



**Executive Board of the  
United Nations Development  
Programme, the United Nations  
Population Fund and the  
United Nations Office for  
Project Services**

Distr.: General  
28 November 2012

Original: English

---

**First regular session 2013**

28 January to 1 February 2013, New York

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**Evaluation**

**Management response to the evaluation of UNDP support to  
conflict-affected countries in the context of United Nations  
peace operations**

**Context and background**

1. In accordance with the current strategic plan (2008-2013), UNDP supports national processes to accelerate the progress of human development with a view to eradicating poverty through development, equitable and sustained economic growth, and capacity development. Violent conflict slows down progress in human development and reverses development gains and achievements. For many conflict-affected countries, the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals is an unreachable target.
2. As highlighted in paragraphs 7 and 12 of the report of the Secretary-General on promoting development through the reduction and prevention of armed violence (A/64/228), “The changing nature of armed violence over the past three decades, including in many situations in which the United Nations has been active in peace operations, post-conflict reconstruction, or development assistance, has blurred the line between armed conflict and crime, and between politically motivated and economically motivated violence. ... The complex links between armed violence and underdevelopment — with armed violence being both a cause and consequence of underdevelopment — are becoming better recognized. Whether in societies wracked by armed conflict, criminal or interpersonal violence, widespread armed violence can impede the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.” In his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881-S/2009/304), the Secretary-General identifies areas in which the United Nations system can bring its collective experience to bear in helping countries avoid relapse into conflict.
3. Recognizing the importance of conflict prevention for sustainable development, and especially for combating fragility and achieving resilience, UNDP has, over the past decade, stepped up its work to assist countries requesting such support to strengthen their infrastructure for peace. This consists of networks of interdependent structures, mechanisms, values, and skills, which, through dialogue and consultation, contribute to conflict prevention and peacebuilding. Aside from



strengthening non-violent, problem-solving skills, the presence of infrastructure for peace helps deepen social networks, develops a shared sense of identity and civic engagement, and strengthens democratic values.

4. As UNDP has strengthened its support capabilities in this area, programme country requests for support have significantly increased. Between 2010 and 2011, conflict prevention and recovery expenditures rose from 15 to 24 per cent of total UNDP expenditures. However, as the bulk of conflict prevention-related activities are reported elsewhere in the UNDP results framework, and therefore not picked up by the UNDP financial reporting system as a dedicated area of intervention, this means that the actual expenditure on conflict-related issues and results is far higher than the reporting system now identifies.

5. As part of the United Nations peacebuilding agenda, an increasing amount of UNDP conflict prevention and recovery work is being undertaken in United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding settings. Unlike in non-mission settings, UNDP conflict-related work in these settings calls for approaches and areas of focus that take account of inherent post-conflict volatility, incorporate the risk of relapse into conflict, contribute towards achieving the peacebuilding objectives defined by Security Council mandates, and strengthen integrated United Nations support to peacebuilding. The growing share of conflict prevention and recovery activities in the UNDP global programme portfolio also has implications for the Organization's commitment to focus on measurable results, strengthen monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management, and learning.

6. It is in this context that the UNDP Evaluation Office undertook an evaluation of UNDP support to conflict-affected countries in the context of United Nations peace operations. The evaluation was undertaken from July 2011 to May 2012 and focused in particular on UNDP support to conflict-affected countries that are host to a Security Council-mandated United Nations peace operation. Nine countries were selected for the case studies, namely, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, South Sudan, Lebanon, Somalia, Timor-Leste and Haiti. In addition to these 9 primary cases, the evaluