
- In the private sector, it has become mandatory for water and sanitation, irrigation and industrial projects to conduct an EIA and submit it for clearance from the concerned EPAs;
- The roles and responsibilities of the various government departments (Planning and Development, PEPA and provincial EPAs) have been clearly defined.

Despite these steps, the procedures for EIA are not fully operational. Some of the difficulties faced include: the lack of skills and experience to prepare EIA; the weak capacity of EPAs to review EIAs, especially at provincial level; the lack of resources to undertake on-the-ground validation of statements in EIAs, and; the lack of full political support for EIA, notably at provincial levels.

To summarise, great steps have been made to integrate environment into large projects in Pakistan, but more needs doing.

### **Integrating environmentally sustainable development into practices**

---

<sup>4</sup> In the coming fiscal year, the committed amount for environmental projects is Rs. 1.1billion. In 1993, the equivalent figure was Rs. 80 million.

This section reviews progress to integrate environment into all practices across Pakistan, mostly the practices of small and medium enterprises and households, in both rural and urban areas. This progress has been significantly less impressive. The integration of environment into practices is mostly limited to a large number of demonstration projects, many of which were supported by international partners. These cover a broad range of areas such as waste-water treatment, car vehicle emissions reductions, reforestation, localised improvement of waterways and localized protection of biodiversity. The demonstration projects also cover ‘approaches’ to natural resources management, for example empowering communities and introducing innovative savings schemes. Some demonstrations notably strengthen the role of women in natural resources management. Despite being large in number, the aggregate geographical coverage of these demonstrations is limited.

The energy sector provides a rare success story. Since the introduction of lead free petrol in July 2002, all refineries in the country are supplying lead-free petrol and are promoting clean fuels including compressed natural gas (CNG). The Government has also offered numerous incentives to private investors to invest in CNG over the last decade. A result is that Pakistan is now the largest user of CNG in Asia. Currently, more than 500 CNG stations are providing CNG to about 500,000 vehicles all over the country, and this number is increasing everyday. These efforts have significantly helped in lowering pollution levels in many urban centres.

Another promising initiative is the establishment of a system of Environmental Tribunals across the country. Three have been established and two more are being established. These Tribunals have the potential to make an effective contribution to environmental protection. At present, few cases are brought to the Tribunals, and the capacity to assess cases and follow-up is limited.

However, outside of these exceptional examples, most practices across the country continue to use natural resources unsustainably and cause environmental degradation. The environmental monitoring system is limited and does not provide a scientific basis for new programs/projects/enforcing mechanisms. There are very few public-private partnerships.

To summarise this Chapter, Pakistan has made significant progress in achieving the Outcome. However, far more progress has been made at the policy level than at the levels of projects and practices. In general, in Pakistan, the necessary policies to control pollution and manage natural resources have been developed and much of the relevant legislation and regulations and standards are in place. This is a good and necessary beginning but there is a need to go further with implementation, in order to influence projects and practices. Progress is also needed in monitoring and enforcement.

### **III Factors affecting the Outcome**

A series of external factors, beyond the influence of MoE and UNDP, have significantly affected progress towards the Outcome. This Chapter briefly reviews these external factors, indicating how they may have affected the Outcome.

#### **Domestic and international political developments**

In the last 16 years, Pakistan has had six governments. During the period being evaluated, dissatisfaction with the government led the military to take over government. This political instability has made it difficult for essential institutions to operate and has contributed to governance challenges. Capacity to manage natural resources and protect the environment may have been undermined. The military take over in 1999 was followed by a period of international pressure for return to a democratically elected government. This, and other international developments, led to a significant drop in international development assistance until early 2002. This also lessened the capacity to address environmental challenges. Overall, the political stability has surely been a factor hindering progress towards the Outcome.

On the other hand, in the last five years, the government has reinvigorated the process of achieving economic and political equilibrium. The government has been very forward looking and has recognized the need to focus on social issues. For example, the government has completely embraced the MDGs and has harmonized the planning process with the MDGs<sup>5</sup>. The environment for civil society to work in is also becoming more conducive. These developments and the recent relative political stability have probably been positive factors in achieving the Outcome.

Another important factor has been the aftermath of September 11<sup>th</sup>. Although this quickly led to increased international support to Pakistan, including to development assistance, security concerns have caused a constant struggle. After September 11<sup>th</sup> and the attacks on Afghanistan, most bilateral and multilateral development agencies adopted a very low profile due to security concerns. A lot of expatriates departed and many international NGOs and donor agencies almost shut down their operations. This lack of operational ability for international development agencies has probably been a negative factor in achieving the Outcome.

It is important to note the role of UNDP through these challenging years. UNDP has maintained the level of its operations through this instability, despite having to adopt a somewhat lower profile and having to continuously take measures to safeguard the integrity of the program in Pakistan. Throughout this period, UNDP was appreciated as a trusted friend by the Government.

### Devolution

Another major factor has been the devolution process. Pakistan's government launched a campaign for political devolution in 2000 that was aimed at transferring administrative and financial power to local governments. The aim was to strengthen local control and accountability and "empower the impoverished". Under the Devolution of Power Plan announced in August 2000, local governments were to be elected on a non-party basis in phased voting between December 2000 and July 2001. District and sub-district governments have since been installed in 101 districts, including four cities.

Although the devolution reforms are well-conceptualised in principle, in reality there are hurdles and issues that need attention and need smoothening out. An example is the struggle between the federal level and the provinces; and between the provinces and the district governments. Devolution to the local level has not been accompanied by fiscal decentralization and this causes friction.

In the long-term, the devolution process will surely be a positive factor in achieving the Outcome, as more responsibilities for environmental management will be delegated to the stakeholders that actually rely on the same environmental resources. However, in the short term, the unclear transition period, and the lack of capacity in local governments, mean that the devolution process could hinder progress towards the Outcome.

Another factor is the increased operating space for civil society in Pakistan, partly brought on by the devolution process and the government's new focus on social sector development. This is a positive force towards the Outcome. However, for a series of historical reasons, civil society in Pakistan has limited capacity, and this is a factor restricting progress towards the Outcome. This lack of capacity in the civil society is exacerbated by the unreasonable increases in expectations by the public of the civil society.

Cultural factors Another key factor affecting the Outcome is a general resistance to change in Pakistani society. The nation is not very comfortable accepting change. This can be observed in decision-making processes at all levels in government circles. A common reaction is to delay decisions as much as possible and to transfer the responsibility to others. Achieving the Outcome requires change and innovation, hence this cultural resistance to change acts as an obstacle to the

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the MTRF.

Outcome. There is also a very top-down approach, which, over time, has probably contributed to the resistance to change. The top-down approach can be traced back to colonial times; subsequent governance structures have only added to and given legitimacy to these top-down attitudes.

Low awareness and understanding The concept of an integrated approach to sustainable development is relatively new in Pakistan. The concept that environmental development is an integral part of the paradigm of sustainable development is even newer. Until recently, economic development has ignored environmental concerns. Only recently are some decision makers beginning to realize that integrating environmental aspects into development policies, plans and programs is not detrimental to development but is necessary for sustainability. Most micro and macro decision makers still believe that protecting the environment limits profit or restrains development, and this is a strong factor against the Outcome.

Fragmented nature of development assistance Development assistance is a major force for development and change in Pakistan, overall positive. However, the fragmented nature of this assistance is undermining its effectiveness. Numerous NGOs, international NGOs, donor agencies and interested parties are financing and implementing development projects and programs at the grassroots level and advocating for changes at the policy level. Government capacity to manage, monitor, guide, coordinate or benefit from these initiatives is limited. This results in, on occasions, a duplication of efforts, unsynchronised interventions, the repetition of development models (e.g. social mobilization, micro-finance) and individual organisational agendas taking priority. Any government agency attempting to engage the many initiatives can be pulled in many different directions and be over-stretched. Negative effects can include the undermining of government institutions and creating dependency amongst communities and institutions.

## **IV UNDP contribution to the Outcome**

Through a broad, consultative approach, the Evaluation Team developed a well-informed and balanced perspective of UNDP's achievements in the EE sector. The following sections provide details of this in the form of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Each finding or recommendation draws from several interviews, visiting several projects and analysing several documents. In this report, the Team provides examples that illustrate the findings of the Team. These are not intended as evidence, rather they are used to clarify and elaborate the Team's findings in the hope that the CO can better use the findings for future programming work.

### **General Findings**

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that UNDP support to the environment and energy sector in recent years has made a significant contribution to the achieving the Outcome and, ultimately, to slowing environmental degradation in Pakistan. The projects and activities have been relevant to national needs and priorities, generally well-conceptualised, appropriately innovative and well-timed. UNDP is highly appreciated across the sector and is seen as a good friend and trusted partner. This is a reflection of the commitment and drive of the EEU.

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the present Outcome Evaluation is well-timed. The context, partners, challenges and opportunities have changed significantly during the period being evaluated. The UNDP CO can build on its past successes and exploit these new opportunities in order to further improve its contribution to the Outcome. The findings described in the following sections indicate that this will require some strategic shifts in approach and close attention to positioning.

### **The UNDP Approach to the Environment and Energy Sector**

At the outset of the period being evaluated, UNDP assistance was almost entirely channelled through projects. These projects were mostly executed by United Nations agencies and financed by UNDP

core funds. Hence, the UN executing agency and project experts covered substantive and technical issues. The role of the CO was mostly facilitative and administrative. Each project had its own objectives and contributed to a project specific higher goal – to a large extent the projects were independent. This situation has changed significantly during the evaluation period.

First, UNDP has placed an increasing emphasis on national ownership and on supporting national priorities. Almost all projects are now nationally executed (NEX). This has increased ownership by national agencies, local agencies and NGOs. It also facilitated technology transfer (particularly soft technology), and facilitated coordination amongst projects.

Second, UNDP adopted the ‘Outcome approach’ and made significant efforts to move to this approach in the environment and energy sector. At the conceptual level, all projects work together to achieve the single Outcome. However, at the implementation level, progress has been limited, and UNDP support has remained predominantly *project* driven. Mostly, each project has its own objectives and stakeholder group, its own structure and success criteria.

As the number of projects has grown significantly, this has resulted in UNDP contributing to a broad range of issues. The NEAP Support Programme (NEAP-SP) was envisaged, in part, to materialise a coherent, programmatic approach in support of a national action plan. Despite the many achievements of the NEAP-SP, it has not materialised this coherent approach. It has resulted in a series of projects connected administratively, but not substantively.

Thirdly, UNDP has developed its capacity to provide ‘soft assistance’. The CO has increasingly provided support in the form of advocacy, policy debate, coordination and resource mobilisation outside of projects and project activities. UNDP has created a niche and is somewhat of a ‘market leader’. The EEU is reputed for its ‘intellectual support’. Soft assistance has led to many notable successes, for example:

- Mobilising GEF and other resources;
- Supporting policy developments, such as the adoption of the MDG and the integration of environment into the MDTF;
- Strengthening donor interaction and coordination through the Environmental Donors Coordination Group (EDCG).

The Evaluation Team has noted some limitations with the soft assistance:

- It is limited to a great extent to Islamabad, and within Islamabad it is concentrated on the MoE;
- Despite its excellent relations with MoE, UNDP is not sufficiently critical of MoE. UNDP’s unique position of trust and friendship with MoE allow it to be more critical;
- Soft assistance requires specific skills and knowledge. As the substantive scope and volumes demanded have grown, UNDP CO in-house technical resources - in terms of both time and expertise – are increasingly stretched.

#### **Box 1 – Fuel Efficiency in the Road Transport Sector Project (FERTS)**

The project commenced implementation in 1993 and is now coming to an end. After significant start-up problems and delays, it is now considered a success.

##### **Key Successes**

- The project has had many successful ‘governance’ interventions, such as strengthening of the institution of Motor Vehicle Examiner (MVE); installation of weighing stations on national highways; banning of 2-stroke motorcycles/rickshaws; implementation of National Highway

Safety Ordinance 2000, and implementation of ticketing system for traffic violations in major cities.

- The project has built individual capacity of a large number of auto mechanics, private sector entrepreneurs and workshop owners.
- The project has contributed to poverty alleviation directly by generating income and indirectly through new business opportunities as a spin-off from demonstrations and trainings.
- The project has raised awareness about the harmful health impacts of vehicular emissions and the relationship with greenhouse gases.

### **Issues/Challenges**

- The project faced many delays in the initial years.
- Sustainability. It is not clear how initiatives launched by the project can be maintained after the project closes. There is a danger that the implementing agency (Enercon) has not developed institutional capacity from the project, and will not be effective in the follow-up;
- Establishment of Energy Conservation Fund has been a challenge. Although it is now 'established', it is not functioning. There is a danger that, once the project is closed, insufficient technical support will be available to support the Fund. Trainings were offered to the mechanics, and workshop owners through already established training institutions through a cost sharing mechanism that has proved to be a successful association and has significantly contributed towards institutional strengthening and suitability.

### **Recommendations:**

Sustainability should have been considered from a much earlier date. A phase-out and exit strategy should have been developed, to ensure that Enercon was fully capacitated to sustain project initiatives, and start new initiatives. At present, although the project has completed its objectives, there is a fear that this good start will slowly die down with the completion of the project.

The project commenced implementation in 1993 and is now coming to an end. After significant start-up problems and delays, it is now considered a success.

Throughout the period under evaluation, UNDP's strategic role in supporting the Outcome consisted of:

- Directly supporting policy development;
- Demonstrating approaches and technologies;
- Upscaling successful approaches and technologies;
- Capacity building – at both the individual and institutional level.

It is assumed that if UNDP successfully does these four things, it is making a valid, effective contribution to the Outcome.

This approach, and related UNDP achievements are discussed in the following sections.

### **Policy Support**

As we saw in Chapter II, Pakistan has made good progress towards achieving the Outcome at the policy level in the evaluation period. UNDP projects and staff members have contributed considerably to this success, working at both Federal and Provincial level. Some illustrative examples are introduced below:



- The NEAP-SP provided inputs into the draft Environment Policy, draft Sanitation Policy and draft Forestry Policy (all submitted to cabinet);
- The Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP) played a critical role in developing the draft Wildlife Act;
- Projects in the SGP have contributed to debates on policy related to squatter settlements and water standards, and to the establishment of two National Parks in the Northern Areas;
- The Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector project (FERTS – see Box 1) developed several policy papers, and directly contributed to policy initiatives in Punjab Province (motor vehicle inspection and certification and the banning of two-stroke motor vehicles in Lahore);
- Findings from the Lachi Poverty Reduction Project have fed into the draft National Water Policy, currently under preparation by Ministry of Water and Power;
- The NEAP-SP also ensured that a major oil spill was given adequate attention by policy makers, and that there was an appropriate response.

Additionally, UNDP projects have contributed to strengthening the process for policy preparation. The FERTS project utilised a participatory manner to identify important policy issues. It then developed policy papers in a consultative manner, before forwarding to policy makers. The NEAP-SP and MACP also introduced participatory approaches to policy development, which are appreciated by MoE. It remains to be seen if the government will fully adopt these consultative approaches to policy development. Finally, UNDP policy advice is well appreciated. It is not regarded as ‘advice from outside’, but from within.

The UNDP programme has also played a key role in raising the multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEA) on the national agenda, and in supporting their in-country implementation.

The next steps would be to help ensure that policy from non-environmental sectors (e.g. industry, transport, trade, finance) pay more attention to environmental issues. This would involve working more closely with important institutes and agencies in these sectors – either directly or through MoE.

### **Demonstration and Piloting**

At the grassroots level, UNDP has contributed significantly to demonstrating the integration of environment into practices and livelihood development across Pakistan. UNDP has been supporting initiatives in all provinces and in rural, urban and semi-urban areas. This support has been instrumental in supporting innovative initiatives and models and in building capacity of local NGOs. This has led to many localised improvements to practices, and has generated a wealth of information and experience on pathways for local development. To a lesser extent, UNDP have demonstrated sustainable *approaches* to technology dissemination.

Good examples of demonstration include:

- the Kasur Tanneries Waste Treatment project has demonstrated that local enterprises can be persuaded to pay for waste treatment and solid waste collection, under the right circumstances;
- the BioSaline rehabilitation project demonstrated how to motivate communities to rehabilitate land, and how to generate significant uptake by farmers and provincial governments. This project’s success may be due to the dedicated, successful efforts to fully involve all concerned levels of government from the outset;
- the Small Grants Programmes has demonstrated, *inter alia*, energy efficient buildings and technologies and environmentally friendly rural development;
- the Lachi Poverty Reduction Project has demonstrated community organisation and empowerment, and rural credit schemes;
- The FERTS project has demonstrated practices and technologies, and how small-scale private enterprises can contribute to environmental objectives.

In general, UNDP supports approaches and technologies that already exist in Pakistan, and helps demonstrate their usefulness to a broader stakeholder group. However, in some cases, UNDP has been a ‘first-mover’, for example: by supporting the first industrial waste water treatment plant in Pakistan (Kasur project), by developing the first community owned pasture management plan (MACP), and by designing the first targeted environmental funds (FERTS and MACP).

However, it is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that the approach to demonstration suffers several drawbacks. First, the Evaluation Team was struck by the large number of demonstration projects ongoing in rural Pakistan, supported by diverse development partners: national NGOs, local NGOs, government and international partners. This has been the situation for many years. In the short time of the evaluation mission, the Team witnessed development partners working in neighbouring regions, with different local partners, to demonstrate very similar approaches. This was even observed within the UNDP programme, where different UNDP projects are demonstrating very similar things in neighbouring districts, with different partners. There is a significant danger that the large number of demonstration is creating confusion and fragmentation on the ground, especially when combined with weak governmental engagement (see below). The ‘value-added’ of new demonstration activities in such a context has to be questioned. Finally, there is a danger of repeatedly ‘demonstrating the wheel’ or very similar wheels!

Secondly, demonstration, particularly of soft technology (e.g. organisational strengthening) in rural areas can take a long time. The typical project cycle (generally limited to five years) may not be sufficient to ensure success and possibly more time should be given to the demonstration. However, the longer the demonstration, the greater the danger of creating *dependency* in the participants and beneficiaries. In some cases, it seems the participants and beneficiaries in demonstration activities treat the demonstration project as an open-ended process, rather than a project with clear objectives to be achieved, or with specific things to be demonstrated. In all cases, demonstration should be accompanied by clear phase-out and/or exit strategies, and leading to institutional and financial sustainability if appropriate.

Thirdly, many demonstration activities observed by the Team had relatively small funds – particularly, but not only, under the SGP. They address complex and innovative (at least in the project site) issues such as developing markets for medicinal plants, reforestation, or empowering local community organisations. These are not easy subjects to address, and in order to be successful such a demonstration requires high-level, regular technical support. Failure could have a negative effect on both the community’s perception of new technologies and on the environment. The Evaluation Team was not able to confirm if the demonstration project teams have access to sufficient technical support.

Finally, overall the Evaluation Team felt that governmental engagement in the demonstrations was not sufficient. This will limit sustainability and upscaling. For example, although the Federal Government initiated the Kasur Tanneries Waste Treatment Project, reportedly it did not closely observe the implementation of this innovative project. Likewise, the Provincial Government felt little responsibility for the MACP.

The typical *modus operandi* in Pakistan of development partners is to establish a local demonstration project in cooperation with an NGO or a dedicated project implementation unit. The governmental framework is often, at best, a passive observer of these compartmentalised demonstrations – of which there are many. Even if engaged, the governmental framework is unable to absorb and disseminate lessons, let alone monitor, evaluate and learn – due to weak capacity. Further, the many demonstrations can have the effect of pulling government departments in many different directions, and so cause duplication or institutional fragmentation. It is noted that UNDP is probably less guilty than others in this regard, particularly in its more recent initiatives. However, UNDP has a role to play in improving the overall situation, possibly through donor coordination, possibly by empowering government agencies to supervise demonstration projects.

## **Upscaling**

UNDP only aims to play a limited direct role in *upscaling*. For example, through projects, UNDP has directly upscaled the conservancy approach to mountain areas and energy efficient housing. Even after this upscaling, these remain limited in scale.

UNDP can and does play a greater role in facilitating the role other agencies play in upscaling technologies and approaches. For example, UNDP projects have led to a broader upscaling of biosaline technology (by provincial governments and neighbouring farmers) and savings schemes (by NGOs such as Taraquee).

Another important role for the UNDP CO is in resource mobilisation, in order to help government upscale approaches and technologies. During the period being evaluated, the UNDP CO mobilised more than \$21 million to the environmental programme, more than its own ambitious target, mostly from GEF. The NEAP-SP programme played a role in resource mobilisation.

One strategic element of the UNDP supported approach to ‘upscaling’ was the development of targeted environment and development ‘Funds’. UNDP has helped develop Funds for Energy Efficiency, for Mountain Area Conservation and for Valley Conservation. This has been a valid experiment. However, it is noted that success has been limited so far and the Funds face various problems. For example, with regards to the Mountain Area Conservancy Fund, problems include mobilising the initial capital, generating sufficient interest from the capital, and responding in a timely manner to stakeholders needs in order to maintain momentum towards mountain conservancies. The Evaluation Team feels it is unlikely that the Fund will play the role envisaged for it in the Project design.

Overall, based on lessons learnt, it may be possible to strengthen the approach to upscaling. This is dealt with in greater detail in the following section.

### **Box 2 – The Small Grants Programme (SGP)**

The Small Grants Programme started as a pilot in 1993. Since then, UNDP has been implementing small grants financed by GEF, LIFE and more recently the EU Tropical Forest Programmes. Each of these is a global or regional initiative, and each has its specific objectives. Collectively, the SGP is governed by an independent Steering Committee, comprising a well-balanced mix of government and non-government members.

#### **Demonstration Successes and Challenges:**

The GEF SGP has helped many local NGOs/CBOs to not only pilot project ideas at the grassroots level, but also to simply survive. With small and flexible grants, local NGOs like Bint-e-Malakand and Environmental Protection Society, that are working in poor and remote areas, have been able to put innovative ideas into practice, even though at a very small scale. The SGP has been instrumental in recognising the potential of small interventions and helping them flourish, as in the case of community-based trophy hunting in Torghar (Balochistan). Another example of the latter is the design and use of energy efficient stoves in northern Pakistan.

In some cases, the demonstrations have been picked up by other stakeholders and replicated in other areas. However, overall, up-scaling has remained limited. Though there has been a lot of demonstration, efforts to generate synergy or complementarity have been less successful.

#### **Policy impacts and institutional strengthening**

Though the impacts of the SGP funded programmes are visible at the grassroots level, in general there has been little involvement of local government departments. In most cases, the innovative

technologies have not been adopted or owned by relevant government departments; the interventions are undertaken purely through NGOs.

Similarly, there have also been few cases of the innovative field practices being translated into policies, despite the good potential. A good example of this is the SGP funded fuel-efficient housing intervention through the Aga Khan Building and Construction Improvement Programme (BACIP). The efforts have been very creative and led to impressive results, but they have not yet been reflected into policies.

### **Capacity Development and Institutional Strengthening**

The UNDP EE programme has focussed significantly on developing the capacity of individual stakeholders. The programme has directly trained a large number of individuals at all levels, in all sectors. This includes both on-the-job and more formal training. This has been complemented by limited support in the form of equipment to various organisations, although this is not a UNDP priority. Overall, individual capacity built through the UNDP programme has greatly contributed to achieving the Outcome.

Capacity, particularly *institutional* capacity, is needed to operationalise the linkages between demonstration, policy and upscaling. An effective institutional framework can engage with and coordinate across all demonstration projects. An effective institutional framework ensures that demonstration results are fed into policy and plans at provincial and national levels. In turn, effective institutional frameworks are essential for implementing the policy, thereby directly leading to large upscaling. An institutional framework requires effective institutions, a clear and complete distribution of responsibilities across the institutions, and institutions that are able to interact with other institutions, for example pushing their own policies, or influencing the policy and practices of others. The primary institutional framework in Pakistan is governmental, although it is complemented by NGOs and other development partners. At present, the institutional framework related to achieving the Outcome is still weak, and this has been a barrier to achieving the progress.

At the demonstration level, almost all activities supported by UNDP have been implemented with NGOs or dedicated implementation units. Often, the internal targets of the activities are met. However, in most cases, the appropriate range of government agencies were not fully involved, often being involved late or not at all. This lack of engagement has meant that government institutions have not benefited from the demonstration project. It also limits the demonstrative value of the activity. Moreover, in situations of low government capacity, a large number of ongoing demonstration projects in one area can contribute to fragmenting the institutional framework, as individuals and departments work with specific demonstration projects.

At the national level, UNDP has provided a solid and flexible support to MoE, most notably through the NEAP-SP. This direct support and technical assistance have been useful and appreciated. This has directly contributed to raising the status of MoE and its ability to interact in some high arenas. UNDP funds have enabled the MoE to provide a better quality service. The UNDP support has also led to a simplification of some procedures: projects approved through the NEAP-SP follow UNDP rather than standard government PC-1 procedures<sup>6</sup>.

There is a possible reverse side to these successes. By directly supporting MoE activities, and so taking on and replacing MoE on some core tasks, there is a danger that departments and individuals within the MoE are no longer given the opportunity to grow.

---

<sup>6</sup> Such projects are managed under the Project Cycle Operations Manual, government approved procedures used for all UNDP funded or managed projects.

The NEAP-SP was designed to support MoE in the implementation of the NEAP. The NEAP-SP at the federal level has undoubtedly had many successes in directly supporting MoE. It is too early to judge the sustainability of this. Some stakeholders feel the NEAP-SP has to some extent replaced the NEAP, and worry about what will happen after the NEAP-SP ends. Moreover, support under the NEAP-SP should have involved more broad institutional development – across MoE, and with other agencies. The Evaluation Team was presented with little evidence for this happening.

During the Evaluation, federal and provincial agencies cited the need for more institutional strengthening from UNDP. The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that UNDP has made efforts to strengthen institutions and avoid institutional undermining, probably more than many development partners. Despite the obvious achievements, particularly at the Federal level, more should be done in the future. This can only be done in close consultation with other development partners.

The Evaluation Team notes that, over the years, several outside agencies have supported government agencies in their core functions. The long-term effects of this need evaluating. This may result in a ‘hollowing’ out of Ministerial capacity, as over time, the Ministry becomes comfortable with outside agencies performing its core tasks. Many externally supported projects are implemented through dedicated implementation units, which can also be a barrier to institutional strengthening. There is a tendency to develop new administrative units to increase the efficiency of individual initiatives, especially in the environment sector as it is relatively new and changing (e.g. NCS, Ozone). Great care must be taken to ensure that any new units are fully integrated into the administrative structure. Finally, many competent individuals leave the government to work for outside agencies. The Evaluation Team was not able to assess to what extent this is happening in Pakistan. The Evaluation Team did note that UNDP is aware of this danger, and is making efforts to mitigate the risk.

### **UNDP Country Office Capacity**

The Evaluation Team notes that the CO has made significant progress in the transformation from the Project to the Outcome approach. Projects, once under implementation, are no longer managed as an ‘end’ in themselves, but as a *means to a greater end*. Partners, initially seen as either implementers or co-financers, are now accepted in a broader light. However, the full implications of the Outcome approach, with regards to planning, partnership building and monitoring are not fully appreciated at all levels. During the period to be evaluated, the Outcome formulation changed regularly<sup>7</sup>. The Evaluation Team feels that no clear articulation of the Outcome was defined (see Annex 2). This makes it difficult to use the Outcome as a planning tool, and to ensure the predominance of the ‘Outcome’ at all stages in the project management cycle. Partnership building and monitoring are addressed in later Chapters.

The CO established an independent EE Unit in 1997 and was soon directly supervised by an Assistant Resident Representative. The EEU has received substantial training and receives support from other UNDP units – in the CO and also from HQ. All stakeholders consulted by the Evaluation team fully appreciate the commitment and inputs of the UNDP Country Office. The small team in the EE Unit have made a significant contribution to environmental protection in Pakistan. Their support, presence, availability and energy have made a real difference.

The work of the CO in the EE sector has become increasingly ambitious and challenging during the evaluation period. During the period of the evaluation, the environment/energy portfolio has expanded many fold, in technical, programmatic and geographical scope. The intellectual ground covered by the EEU has expanded to cover issues as diverse as social organisation, sustainable energy financing, sustainable land management and institutional strengthening. There is an ever increasing demand to attend meetings, travel to sites, resolve conflicts, guide projects and oversee the details of input mobilisation. In addition, the broad adoption of the NEX modality has increased the demands on the

---

<sup>7</sup> It is noted that this is a result of influences beyond the CO.

EEU. Finally, the UNDP global shift to results based management and the Outcome approach has placed additional demands on the resources of EEU.

In this context, it is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that the EEU is over-stretched. The Evaluation Team saw little evidence that the EEU has the time to develop its substantive capacity or to strategically plan its own evolution. The Evaluation Team considered that, due to the diverse and demanding workload, the EEU is unable to be proactive. As discussed below, adaptive management (notably through monitoring and evaluation) has particularly suffered at both the project and Outcome levels.

### **Implementation Modalities**

The Evaluation Team noted that almost all projects experienced significantly delays in start-up. It appears this is due to a combination of: difficulties of hiring staff; the need to clarify management arrangements, and; complex financial and administrative procedures. It is noted that, once project start, implementation rates improve considerably and most projects run smoothly.

In projects, an important factor has been a high turnover of staff, notably in the government counterparts but also in the project teams. The precise reasons behind this are not clear.

Most stakeholders consulted by the Evaluation Team felt that UNDP projects place too much responsibility and authority in the National Project Director (NPD). This contributes to delays, and leads to problems when the NPD changes in mid-project, a relatively common occurrence.

In general, it has proven challenging to define implementation arrangements that:

- Maintain an appropriate level of engagement and ownership of government agencies;
- Enable expediency in decision-making and financial disbursements;
- Appropriately distribute authority across federal, provincial and lower levels of government;
- Assure a reasonable degree of continuity in project management and project staff;
- Ensure projects do not require regular support from UNDP CO professional staff.

Recent revisions of the PCOM may address some of these concerns. The Evaluation Team notes that these are challenging issues and there are no simple solutions.

#### **Box 3 – Mountain Area Conservancy Project (MACP)**

The project started implementation in 1997 and is scheduled to end by end-2006.

##### **Demonstration successes and challenges**

The project team has worked diligently to implement an impressive diversity and number of activities across large areas of rural Pakistan. The project has created a number of valley organisations, women's organisations, valley conservation plans and specific natural resource management plans – mostly in a truly participatory manner. The project has initiated and supported many on-the-ground improvements that address livelihoods, conservation, or usually both. The likelihood of sustainability is considered higher than in previous similar initiatives – although it is too early to tell. Frustration at the lack of external follow-up financing is growing. Initial challenges included obtaining the acceptance of the local communities. Later challenges have been largely logistical, given the vast, remote area covered. In addition, it is a challenge to constantly provide guidance and technical support to local communities – and this is needed. Finally, local communities tend to see the MACP as an open-ended process; clear exit or phase-out strategies have not been determined or accepted.

##### **Partnership building**

At the local level, partnership building with communities and CBOs has been impressive. Efforts to increasingly engage provincial and national governments have also had success, particularly in the

NWFP, but more has to be done. Apart from GEF, WWF and IUCN (the latter two involved from the outset as implementing agents), no international agencies have become engaged. The appropriateness and design of the Mountain Areas Conservancy Fund (MACF) in ensuring financial sustainability has yet to be proven.

#### Institutional strengthening and policy impacts

The project has contributed to developing national Forestry Policy. Institutional strengthening has not been a focus of the project. Government agencies do not yet feel 'responsible' for the project, and without the full institutional involvement of all concerned government agencies it is challenging to build institutional capacity.

#### Gender

The project has successfully made efforts to engage and empower women communities in remote and conservative areas of Pakistan. Less has been achieved in provincial and national circles. Gender specific activities (e.g. preparation and implementation of VCPs, budgeting, training, role-model building, monitoring) are rare.

## **VI UNDP Partnership Strategy**

### **Description of the Strategy**

The First Country Cooperation Framework (CCF), 1998 – 2003 identifies that 'alliance building' is one of four elements that cut across all programmes. The CCF also identifies an important role for UNDP in coordination of the UN system and more broadly across the donor community. In the sustainable livelihoods sector, it identifies the need for specific local collaborative agreements with other donors, local NGO and CBOs. Hence, the CCF generally identified the importance of partnerships, although it provided few details and no specific strategy. A strategy would clarify objectives and set targets and priorities. It would identify roles of all partners.

A more formal approach to developing partnerships developed during the period under evaluation, with the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and the Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR). Through these, the UNDP CO commits to identifying specific partners for specific projects, and reports back on progress. The CO also reports annually on overall partnerships. For one specific project, the NEAP-SP, the design document included an assessment of stakeholders. It provides a list of partners and potential stakeholders. Hence, there is still no overall strategy, but many of the elements of a strategy are found in various documents.

By the time of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2004-2008, UNDP had formalised an approach to partnerships. The CPAP sets out elements of a strategy, identifies key partners and their roles. This is a commendable partnership strategy. One conceptual weakness is that it tends to put UNDP at the centre of the partnerships, rather than designing a broad and equal front. Also, there is no formalised decision mechanism regarding how much CO resources should be allocated to partnership building - it is one of many tasks CO staff have to undertake. There is no clear system to monitor partnerships. The list of proposed partners is very long, and priorities would have to be set. Finally, there is no specific strategy for EE or for the Outcome.

### **Achievements**

During the period of the evaluation, UNDP has developed an impressive number of partnerships in the environmental sector, at all levels, with all elements of society. The EEU is perceived by all stakeholders as a dynamic and trusted friend.

Most efforts to build partnerships have been at the project level, the list of productive partnerships in the EE sector is very long. Notable examples include:

- Partnerships with small and medium enterprises through the FERTS project;
- Partnerships with local CBOs and communities through the MACP and Small Grants Projects;
- Partnerships with large scale private enterprises, notably Shell Oil and The Premier Gas Co.;
- Partnerships with international NGOs, WWF and IUCN;
- Partnership with the Alternative Energy Development Board on renewable energies;
- Partnerships with Ausaid, DfID, GEF and RNE, largely in the form of co-financing UNDP projects;

A partner at the Outcome level is different than at the project level. At the project level, partners are usually co-financers, government counterparts or beneficiaries. In the Outcome approach, partners are committed development partners, with a shared goal, implementing both separate and shared activities. Partners are more open to debate and criticism. Partners at the Outcome level have a range of diverse interactions, over the long-term. Typically, full Outcome level partners contribute to each others planning, reviews, trouble-shooting and monitoring, at the programme level. Together, partners set out to achieve the common objective or Outcome, rather than following an individual agenda.

At the Outcome level, UNDP's principal partner is the Ministry of Environment (MoE). In the evaluation period, UNDP has developed very strong two-way working relations with MoE. MoE relies on UNDP for technical and intellectual support, and generally UNDP can provide this support. UNDP has access to the MoE at all levels, and is able to advocate and initiate policy debates. This support is further materialised through several projects executed or implemented by MoE.

However, beyond MoE, UNDP has not developed 'Outcome Level' partnerships – either with international partners or national agencies.

In the EE sector, UNDP continue to perceive international donors in a limited fashion as potential co-financers, and too often it perceives large NGOs as potential competitors. The roles of national implementing agencies and local beneficiaries are limited to implementing and receiving, and not that of full partners. More effort could be made to embrace partners, put short-term differences aside and openly discussing common challenges.

UNDP's role in the EDCG is generally well appreciated. Some members would like to see this group re-energised and its terms of reference clarified. Focus could possibly be on harmonisation and policy review, or on using this as a forum for influencing the government agenda.

At the provincial level, the most obvious 'Outcome' partners for UNDP would be the Planning and Development Departments, the Provincial Environmental Protection Agencies, and the provincial forestry and wildlife departments. The Evaluation noted that these partnerships are developing, although with varying intensity across provinces and across departments.

Finally, UNDP also has a role to play in helping its key partners to build strategic partnerships. There have been some notable successes, such as the role UNDP has played in helping MoE to establish relationships with AEDB, Ministry of Health and the Statistics Bureau. More could be done.

## **Recommendations**

Forging partnerships takes time and resources, hence there are costs as well as benefits. With this firmly in mind, UNDP should consider the following:

The perception of Partners being competitors, beneficiaries or fund providers needs to be expanded. A true 'Outcome Level' partnership should be forged. Willing international and national partners could construct this partnership, commit to a shared Outcome, implement individual programmes in the



context of the Outcome, with some shared activities, approaches and monitoring. Government would drive this.

At the national level, UNDP may expand its partnerships with non-environmental governmental agencies (such as those responsible for transport, energy, fisheries, trade). Ultimately, these agencies *have a larger impact on the environment than the environmental agencies*. Alternatively, UNDP can help MoE to establish fruitful partnerships with these agencies.

The unique relationship established with MoE should continue to be nurtured. Within this relationship, UNDP can perhaps provide more constructive criticism of the MoE. Through the NEAP-SP, UNDP has greatly assisted MoE to undertake its core tasks and improve its quality of operations. Care should be taken to avoid the creation of dependency.

At the project level, UNDP (as other donors) has a preference for working through NGO or through dedicated project implementation units, rather than working through existing governmental departments. Care must be taken to stop projects ‘having a life of their own’, this would have negative implications for sustainability. Care must also be taken to avoid any possibility of undermining the existing institutional framework.

## **VI Poverty Alleviation and Gender**

### **Poverty Alleviation**

Pakistan’s goal of achieving sustained economic growth for poverty reduction includes environmental sustainability. The poor are most dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods and most affected by environmental degradation. A key challenge is to work towards sustained poverty reduction through better environmental management. Environmental concerns like water, air, and land pollution, degrading agricultural lands, shrinking forests, diminishing supplies of clean water, dwindling fisheries and the threat of growing social and ecological vulnerability from climatic changes and the loss of biological diversity, have implications for long-term sustainable growth, and are adding to the challenges faced by the poor. Pakistan's population of 145 million is increasing by 3-4 million people per year - one of the fastest growth rates in the world. This rapid growth is adding to the already unprecedented pressure on the country's social fabric and limited natural resources.

At the policy level, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) emphasises the need to achieve the MDGs related to sustainable development and poverty reduction. The PRSP includes strategies to address issues of gender, employment and the nexus of environment with poverty. It is important to highlight the role UNDP played in integrating environment into the PRSP. First, the EDCG voiced its concerns that the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (IPRSP) covered social and economic aspects of development but did not address environmental aspects. Next, UNDP and CIDA (as co-chairs of the EDCG at the time) prepared an analysis of the IPRSP and presented it to the Government, highlighting the importance of integrating environment in the final PRSP. The recommendations and analysis were deliberated by a wide range of stakeholders, and ultimately environmental concerns were addressed in the PRSP. This in itself is a great achievement, and typifies the type of soft-assistance that UNDP aims to provide, generally successfully.

Another success in recent years is the increasing acceptance of the fact that environment, people and poverty are integral parts one paradigm. The concept of “conservation”, especially amongst government circles, now takes into account “community participation” and poverty alleviation. UNDP, together with other agencies, have contributed to this increased awareness and understanding.

Looking specifically at the UNDP Programme, the CCF reinforced the focus of UNDP’s interventions on “poor and disadvantaged people”. The CCF recognized poverty eradication as an over-arching theme; with each component programme directed towards improving the living standards of the

poorest segments of society. Individual and community empowerment is a common thread throughout the CCF. This has been reflected in all the projects and programs designed and implemented with UNDP cooperation. All EE projects, be they for biodiversity conservation, arresting urban pollution or area development, have had a strong poverty alleviation component. This is a good achievement by UNDP Pakistan. Some examples are:

- The FERTS project, that developed businesses and created employment opportunities;
- The Lachi and BioSaline projects, that improved productivity and livelihoods in rural areas for significant numbers of poor people.

## **Gender**

UNDP's focus on gender mainstreaming has been increasing with the increase in the level of involvement of diverse development stakeholders (government, civil society, etc.). The CCF recognised the need to focus especially on developing gender sensitive policies, programs, and projects as the mid-term review of the earlier country program had pointed out that though gender was a cross-cutting theme, it required special focus. In the CCF, the objective related to closing the gender gap in development was stated as:

*UNDP will assist the process of preparing a national programme for the implementation of CEDAW<sup>8</sup> while developing specific interventions intended to make an identifiable difference to the lives of women - particularly poor women - in Pakistan.<sup>9</sup>*

The CPAP further strengthens the gender component of UNDP country program by adopting a strategy of "mainstreaming gender in all areas and ensure that gender is an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all programs and projects<sup>10</sup>".

In order to achieve the objectives set out in the CCF and the CPAP, UNDP has established a separate gender unit (previously a part of the Governance Unit). The focus of the gender unit has been: addressing women's involvement in political processes; capacity building of women at the local level of women's contribution to decision making; mainstreaming gender in the macroeconomic and budgetary process of the government at all levels; and, strengthening the National Commission on Status of Women through action as well as advocacy. UNDP's efforts in this regard have been very visible.

However, UNDP has been less successful at mainstreaming gender, including into UNDP's energy and environment policies, programs and projects. The Evaluation Team feels this has been given less attention. All programmes and projects do recognize "gender" as a cross-cutting theme, particularly at the design stage. However, when it comes to implementation, the issue of gender generally seems to fall through the cracks. The Evaluation Team saw little evidence of gender mainstreaming in most of the projects it observed. There are some exceptional projects, especially in the GEF-SGP portfolio, that have had a specific focus on the involvement of women and men, but there is a need to make this systematic. There is rich expertise available within the UNDP that can be tapped into.

At an institutional level, if a gender-sensitive approach is built into the design of the project or program right at the conception stage, it is usually implemented in the implementation phase. Tools that are useful for ensuring gender mainstreaming in all interventions are establishing gender-disaggregated baseline; gender budgeting; and gender-sensitive monitoring indicators. This has not been seen in any of the programs and projects. In addition, there may be opportunities for innovation and experimentation. For example, each UNDP project could create positive role models for underprivileged women.

---

<sup>8</sup> Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women

<sup>9</sup> Country Cooperation Framework (1998-2003)

<sup>10</sup> Country Program Action Plan (2004-2008)

An attitudinal change is required towards gender issues and the subsequent disparities; such an attitudinal change cannot be brought about without ensuring that these issues are addressed across the board and there are institutional mechanisms in place to ensure the change from within to start with.

The Evaluation Team would strongly recommend a pilot initiative to fully mainstream gender into one project/program from the environment and energy portfolio, from the design stage. This would require hiring experts, identifying outputs and activities and budget to include in the project plan, and developing gender-sensitive monitoring indicators and continued monitoring of the results. UNDP can use the expertise available to develop role models that can play the role of pioneers in addressing gender issues in development policies, programs, projects and practices.

## **VII Monitoring and Evaluation**

The UNDP country program has seen a strategic shift towards results based management. This has been an important move in terms of shifting the emphasis from monitoring activities to monitoring expected results. The SRF and MYFF are two tools to enable performance monitoring of the programme or Outcome. At the project level, projects are mandated to report on their results based matrices. M&E mechanisms can be further assessed at the two levels: project monitoring and programme or outcome monitoring.

At the project level, there are inbuilt mechanisms to monitor delivery and project activities. Monitoring is done by the relevant section in UNDP and by the Tripartite Review – TPR (Ministry of Environment, Economic Affairs Division and UNDP) and/or Project Steering Committees (PSC). The TPR and PSC are designed to review progress, provide overall guidance to the projects, approve annual workplans and budgets and take decisions that may have strategic impacts on project implementation.

Whereas most projects have developed well-entrenched process monitoring mechanisms, *results* monitoring (also known as performance monitoring) is a weak aspect of the overall M&E system. Monitoring, whether at the project level, the UNDP level or overall steering level, has been limited to process monitoring. Even the role of the PSC has become more of micro-management rather than providing overall guidance and conceptual direction to the projects. Whereas there has been a shift from process to performance on paper, this has not yet been fully translated into practice. Annual Progress Reports (APR) are prepared for each project, however these tend to simply list achievements, and are not strong at discussing impact and challenges.

In the past, all UNDP CO undertook independent mid-term reviews or evaluations of all projects above a certain size. This practice has been dropped corporately, but is still prevalent in the EEU. This independent monitoring of projects is essential to support monitoring at the Outcome level.

There has been less emphasis on monitoring at the Outcome level. Clear indicators were never determined for the Outcome, and little data was collected. Not much thought was given to developing mechanisms to monitor the indicators. Reporting on SRF and MYFF has been considered a formal requirement by UNDP New York, and not a mechanism to feed into future planning and decision-making.

Monitoring outcomes and impacts is challenging. Capacity is limited at the international level, let alone in-country. However, UNDP may build its M&E capacities to address results monitoring at the country level. Such in-house expertise can play an instrumental role in capturing, documenting and disseminating the impacts of UNDP interventions. It can also play an important role in building government and civil society capacities to monitor, for example to monitor progress towards the MDGs. For example, the CPAP has rightly identified the need to conduct regular outcome evaluations. The lessons learnt from such evaluations can be built into the development programs of stakeholders.

The concept of ‘adaptive management’ is not yet fully appreciated, neither at the project or outcome level. In adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation are positive, welcome processes that provide information for staff and decision-makers, leading to changes in project and programme design and approach. This approach has not been instilled in the M&E culture across the organization.

## **VIII Review of Ongoing Country Programme<sup>11</sup>**

### **Outcome level**

The ongoing Country Programme firmly places UNDP assistance within the broader framework of UN development assistance (i.e. UNDAF). The overarching objective of all UNDP cooperation is poverty reduction. The overall strategies of UNDP assistance are:

- Institutional capacity-building, and;
- Community development with asset building for the poor.

Within this framework, and in the national context, UNDP has to continue to find an appropriate niche for activities related to environment and sustainable energy use.

As discussed in Annex 2, the outcomes, objectives, indicators, goals have changed several times in recent years, both for the CO and for the EEU. Typically, there has been more than one overall planning matrix for the CO at the same time. This is confusing and undermines the approach to results-based management and makes reporting, at both project and Outcome levels, almost impossible. The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the EEU, in consultation with UNDP senior management, other UNDP units, and national partners, should define an optimal Outcome for the coming five years, and stick to it, and develop clear indicators, and measure them.

The Evaluation Team has formulated the present Outcome as *the principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices*. It is understood that this should contribute to poverty reduction, livelihood improvement and that gender mainstreaming should be a priority. Care should be taken to ensure that meeting short-term poverty objectives does not come at the expense of meeting long environmental (and so poverty) objectives. Within this context, the present portfolio of ongoing and pipeline projects in the environment sector seems overall timely and relevant.

### **Project level**

The Evaluation Team met with several teams from mature projects during the mission. In each case, the project team requested a significant extension to the project. This suggests that exit strategies have not been sufficiently determined or agreed to in the past. This may also be partly a result of the approach to implementing projects through NGOs and dedicated implementation units. First, this can create dependency. Also, the individuals in the implementation unit have an incentive to slow things down and maintain their employment for as long as possible. One approach would be systematically phase out projects or phase the hand-over to government. Most importantly, the development of organisational and financial sustainability should be core to all future projects, and integrated into ongoing ones.

UNDP’s funding is limited. UNDP is unable to finance significant technology transfer, for either demonstration or upscaling. In order to be catalytic and cost-effective, future projects should pay more attention to the following connected issues:

---

<sup>11</sup> UNDP Country Programme for Pakistan (2004 – 2008) and related projects and activities.

- The Government has been very active in developing policies in recent years, and there are many policies in the pipeline. UNDP has played a role in this. However, it is generally recognised that the next important step is to increase capacity to implement policies across the country. Future projects should specifically aim to develop this implementation capacity;
- Institutional strengthening. This is key to development and sustainability of initiatives. Each project should be designed to include institutional framework development. This should also be monitored;
- Gender mainstreaming should be addressed more vigorously;
- For projects with a technology component (soft or hard technology), UNDP assistance should focus on demonstrating *how the technology can be sustainable*. It is not sufficient to demonstrate how the technology is used or the impact it can have. This would include demonstrating how community organisations can achieve organisational and financial sustainability, developing incentives for environmental protection, and developing innovative financing mechanisms (e.g. for pollution control, natural resources management, water conservation and biodiversity conservation).

Environmental protection rests to an important extent on the capacity of tehsil and district level governments. UNDP and other development partners have to address this more directly. However, development partners can only cover a small number of tehsil/districts, and care should be taken to not spread resources too thinly. Driven by the government, and working as true partners, it may be possible for development partners to make a difference across a significant number of districts, and ensure that the findings feed strategically to the national level Outcome.

## **IX Millennium Development Goals**

This Chapter assesses to what extent Pakistan has adopted the MDGs, how this has driven the development process in Pakistan, and the role of UNDP in ensuring the MDGs are adopted.

During the period being evaluated, the Government of Pakistan has embraced the Millennium Development Goals. This is evidenced by the structuring of *The Mid-Term Development Framework, 2005-2010* around the MDGs. In addition, all government reporting has to be in line with the MDGs. This change may be associated to the support of the UN Country Team and notably the UNDP CO, as they have been very active in advocating the MDGs.

The adoption of the MDGs as a primary planning and reporting framework in Pakistan has meant that the MDG goals and related targets have been placed firmly on the national agenda. This has given national prominence to poverty reduction, gender mainstreaming and to environmental protection. Once again, through its role in advocating the MDGs, UNDP takes some credit for this.

Finally, UNDP has played a direct role in building capacity to report on progress towards MDGs in Pakistan. This has improved reporting capacity and further raised awareness on the MDGs.

At the project level, all environmentally related projects can be considered to contribute to the MDGs. As discussed in the previous section, each project has made a direct contribution to poverty reduction, thereby contributing directly to goal no. 1. All the projects are designed to contribute to environmental improvement and so should contribute to Goal no. 7, and Target 9 in particular.

Overall, UNDP's assistance is well aligned to the MDGs, and UNDP has played an effective role in mainstreaming the MDGs into the development process in Pakistan. At the national level, the MDGs can be considered effectively mainstreamed. However, apart from the overall challenge of meeting the MDGs, two specific challenges lie immediately ahead:

- Developing effective capacity to monitor progress towards the MDGs in Pakistan;
- Raising awareness and understanding of the MDGs with decision-makers and influential people at provincial and lower levels.

## **X Summary of Main Findings and Recommendations**

1. UNDP has made a significant contribution to the achieving the Outcome and, ultimately, to slowing environmental degradation in Pakistan. Projects and activities have been relevant to national needs and priorities, generally well-conceptualised, appropriately innovative and well-timed. UNDP's contribution is highly appreciated across the sector. The commitment and drive of the EEU has been a key factor. In some ways this can be considered a 'model' UNDP programme. The Evaluation Team's formal ratings for the Outcome and UNDP Outputs are provided in [Annex 6](#).

***Recommendation*** UNDP, in close consultation with key partners, fully consider all the findings and recommendations of this Evaluation and identify a follow-up strategy.

2. UNDP CO has largely made the transformation to the 'Outcome' approach in the EE sector. However, more work need to be done with regards to: determining a clearer articulation of the Outcome; the systematic use of the Outcome for planning activities; monitoring the Outcome; and developing a small number of Outcome level partnerships.

***Recommendation*** Working closely with key development partners, define and agree to a shared Outcome and determine true partnership roles (see also Recommendation no. 10).

3. During the period being evaluated, soft assistance has become an important and integral component of EEU activities, and this assistance is having an impact. However, soft assistance by the CO is not strategically planned or monitored, and the necessary resources to provide soft assistance are underestimated. Impacts are limited mostly to Islamabad.

***Recommendation*** More CO resources could be allocated to 'soft assistance'. The *impacts* of soft assistance should be planned and monitored. UNDP EEU could be more active and accessible at provincial level.

4. UNDP support has contributed significantly to developing the policy and legislative agenda in the environment and natural resources sector.

***Recommendation*** Continue to an appropriate extent, working closely with other development partners. Try to focus more on integrating environment into non-environmental legislation and policy (e.g. industry, transport, fisheries and trade).

5. UNDP support has contributed to demonstrating many approaches and technologies across Pakistan. However, especially in rural areas, the high number of demonstration projects is confusing. The time and technical expertise required to successfully demonstrate may be underestimated.

***Recommendations*** Demonstration should remain a key component of UNDP support in the sector. However, in each project, demonstrations should be strategically designed: considering the *what, why, who* and *how of demonstrating*. Where possible, previous and existing demonstration activities can be used as a basis for policy advice and upscaling. Fragmentation and confusion at the local level must be avoided. Demonstration should be of 'sustainable approaches' – not technology.

6. UNDP support has contributed to some extent to upscaling, mostly by influencing government programmes, NGO programmes and international donor programmes, and also through UNDP's own

programme. However, limited institutional capacity in Pakistan is a constraint to upscaling (see Recommendation no. 7). The use of specialised ‘funds’ as a mechanism for upscaling has not yet been effective.

*Recommendation* Review the design and use of Funds and consider a broad range of alternatives.

7. UNDP has built considerable individual capacity. Although to some extent the capacity of MoE grew during the period being evaluated, overall governmental capacity in this sector remains very weak. This is a major constraint to sustainability, to upscaling successes and to achieving the Outcome.

*Recommendations*. Work closely with international partners on all related aspects. Involve all concerned government agencies from the outset of UNDP supported activities. Ensure all projects have a component on institutional strengthening. Consider, together with partners, supporting a project that uniquely addresses institutional strengthening across the EE sector – horizontally and vertically. Monitor projects to ensure there is no danger of creating dependency or undermining governmental frameworks.

8. The EEU is, to some extent, a victim of its own success: as its portfolio has grown, so as its workload. The workload also increased with the transition to NEX and due to the regular revision of the UNDP programming frameworks. EEU resources – time and technical - are now over-stretched.

*Recommendations* Ideally, the UNDP CO should hire an additional professional staff member. Otherwise, the UNDP CO should focus its activities either regionally or technically or, both.

9. Most Projects faced considerable delays in initial stages. Once underway, implementation is smoother, although progress can be delayed by staff changes or by micro-management from Project Steering Committee members. The thorough financial management arrangements have been a good model for government agencies.

*Recommendation*. Establish implementation arrangements that: maintain an appropriate engagement and ownership by government agencies; enable expediency in decision-making and financial disbursements; appropriately distribute authority across federal, provincial and lower levels of government; assure a reasonable degree of continuity in project management and project staff; do not require large, regular support from UNDP CO professional staff.

10. The approach to partnerships has improved considerably. The CO and EEU have developed many partners, from all elements of society, particularly at the project level. This is a commendable achievement. An excellent partnership with MoE has been established at the Outcome level. The EDCG provides a good foundation for developing partners. However, beyond MoE, a full strategy for partners to achieve the Outcome has not been operationalised. More needs to be done to build full Outcome level partnerships

*Recommendations* Continue the excellent work with partners at the project level. Develop true ‘outcome level’ partnerships: long term commitments, to a common national Outcome, with effective monitoring and shared trouble-shooting mechanisms – both for the Outcome and for the partnerships. There is an opportunity for UNDP Pakistan to break new ground here.

With MoE, consider being more critical. Provide assistance to MoE in its partnership building. Given that future success in the environmental arena will require interaction and influence over line agencies,

provincial and district governments, consider involving these more prominently in the partnership strategy. Future projects should centrally involve these agencies, from the outset.

11. The present portfolio of ongoing and pipeline projects in the environment sector seems well-designed, timely and relevant.

Recommendations Focus future support on capacity to *implement* policy, on institutional strengthening, and on demonstrating sustainability (notably organisational and financial). Ensure all projects have clear, determined exit strategies and are mainstreaming gender issues. Consider focussing and directing more support to a small number of tehsil/districts, with a clear demonstrative value. With full agreement of all key stakeholders, an external review of the NEAP-SP should be held, in order to re-energise and possibly restructure this initiative. Likewise, the MACP may benefit from a review to ensure the final years are strategically optimal.

12. Largely due to external reasons, adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation remain a weak link at project and Outcome levels.

Recommendation Further strengthen the CO in-house culture of monitoring and evaluation and adaptive management. Develop a single M&E framework, and devote appropriate resources in terms of time and expertise to monitoring. This should include gender sensitive monitoring.

13. The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the environment and energy programme has been very successful in building and strengthening the poverty alleviation-environmental protection nexus through all its interventions. This has been exemplary. Almost all projects have resulted in direct improvement in the livelihoods of poor people

14. Gender mainstreaming is one of the priorities of the UNDP Pakistan programme. Partly as a result of this, gender issues have taken a more prominent position on the national agenda, including in environmental circles. However, operationalising this inside the EE programme has proven a challenge at all levels. Gender mainstreaming in EE projects has been sporadic and limited.

Recommendation Capacity to deliver gender mainstreaming should be built. As an initial move, one project from the portfolio should be fully gender mainstreamed. This requires hiring expertise to determine a package of activities and outputs that should be incorporated into the project activity plan and budget. Experimentation and innovation is encouraged. Some gender related activities (e.g. budgeting) should become standard for all projects

15. The Government of Pakistan has embraced the MDG approach and the individual MDGs. UNDP and other UN agencies take credit for this. This has raised environment, poverty and gender on the national agenda. Likewise, all the projects reviewed are contributing to meeting the MDGs.

Recommendation Building on the national level successes, awareness raising with regards to the MDGs should be undertaken at the provincial and lower levels. Support could also be given to monitoring progress towards MDGs.



## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AUSAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CCF	UNDP First Country Cooperation Framework
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CO	UNDP Country Office
CPAP	(UNDP) Country Programme Action Plan
DfID	UK Department for International Development
EDCG	Environmental Donors Coordination Group
EE	Environment and energy sector
EEU	Environment and Energy Unit of the UNDP Pakistan CO
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FERTS	Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector project
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
HQ	Headquarters (of UNDP)
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
IPRSP	Interim PRSP
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
MACP	Mountain Areas Conservancy Project
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEA	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MTDF	Mid-Term Development Framework
MYFF	Multi Year Funding Framework
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NEAP-SP	NEAP Support Programme
NEX	Nationally executed (UNDP execution modality)
NPD	National Project Director
NWFP	North West Frontier Province
PEPA	Pakistan Environment Protection Agency
PEPC	Pakistan Environment Protection Council
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
SLU	Sustainable Livelihoods Unit of the UNDP Pakistan CO
TPR	Tri-Partite Review
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
WWF	The Worldwide Fund for Nature

## **Annexes**

## Annex 1      Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

**Multi Year Funding Framework (MYFF) GOAL:**      Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development

**Outcome:**      A comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development integrated in national development planning and linked to poverty reduction

### **1. BACKGROUND:**

Traditionally, monitoring and evaluation focused on assessing inputs and implementation processes. Today, the focus is on assessing the contributions of various external and internal factors to a given development outcome, such as outputs, partnerships, policy advice, advocacy and coordination, in a national context where capacity, ownership and policy environment is at various levels.

The growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realisation that producing good “deliverables” is simply not enough. The question of how best to enhance the impact of development assistance has become more pressing than ever. Being a key international development agency, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been increasing its focus on achievement of results. Nowadays, results-based management - RBM - has become UNDP’s management philosophy.

As part of its efforts in enhancing RBM, UNDP has shifted from a traditional project monitoring and evaluation to a results-oriented one, especially outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and strategies intended to bring about a certain outcome. Such an evaluation assesses how and why outcomes are or are not being achieved in a given country context, and the role UNDP has played. It may also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative), recommend actions to improve performance in future programming, and generate lessons learned.

Outcome evaluations are conducted with a futuristic or forward looking approach and mainly provides the basis for:

- Enhance organizational and development learning;
- Ensure informed decision-making;
- Support substantive accountability and UNDP repositioning;
- Build country capacity in the above three areas, and in monitoring and evaluating functions in general.

### **2. NATIONAL CONTEXT:**

Pakistan faces major environmental challenges caused by population pressure, transition from subsistence to market based economy, and changes in lifestyle both in rural and urban settlements. Land degradation is rampant due to drought, floods, salinization, seawater intrusion as well as deforestation, biodiversity loss, monocropping, groundwater depletion and urbanisation. The environmental impact on the human health is on the rise as most of the reported cases are linked to the exposure to contaminated water, overuse of pesticides, over dependence on fossil fuel, and toxic waste from industries, hospitals and households. Poor people living in marginal lands and squatter populations are particularly vulnerable. Poor women are disproportionately burdened by the degrading environment, having to carry water and fuel wood from long distances, and being responsible for cooking food and caring for the children and the sick, while they are often victim to ill health themselves and less apt to seek help.

After the Pakistan Environmental Protection Ordinance came into force in 1983, many institutional, policy and regulatory developments have taken place at the federal and provincial levels. These include, among others, creation of the Ministry of Environment and Environmental Protection Agencies, promulgation of Pakistan Environmental Protection Act in 1997 and adoption of the National Environmental Quality Standards (NEQS). In 1992, the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy was developed, which was subject to the mid-term review in 1999. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) has highlighted environment as one of the cross-cutting areas that has direct bearing on the rising trend in poverty in Pakistan. The draft National Report on the Millennium Development Goals has adopted national level set of indicators to monitor the progress towards the targets of MDG 7 on environment sustainability.

Addressing the environmental issues linked with poverty needs coherent response and, as such, the Government of Pakistan approved the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) in 2001. NEAP aims to initiate actions and programmes for achieving the state of the environment that safeguards public health, promotes sustainable livelihoods and enhances quality of life of the people of Pakistan. Its focus is to take immediate measures to achieve a visible improvement in the rapidly deteriorating environmental conditions through effective coordination between the government agencies and civil society. NEAP role to develop poverty-environment nexus can be instrumental as the government embarks on interventions that help implement the Poverty Reduction Strategy.

In addition, in the context of the adoption of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as long-term targets for development, as agreed globally, efforts are made to review and adapt the national targets to comply with the MDGs required trends. Similarly, efforts are made to reflect the MDGs in other sectoral strategies such as the recently adopted Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

## **2. ROLE OF UNDP**

The future programmes of the Government of Pakistan as well as of various UN agencies are specifically directed towards the NEAP objective. UNDP being the lead UN agency working in the field of environment has taken the initiative to assist in the implementation of the NEAP under a support programme called the NEAP – Support Programme (NEAP-SP). NEAP-SP now forms the national environmental action agenda and the basis for most of the future environmental actions in the country. The challenge, however, remains in terms of building partnerships across the organisations and individuals to implement NEAP effectively and arrest fast deteriorating environmental conditions of the country.

UNDP-supported programmes focus, in an integrated way, on different aspects of the environment that includes: natural resources management; improvement of living conditions in the urban centres; multi-level capacity building for decision-making; mainstreaming environment into the development process; and information dissemination and advocacy. Launching of National Environmental Action Plan Support Programme (NEAP-SP) in collaboration with the Government of Pakistan is an example of this integrated approach to tackle the issues of environmental protection along with concerns for poverty alleviation.

Additional projects are under way in response to the Country's status as signatory to various global environmental conventions and substantive resources are being mobilised from global funds such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF). UNDP is providing strategic support and policy advice to the Ministry of Environment towards the implementation of the Convention for Combating Desertification (CCD) Through its interventions, UNDP is also providing support to the Government by assisting them in meeting other international commitments. These interventions encompass sector and sub-sector policy reviews and formulation exercises, such as the policy study on the phase out of Ozone Depleting Substances under the Montreal Protocol project. In order to meet the Government's commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in-situ measures are being implemented in fragile and threatened eco-systems of the country by mobilizing resources from global mechanisms such as GEF, partner donors and the private sector etc. In augmenting the capacity of the

GoP to meet its commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), UNDP CO is actively involved for the stabilization of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere with its Fuel Efficiency in the Road Transport Sector and Wind Energy projects. UNDP anticipates the development and support of a broad portfolio of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) projects, including Enabling Activities, Full, Medium-Sized and Small Grants projects to assist in meeting its obligations under the Stockholm Convention on POPs.

### **3. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION:**

The broader objective of the evaluation would be to look at all initiatives contributing to the environmental supporting assistance in the country, as these initiatives have various impacts to the outcome. The evaluation will also focus on soft-assistance efforts with regard to the outcome.

In this context, by taking into account the up-to-date achievements and challenges of UNDP-Pakistan programmes, the evaluation will review: (a) internally: the relevance and impact of environmental projects, environmental components found within other programmes or MDG supported activities, as well as the set of elaborated environmental indicators and the challenges posed by the MDGs; (b) externally: the national settings on institutional arrangements, policy environment, national capacities and ownership as well as the donors environmental assistance framework, which has an influence in achieving the outcome.

Specifically, the outcome evaluation is expected to address the following issues:

#### Outcome analysis

- Whether the outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement;
- An analysis of the underlying factors beyond UNDP's control that influence the outcome;
- What has been the role of UNDP soft-assistance activities in helping achieve the outcome?
- With the current and planned interventions under the Country Programme 2004-08 in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, will UNDP be able to achieve the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed?
- How can the MDGs framework be suited to help achieving the outcome?
- What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome?

#### Output analysis

- Whether UNDP's outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome, including the key outputs, programmes, and projects that contributed to the outcome;
- Are the UNDP outputs still relevant to the outcome?
- How can links be established between outputs and MDGs requirements?
- Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs?

#### Partnership analysis

- Whether UNDP's partnership building has been appropriate and effective.

In summary, the evaluation should be a forward-looking exercise with following scope of work:

- Geographic Area: National
- Relevance of the intended outcome in the context of development and environmental 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 environmental initiatives, particularly, NEAP;
- Further developing the environmental portfolios in the country context
- Sustainability and synergy with other outcomes.

#### 4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION:

A comprehensive evaluation report, with an executive summary, highlighting the evaluation methodology, key findings, lessons learned, rating on performance, best practices and recommendations would be the final product of evaluation. The contents of the report should emerge from the corporate *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators* and would essentially cover the following:

- Executive summary
  - Introduction
  - Description of the evaluation methodology
  - An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
  - Key findings, in the context of mainstreaming the MDGs and the need for integrating and strategizing the environmental assistance
  - Conclusions and recommendations
    - An action item list to build an appropriate niche for UNDP interventions in the country.
    - Strategies for continuing UNDP assistance towards the outcome;
    - A rating on progress towards outcomes and progress towards outputs;
    - A rating on the relevance of the outcome.
  - The assessment should also review the relevance of the outcome and recommend appropriate modifications.
- Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

#### 5. METHODOLOGY:

- Document Review (desk study)  
 GOP's National Environmental Action Plan; Pakistan Environmental Protection Act; Mid-year Review Report of National Conservation Strategy; Country Assessment Report for WSSD; Programme Document of NEAP-SP; Draft MDGs Report; Strategic Result Framework (SRF); Result Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) 2002; Annual Progress Reports (APR), UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP); Common Country Assessment/UN Development Assessment Framework (CCA/UNDAF); respective project documents and reports
- Discussions with the Senior Management and Programme Staff of UNDP-Pakistan
- Interviews  
 Interviews with stakeholders in the key Government Agencies, Civil Society Organisations, Academic Institutions, Private Sector and independent development practitioners.
- Field Visits  
 Gilgit, Peshawar, Lahore, Quetta, Karachi and Islamabad based projects
- Participation of Stakeholders and/or Partners  
 National counterparts including GOP officials both at the national and sub-national levels, NPDs, environment activists, concerned civil society partners, UN country team representatives as well as partner donors.

## 6. EVALUATION TEAM:

Three consultants: Team leader (international) and two national experts, with expertise in cross-thematic issues particularly in environment, poverty, governance and crisis prevention & recovery; experience in design and evaluation of environment-related projects. The team should have good understanding of the national context and cognizant of the results-based-management approach. All the team members would be independent, with no connection in the design, formulation or implementation of UNDP outcomes, programmes or projects.

Areas of expertise to be considered in the team composition include the following:

- Technical knowledge and experience in UNDP's thematic areas;
- Knowledge of the national situation and context;
- Results-based management expertise;
- Capacity building expertise;

The international consultant should have an advanced university degree and at least five years of work experience in the field of sustainable environment, sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation). The international consultant will take the overall responsibility for the quality of the evaluation report (including finalization of the evaluation report in English).

Specifically, the international consultant (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report within the specified timeframe of evaluation.

The national consultants will perform the following tasks, as per the shared work defined by the Team Leader:

- Review documents;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above); and
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report.

## 7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

Deputy Resident Representative (Programme) will supervise the mission, while concerned Unit Chiefs will coordinate visits to the projects and meeting with concerned stakeholders. Programme Resources Management Unit would be assisted by the Environment Unit to provided necessary support to the evaluation mission.

## 8. CONTRACT:

Contract Period: November/December 2004  
Working Days: 27 (for each Team member i.e. 81 person-days)

## 9. ACCOUNT CODE:

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

## 10. PROPOSED ITINERARY:

The mission will assemble in UNDP, Islamabad office, where it will be briefed about the tasks to be performed. The duration of the mission is 25 - working days. Before departure, the Mission Leader will finalize the report in the light of comments/suggestions and submit to the UNDP Resident Representative for necessary follow-up actions.

Date	Meeting
Day 1	Briefing with UNDP Resident Representative/DRR (D) Briefing meeting and discussion with Environment Unit Staff; discussion with UNDP/GEF task Manager(s)
Days 2-4	Meeting with: Economic Affairs Division (EAD), Ministry of Environment (MoE), Planning and Development Division; National Project Directors (NPD), Programme Directors, National Project Managers (NPM) and Regional Project Managers
Day 5	Travel to Lahore Meeting with Government Officials in Lahore
Days 6-8	Visit to Kasur Project, Bio saline Projects, FERTS Center Staff, WWF-Pakistan
Days 9-10	Travel to Quetta Meeting with SUSG-CA, Area Development Programme, FERTS Center Staff
Days 11-12	Meetings with Government of Sindh, IUCN, NIO, FERTS.
Days 13-15	Travel to Peshawar- Meeting with MACP Partners and Field visit of MACP Conservancy in Swat
Days 16-18	Return to Islamabad meeting with Donors Partners
Days 19-22	Report writing/Follow up meeting in Islamabad
Day 23	Presentation of Draft Report to UNDP
Day 24	Revise Report
Day 25	Final Report Presentation to UNDP

## 11. LIST OF PROJECTS TO BE ASSESSED DURING EVALUATION

Area Development Programme Balochistan  
Balochistan Species Habitat Project  
Bio-Saline Project  
Drought Relief Assistance Project  
Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector  
GEF/Small Grants Programme  
Institutional Strengthening Project - MP Phase II  
Kasur Tanneries Pollution Control Project  
Lachi Poverty Reduction Project  
Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment  
Mountain Areas Conservancy Project  
National Environmental Action Plan - Support Programme  
Pakistan Wetlands  
POPS - Enabling Activities



## Annex 2      Review of Outcomes and Indicators

This Annex reviews possible formulations of the Outcome supported by UNDP during the evaluation period. It reviews related objectives identified by key government, UN and UNDP in policy documents.

The Outcome initially provided in the Evaluation ToR is: ‘A comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development integrated in national development planning and linked to poverty reduction’

It is noted that an Outcomes should ideally ‘represent a development change’, it should ‘require the help of partners, and preferably it should be fully achievable in the SRF/CP period. Examples are; ‘jobs created’, ‘increased trade, and ‘legislation passed’.

### 1. The “NEAP Objective”

The NEAP identifies ‘initiate actions and programmes for achieving a state of the environment that safeguards public health, promotes sustainable livelihoods and enhances quality of life of the people of Pakistan’ as an objective.

The NEAP deconstructs this into clean air, clean water, solid waste, ecosystems and other areas. Indicators are not provided at the objective level, only for the component project objectives.

This formulation relies on ‘initiate’, which the Team felt to be too weak.

### 2. UNDAF

UNDAF identifies ‘improving living conditions through environmental management for sustainable development’

Indicators are:

- Policy guidelines, regulatory framework and technical standards developed;
- Environmental accounting integrated in national plans;
- Financial resources mobilised in support of National Agenda on Environment and Sustainable Development with the goal of poverty reduction;
- Knowledge, attitude and practices (water and sanitation) of communities in targeted programme areas improved;
- Improvement in environmental conditions and access with reference to safe water, forest cover, biodiversity and renewable energy;

The team felt that this formulation did not capture UNDPs attention to policy. The Team did feel that the indicators were good.

UNDP also identified ‘improved water and natural resources management and utilisation’.

Indicators are:

- Number of trainings
- Inputs delivered in areas of water, soil conservation and social forestry and environmental issues
- Introduction of improved techniques (water, irrigation, )
- Number of effective, functioning water uses associations and community managed tube wells;

- Enhanced community involvement (in water management, etc)

Again, the Team felt this was rather limited, and did not capture UNDP upstream work. The indicators are at quite a low level and concentrate on water, and not so useful.

### 3. MDG:

Under Goal no. 7 (Ensure environmental sustainability) one Target is ‘Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes, and reverse the loss of environmental resources’.

Indicators are:

- Forest cover
- Area protected
- GDP/energy consumed
- Vehicles using CNG
- Sulphur content in diesel.

The Target was quite good, although there is a need to go further than ‘policies and programmes’, and influence ‘practices’. The Team’s final Outcome was very close to this one

The indicators are being monitored in Pakistan. During the Evaluation Period, 4 of the indicators showed improvement, whereas for 1 there was no data. This would suggest that progress is being made on environmental protection in Pakistan, whereas it is generally accepted that things are getting worse. Hence, these may not be good indicators.

### 4. PRSP

No suitable outcome formulation was identified in the PRSP.

### 5. UNDP Country Programme, 2004-2008.

The CP uses the two Outcomes from UNDAF. In addition, the CP establishes the following *Strategic area of Support*: ‘national capacity for participation in global conventions, regulatory regimes and funding mechanisms for environmentally sustainable development’

Additional indicators include:

- Environmental issues integrated in ten year plan and PRSP;
- Zero increase in CO2 and NOX emissions
- Forest cover increase.

National capacity is not suitable as an Outcome.

### 6. Draft Environmental Policy

This also provides a possible framework for UNDP actions. The overall aim is to improve the quality of life of people through protection, improvement of environment and effective cooperation amongst government, civil society, private sector and others.

The stated Objectives are:

- Secure a clean and healthy environment.
- Attain economic development with regard to protecting the resource base and environment;

- Ensure effective management of the country's environment through active stakeholder participation

The Evaluation Team considered the third of these would be an Outcome for UNDO to support.

The Policy is deconstructed into sectoral and cross-sectoral issues. Each one could have indicators, each could be a focus for UNDP within the Outcome.

Also, the Policy includes several policy implementation instruments (e.g integration of environment into development planning – which is remarkably similar to our given outcome), each may be an area for UNDP support.

The Policy lists a series of targets, many of which are taken from the Pakistan MDG report. These are almost indicators.

7. Strategic Results Framework (SRF), 2000 – 2003 (note, this should be the definitive document for planning and monitoring/evaluation in the given period).

Prepared during 1999, the third goal is 'to protect and regenerate the global environment and natural resources asset base for sustainable human development'.

Three sub-goals are to be supported (Note the 'sub-goal' is something to be achieved by UNDP, and so should not be suitable as an Outcome):

- 'Promote integration of sound environmental management with national development policies and programmes'. This has 1 Strategic area of Support, with one 'outcome' (note different definition) and several indicators;
- 'Protect and regenerate the environment and promote access to natural resource assets on which poor people depend'. This has 2 Strategic areas of Support, each with one or more 'Outcomes' (again different definition) and several indicators;
- 'Promote equity and burden-sharing in international cooperation to protect and enhance the global and regional environment'. This has 3 Strategic areas of Support, each with one or more 'outcomes' (different definition) and several indicators;

This framework was revised a couple of times, and by December 2001 the environment related Goal became:

Goal: Environmentally sustainable development to reduce human poverty.

Sub-goals:

- Sustainable environmental management and energy development to improve the livelihoods and security of the poor. This has three strategic areas of support. This later became synonymous with outcome: a comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development in national development planning and linked to poverty reduction.
- Regional and global instruments for environmentally sustainable development that benefit the poor, with two strategic areas of support. Later became synonymous with outcome: improved national capacity to negotiate and implement global environmental commitments.

## 8. Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF)

This has 1 goal (energy and environment for sustainable development) and 1 associated intended outcome: 'A comprehensive approach integrating environmentally sustainable development, global

environmental concerns and commitments in national development planning, with emphasis on poverty reduction and quality gender analysis’.

There are 6 ‘service lines’, some are divided into 2 or more components. There is an annual target for each intended ‘outcome’ for each of these components. Reporting is pretty extensive.

Annual ‘targets’ are defined, but not multi-year targets.

This formulation is approximately the Outcome given in the initial ToR.

### Conclusion

Clearly, all these planning documents and formulations are confusing, and it is not clear which the UNDP CO EEU is to follow.

The Evaluation Team combined the wording of the MDG, CP and MYFF to determine the formulation:

“The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices” with specific links to poverty reduction and gender mainstreaming.”

The team noted the importance of the words:

- ‘country’ as opposed to ‘national’ to emphasis that impact should be felt across the country, not just at national institutions;
- ‘practices’ to emphasise that it is not sufficient to change policies and plans, practices must change.

## Annex 3      Methodology

The aim of the evaluation is to collect information and to develop understanding regarding:

- Progress towards the Outcome UNDP has been aiming to achieve in the period 1998-2004;
- Factors affecting the Outcome;
- UNDP's contribution to the Outcome, through Projects (Outputs) and through soft assistance;
- The effectiveness of UNDP's partnership strategy with respect to achieving the Outcome.

Prior to the fielding of the Evaluation Team, the Evaluation Team leader prepared preparatory notes outlining the steps to be taken by the Team Members and the UNDP CO Staff, and outlining a general agenda for the evaluation. However, it was not possible to recruit the team members prior to the fielding of the Team Leader.

The first step in the Evaluation was an Evaluation Team building exercise, consisting of:

- Identification and selection of team members. Final team consisted of 1 full time team leader, 2 full time national experts, and one part-time national expert;
- Review of international documentation related to Outcome evaluations;
- Review of key Pakistan related documentation;
- Discussion of key concepts and application to Pakistan.

The second step was to plan the evaluation, including:

- Identifying people to be interviewed;
- Identifying documents to be reviewed;
- Defining the Outcome, and related indicators;
- Developing a comprehensive list of issues to be studied and questions to be answered. This list was developed specifically in order to clarify the linkages between UNDP work and the Outcome.
- Defining the methodology;
- Clarifying logistical arrangements, and;
- Allocating roles to individual team members.

The third step was a mini 'participatory evaluation' exercise. In this, the evaluation team facilitated a comprehensive brainstorming of concerned UNDP professional staff and 'professional friends' in order to determine the perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with regards to the Outcome. The aim of this participatory exercise was to ensure that the final report adequately reflects UNDP's understandings and concerns.

The fourth step, and the most important and time-consuming step, was the information collection stage. Information was collected through three complementary mechanisms:

- Review of related UNDP and Pakistan documentation;
- Open-ended interviews with a range of stakeholders across the country<sup>12</sup>;
- Site visits and observation of impact of UNDP supported activities. The project made rapid visits to the following projects;
  - Area Development Programme Balochistan
  - Kasur Tannery Waste Management Agency

---

<sup>12</sup> In addition to Islamabad, team members travelled to Karachi, Quetta, Lahore, Kasur, Peshawar and Swat.

- National Environmental Action Plan – Support Programme (NEAP-SP)
- Lachi Poverty Reduction Project (LPRP)
- Small Grants Programme (two grantees, Bintah-e-Malakand and Environmental protection Services) were visited.

The project made lengthier visits (say total of 2 days) to the following projects:

- Mountain Areas Conservation Project (MACP)
- Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector (FERTS) Project

- To the extent possible, identification of indicators, and determination of progress of the indicators from official statistics;

The list of issues prepared under the second Step above guided this step. At all times, the evaluation team had to balance quantitative and qualitative information. Hence the evaluation is based on a balance of ‘hard facts’ and informed opinions.

The fifth step was a reflection by Evaluation Team Members and the preparation of a short document outlining the main findings and recommendations of the Team. This document was reviewed with UNDP EEU, and consideration given to their feedback. These consultations were held parallel to the preparation of the first draft Evaluation Report. The Table of Contents for the final report was also cleared with UNDP EEU at that stage.

Through the process, the Team consistently developed hypotheses regarding the objectives of the Evaluation, and continuously probed the stakeholders in order to test the hypotheses. Where appropriate, these hypotheses developed into the main findings of the Evaluation Team.

Final consultations included a review of major findings with an inter-disciplinary team at UNDP.

Finally, during to time constraints, it was not possible to review the draft evaluation findings with stakeholders outside of the UNDP during the mission of the international team member.

The complete draft Evaluation Report was submitted to EEU on the final Friday of the mission.

The comments of UNDP CO, UNDP HQ and other stakeholders were prepared over a period of several weeks. The Evaluation Team Leader took the responsibility for addressing these comments, in a consultative manner.

## Annex 4 List of Documents Reviewed

### UNDP Project Related Documents

1. All Annual Progress Reports of Projects listed in the Terms of Reference, including:
  - Kasur Tannery Control Project, 2001
  - Area Development Programme Balochistan, 2004
  - FERTS, 2004
  - Lachi Poverty Reduction Project, 2004 (Draft)
  - MACP, 2004
2. All available UNDP Project Design documents, including:
  - NEAP Support Programme
  - FERTS
  - Mountain Areas Conservancy Project
  - Kasur Tanneries Project
  - Biosaline Project
  - Wetlands Project
  - Species Protection Project
3. Terminal Report: Drought - 2000 Relief Assistance Project
4. Brochure on Kasur Tannery Pollution Control Project
5. UNDP, *Brief for MD ENERCON/NPD FERTS*
6. FERTS Project, *Strengthening the Institution of Motor Vehicle Examiner in Pakistan*, UNDP/ENERCON, FERTS Project, December 2004
7. Project Brief on Pakistan Community Development Project for Rehabilitation of Saline and Water Logged Land (PAK/97/024)
8. Water Quality Monitoring of Hudiara Drain --- A two year project funded by UNDP under GEF Small Grants Programme, November 2001, Environmental Pollution Unit, World Wide Fund for Nature – Pakistan
9. *POWER OF PARTNERSHIP: Working within the System and Living within the Means -- Celebrating 10 Years of UNDP – GEF Small Grants Programme in Pakistan*, IUCN, UNDO, GEF/SGP.

### UNDP Documents

1. Available MYFF, SRF and ROAR reports for UNDP Pakistan
2. Klap, Andre J, et al, (2003), *Increasing Livelihood Opportunities in Affected Communities*, Outcome Evaluation Report, UNDP Timor.
3. UNDP Pakistan (2004), *Country Programme Action Plan for Pakistan – 2004-2008*
4. UNDP Evaluation Office, *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*
5. UNDP Headquarters, RBM in UNDP – Knowing the What and the How

6. UNDP Pakistan, *Country Cooperation Framework 1998 – 2003*
7. UNDP Pakistan, *Country Programme Action Plan 2004-2008t*
8. UN Pakistan, *United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2004-2008*
9. Siddiqui, Tasneem Ahmed (Editor), *Development Issues Innovations and Successes*, 2004
10. GEF/UNDP Pakistan, *GREEN PIONEERS: Stories from the Grass Root*, Karachi 2002
11. CRC, A Handbook of “Appropriate Building Design For Southern Punjab” June 2004
12. UNDP Evaluation Office, *VIETNAM Country Evaluation*,

### Other Documents

1. Government of Pakistan, *National Environmental Action Plan*
2. Government of Pakistan, *Pakistan Environmental Protection Act*
3. Power of Partnership: Working within the System and Living the Means
4. Addendum for Country Programme Strategy for GEF/SGP Pakistan (2004-2009)
5. Waseem, Dr. Mohammad and Mohmand, Shandana Khan (2002); *Outcome Evaluation 2002: Decentralisation Policies*, UNDP Pakistan
6. Government of Pakistan, *Pakistan Millennium Development Report 2004*
7. Hanson, Arthur J. et al, *Pakistan’s National Conservation Strategy: Renewing Commitment to Action*, November 2000
8. Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan, *Draft Mid-Term Development Framework 2005-2010*
9. Khan Marium, COMSATS, and Inayatullah, Dr. C, UNDP, *Poverty Environment Nexus in Pakistan*, April 2004
10. Presentation and Brochure from TOYOTA SOTHERN MOTORS on ENERCON Tune-up Center, Karachi
11. International Water Logging and Salinity Research Institute, *Publication No. 214: Proceedings of the Launching Ceremony for the Project --- Pakistan Community Development Project for Rehabilitation of Saline and Water Logged Land by Pakistan Water and Power Development Authority*, May 1999.
12. Brochure of National Institute of Oceanography --- A brief Introduction
13. Proceedings of the International Conference on Pollution Control in Tanning Industry of Pakistan Lahore, June 11-13, 2002, KTWMA/UNDP
14. IWASRI, Australian Agency for International Development (AAID) and UNDP, *Performance Indicators for the Pakistan Community Development Project for Rehabilitation of Saline and Water Logged Land*, The proceedings of a Collaborative Workshop October 7-8, 1998, IWASRI, Lahore.
15. Brochure from Aga Khan Planning and Building Service, Pakistan
16. Zaidi, Akbar S, *Can the Public Sector Deliver? An Examination of the Work of the Sindh Katchi Abbadis Authority*
17. Malik, Dr. Mumtaz and Nawaz, Rab, *The Pakistan Galliformes Project, Status of Pheasants in Hazara*,
18. Zaidi, S Akbar, Government of Sindh, *Task Force for Municipal Services, Setting Directions for Good Governance*, February 2005
19. Consumer Rights Commission of Pakistan (CRCP), *Sustainable Energy Consumption and Environment Protection*
20. IUCN Presentation on Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP) Implementation Period: (July 1999 – June 2006)



## Annex 5 List of Interviews held/People met

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title/Organization</b>
<b>UNDP/Pakistan</b>		
1.	Onder Yucer	Resident Representative, UNDP – Pakistan
2.	Haoliang Xu	Deputy Representative, UNDP – Pakistan
3.	Arif Alauddin	ARR / Chief, Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP
4.	Abdul Qadir Rafiq	Programme Officer, Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP
5.	Naima Saeed	Young Professional Officer, Ener. & Envir. Unit, UNDP
6.	Fayyaz Baqir	National Coordinator, LIFE/GEF – SGP
7.	S. Nadeem Hussain Bukhari	Programme Monitoring Officer, LIFE/GEF – SGP
8.	Faiza Effendi	Assistant Resident Representative / Chief, Gender Unit
9.	Naoko Takasu	Programme Officer, SL Unit – UNDP
<b>Federal Government</b>		
10.	Farah Ayub Tarin	Deputy Secretary – UN, EAD, GOP, Islamabad
11.	Javed Hassan Aly	Secretary, Ministry of Environment, GOP, Islamabad
12.	Ms. Rukhsana Jabbar Memon	Additional Secretary/NPD, NEAP-SP, MoE, Islamabad
13.	Dr. Amjad Virk	IG Forest, MoE, Islamabad
14.	Abdul Hameed	JS/MoE, MD/ENERCON, MoE, GOP, Islamabad
15.	Asif Shuja Khan	DG, Pak-EPA, MoE, GOP, Islamabad
16.	Air Marshal (R) Shahid Hamid	Chairman, AEDB, GOP, PM, Secretariat, Islamabad
17.	Brig.(R) Dr. Nasim A. Khan	Secretary, AEDB, GOP, PM, Secretariat, Islamabad
18.	K.M. Zubair	Chief ENERCON, MoE, GOP, Islamabad
19.	Dr. M.M. Rabbani	DG, NIO, MoS&T, GOP, Karachi
20.	Dr. S.H. Niaz Rizvi	Principal Scientific Officer, NIO, MoS&T, GOP, Karachi
21.	Abdul Qayyum	Chief Environment, Planning Commission, Islamabad
22.	Dr. Aurangzeb	EA Specialist, Planning Commission, Islamabad
<b>Government of Punjab</b>		
23.	Mr. Hashim Tarin	DCO, Government of Punjab, Kasur
<b>Government of Sindh</b>		
24.	Ghulam Sarwar Khero	ACS (Development), Government of Sindh, Karachi
25.	Fazal A. Nizamani	PD Sindh Rural Dev. Project, LG&SD Dept. GOS, Kar.
26.	Ghulam Mustafa Abro	Sr. Chief S.T. & Poverty Alleviation /NPD,NUPAP, GOS
27.	Iqbal Nafees Khan	DG-EPA, Government of Sindh, Karachi
28.	Irfanullah Tunio	Dy. Director-EPA, Government of Sindh, Karachi
29.	Mirza Mujtaba Baig	Assistant Director-EPA, Government of Sindh, Karachi
<b>Government of Balochistan</b>		
30.	Maj. (R) Nadir Ali	ACS (Development), GOB, Quetta
31.	Shabir Baloch	Chief (Environment), P&D, GOB, Quetta
	Mr. Muhammad Saleem	Secretary, Forest Wildlife Department
<b>Government of NWFP</b>		
32.	Syed Manzoor Ali Shah	Secretary Planning and Development, NWFP

Sr. No.	Name	Title/Organization
33.	Tahir Laeeq	Senior Research Officer, PFI, Govt. of NWFP, Peshawar
34.	Dr. M. Bashir Khan	Director-EPA, Govt. of NWFP, Peshawar
35.	Khalid Mumtaz Khan	Research Officer, Foreign Research Sec., P&D, NWFP
36.	Sultan Mehmood Khattak	Additional Secretary, Environment, NWFP
37.	Dr. Muhammad Mumtaz Malik	Conservator Wildlife, Govt. of NWFP, Peshawar

Donor Agencies		
38.	Niels Veenis	First Secretary Dev. Coop. Royal Netherlands Emb, Isld.
39.	Yasmin Jawed Khan	Senior Programme Officer, RNE, Islamabad
40.	Denis Bugnard	Country Co-Director, SDC, Embassy of Switzerland, Isld.
41.	Michael David Dale	Counsellor, Head of Operations, European Union, Isld.
42.	Imran Ashraf	Agronomist/Dev. Advisor, EU, Islamabad

International NGOs		
43.	Faisal Farooq Khan	Head, Programme Development, WWF – Pakistan, Isld.
44.	Abdul Latif Rao	Country Representative – IUCN, Karachi
45.	S.M. Saleem Chishti	Head Balochistan Programme – IUCN, Quetta
46.	Dr. Abdul Majeed	Head Water Programme – IUCN, Quetta

NGOs		
47.	Mehboob Ahmed Bajwa	Manager HRD, Traqqi Foundation, Quetta
48.	Fatima Bibi	Chief Coordinator, Bintah-e-Malakand, NWFP
49.	Rehana Bibi	Project Coordinator, Bintah-e-Malakand, NWFP
50.	Fauzia Bibi	Co-partner, Bintah-e-Malakand, NWFP
51.	Ak Barazeb	Exec. Dir, Env. Prot. Services, Mingora, NWFP
52.	Ifti Kharali	Programme Manager, CARE Programme

UNDP Projects		
Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector (FERTS) Project		
53.	Col. Naeem Bari Salaeemi	Manager (Diesel), UNDP/ENERCON, FERTS Project
54.	Col. Nasim	Manager (Sp. Stud.), UNDP/ENERCON, FERTS Project
55.	Col. Kalil	Manager (Petrol), UNDP/ENERCON, FERTS Project
56.	Shahrukh Paracha	Project Administrator UNDP/ENERCON, FERTS Project

Area Development Programme Balochistan		
57.	Syed Ghulam Muhammad	Eco-System Specialist, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta
58.	Dr. Taj Muhammad Hassni	Livestock Specialist, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta
59.	Aijaz Hussain	Water Sector Specilaist, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta
60.	Salam Asif	GIS Specialist, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta
61.	Muhammd Shakil	IPM Specialist, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta
62.	Ahmed Jan	Finance and Admin. Officer, ADBP, UNDP, Quetta

Kasur Tannery Waste Management Agency		
63.	Salman Akhtar Khan	Field Sites Coordinator, Kasur - Pakistan

National Environmental Action Plan – Support Programme (NEAP-SP)		
64.	Irfan Saeed Alrai	Programme Manager NEAP-SP, Pollution Control, Isld.
65.	Mr. Javed	Programme Manager NEAP-SP, POPs, Isld

Sr. No.	Name	Title/Organization
66.	Dr. Murtaza Malik	Programme Manager NEAP-SP, Policy, Isld
67.	Mr. Khalid	Programme Manager NEAP-SP, , Isld
<b>Bio-Saline Project</b>		
69.	Dr. Muhammad Nawaz Bhutta	Director General (IWASRI), Lahore
70	Anwar-Ul-Haq	Field Sites Coordinator, IWASRI, Lahore
<b>Building and Construction Improvement Programme (BACIP)</b>		
71.	Mr. Asif Merchant	Chief Executive, Aga Khan Planning and Building Services, Karachi - Pakistan
72.	Syed Fakhar Ahmed	National Programme Manager – BACIP Aga Khan Planning and Building Services, Karachi
<b>Lachi Poverty Reduction Project (LPRP)</b>		
73.	Muhammad Azam Khan	Project Manager, LPRP, Peshawar
74-75	And two project staff	
<b>Mountain Areas Conservation Project (MACP)</b>		
76.	Iqmail Hussain Shah	Regional Programme Manager, NWFP
77.	Abful Ghafoor	Biodiversity Specialist, NWFP
78.	Altaf Hussain	Environmental Education Coordinator, NWFP
79.	Kaleem ur Rehman	Rural Sociologist, NWFP
80.	Amjad Ali Khan	Environmental Education Officer, NWFP
81.	Faiq Ali	Conservation Planner, NWFP
82.	Ms. Amber	Ex-Conservation Planner, NWFP
83.	Asim Jamal	Social Organiser, NWFP
83 to 118	35 - stakeholders	Members of VCC and CMC, Kalum Sub-Conservancy, NWFP
119 to 136	18 - stakeholders	Members of the Women's Group in Shahiabaad Village, Godar, Kalam Sub-Conservancy, NWFP
<b>Private Sector</b>		
137.	Mr. Fadoo	CEO, Toyota Southern Motors, Karachi
138.	Mr. Ali Fadoo	Director, Toyota Southern Motors, Karachi
139.	Mr. Munawar Qureshi	Director, Toyota Southern Motors, Karachi
140	Mr. Shabbir Hussain	Director, Toyota Southern Motors, Karachi
<b>Out-Come Evaluation Team</b>		
141.	Dennis Fenton	Team Leader
142.	Zafarullah Khan	Team Member
143.	Ch. Laiq Ali	Team Member
144.	Amara Saeed	Team Member

## Annex 6     Ratings for Outcomes and Outputs

1. Outcome Rating. *The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices*

Overall, has there been?:

- Positive change;
- Negative change;
- No change;

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that there has been significant positive change..

2. Sustainability rating. Is progress towards the Outcome?:

- Sustainable
- Unsustainable
- Too soon to tell

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that it is too soon to tell.

Whereas advances have been, and progress so far is good, it is too early to say if they are sustainable, particularly when considering the many external factors influencing the Outcome.

3. Relevance rating. Is the Outcome?:

- Relevant to the country's development situation and needs;
- Somewhat relevant to the situation/needs;
- Not relevant

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the Outcome is very relevant

4. Output Ratings: In general, have the UNDP Projects we've looked at:

- Achieved their targets
- Partially (i.e. 2/3 or more) achieved their targets
- Not achieved their targets

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the Outputs are partially achieved.

Some projects have made more progress than others, but all are at least 2/3 on track. The Evaluation Team notes that it was unable to analyse the projects in great depth.

5. Cost-effectiveness rating: has progress towards Outcome been cost-effective, with specific reference to UNDP contribution?:

- Yes
- Somewhat (if so, how could it have been better)
- No

The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the progress, and UNDP's contribution, seem to be cost-effective.

The Team takes note that the Outcome addresses difficult geographical and technical issues. Cost-effectiveness is noted for the EEU soft assistance and for working with grass-roots communities. The Evaluation Team notes that it was unable to analyse this issue in any detail.

## Annex 7 Issues addressed by the Evaluation Team

The following questions and issues were used as an informal guide by the Evaluation Team, to guide all interviews and research into documents. They were not used systematically or as a questionnaire.

Stakeholder groups, to be surveyed, interviewed: UNDP (U); Project Staff (P); Senior Government decision makers (envt, non-envt) (GD); Government technical levels (envt, non-envt) (GT); Local government (LG); NGO; International partners (I); Private sector (PS).

Outcome to be evaluated, “The principles of environmentally sustainable development integrated into country policies, plans, programmes, projects and practices”

### Basics

U: What period should our evaluation cover?

U, G: what are your expectations from this evaluation?

U: which of the four bullet points should be our priority for evaluation? And, if it's the 3<sup>rd</sup> (UNDP contribution), focus on projects or on soft-assistance. (Remember, our evaluation is forward looking, and should look at those areas where actionable recommendations for change can be made – partnerships and soft assistance!) and see my additional ‘bullet points’. And ‘awareness raising of this approach’ is also an objective.

U: Explain in general terms the MYFF, how it was constructed, and describe the ‘Results Based Management approach of UNDP’;

((U, G: describe the ongoing next UNDP Country Programme, – how is it constructed?, and how does it relate to UNDAF and MYFF?))

### Definition of the Outcome Definition, and Progress towards the Outcome

All: is the NCS the overall guiding document in this sector?

What is the Outcome that UNDP has supported over evaluation period?

U, GD, I: Is supporting the NEAP equivalent to supporting the Outcome?

Is the Outcome nationally driven and/or nationally owned?

I: how important is this ‘Outcome’?

All: is the Outcome relevant (optimally)?

All: has the Outcome been achieved?

All: what factors influence the Outcome?

U, GD, I: If MDG indicators (for environment) show overall positive trend, why is it generally acknowledged that environment is declining?

### UNDP Strategic positioning and partnerships

U, P, GT, I: is there a niche, a comparative advantage for UNDP? What is it?

U: how is UNDP positioned? Is this strategic or random?

U, GD: should UNDP be setting the agenda, or picking up things already on the national agenda and promoting/modifying?

I: how do you see the role of UNDP in Pakistan? How could this be strengthened?

I: how do you perceive UNDP's reform in-country?

All: Is UNDP consulting with partners and is there coordination?; are common activities taking place?; is information being shared?; are joint activities related to the Outcome being prepared?

U, GT, P: why is more not achieved?

Why are partnerships important? Who should be the partners?

U: how do you deal with the fact that some partners (eg donors, GEF) may not agree with the Outcome?.

U: was there 'resistance' from partners? Which? Why? Follow-up with each partner.

U, GD, I: If UNDP is mobilising resources (to UNDP), how does this relate to the Partnership strategy in support of a *national* Outcome?

### **UNDP overall contribution to Outcome**

All: Is UNDP having a 'development impact', as opposed to delivering deliverables?

All: what has been UNDP's contribution to achieving the Outcome?

U: CP (para 5) states that significant results were achieved during CCF 1998-2003. Where is the data to back this up?

U, P, GT: has there been unintended impacts, positive or negative, inside the 'Outcome'?

U: is it clear how projects, soft inputs, and work of partners link together to achieve the Outcome? Do you have a handle over this?

U, GT: how are pilot and demonstration projects used. What is balance between pilot/demonstration and 'upstream' projects? How are links made between the two? Is there a demonstration and/or replication (uptaking) strategy?

U: what does it mean to have poverty alleviation the core objective in EE actions?

P: describe your project's contribution to the 'Outcome'.

U: EE support to other areas: poverty alleviation, governance (local, IS, participation), gender, ICT and knowledge

### **UNDP approach and coordination**

U: what is difference between 'Outcome/results based management' and 'project management'?

U, I: Are the following nexus sufficiently understood and exploited: E – health; E – poverty; E – local governance?

U: What is common thread to UNDP work (it covers green issues, brown, awareness raising, legislation, demonstration, GEF, MP – seems pretty diverse)?

U: collaboration and coordination across UNDP ‘units’? how is it effected, is it working, are you satisfied?

U: is the portfolio focussed and coherent? Is it prioritised?

U: is there time to focus on policy advice, technical support?

U: overall funding levels, sources of funds?

### **Programming and monitoring**

U, G: how is programming undertaken? How is planning for ‘soft assistance’ undertaken?

U: how did the office log-frame evolve?

U: where did two focus areas of CP (i.e. instit. Cap bldg and comm. Deve) come from? In fact, the aims/approaches of the EE are distributed broadly across these two focus areas?

U, I: describe the UNDAF exercise, and how has it influenced programme and project management?

U: what is relationship to MDG, how much does this *drive* programme management?

U; describe project and programme monitoring

U, P: how has Outcome progress been monitored? What are the findings of this monitoring?

U; how were the indicators in the CP, SRF, MYFF, UNDAF developed? Which are being monitored, and how?

GT, U: how does the government monitor its actions to improve the environment?.

U, I: MDG report present new framework for environmental improvement, consisting of: strategies; focus; measures; ways; governance strengthening and; priorities for development assistance. How/can this be used as a guidance framework?

### **Soft assistance**

U, P, GD: Soft assistance, policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and coordination, through projects, RR, regional support. How do you go about this? How is it going, how is it measured? Especially with U – what is their strategy on this, are they satisfied? Is there a planning paper for soft assistance (as there is for *each* project!)? How much time is spent on this? Probe different groups in U; what are the hard results?

U: let’s see all the policy dialogue/advocacy products

P: how has ‘soft assistance’ supported your project implementation?

### **Projects/Outputs**

P, GT: does UNDP provide technical support in connection with projects?

P: how relevant is your project (to outcome, to country)?



P: has management been adaptive?

P: how have changes in UNDP structure affected project evolution?

P: how has UNDP's 'partnership strategy' affected project evolution?

P: how is project decision-making and project implementation arrangements? How is national ownership of project? Is project contributing directly to national and/or governmental initiatives?

P: if there has been considerable effort and success at the project level, there should be results at the outcome level.

### **Organisation and administration**

U: how are the administrative and implementation arrangements

P, GT: how flexible and appropriate are the UNDP implementation arrangements?

- Insert gender related questions and issues at all points.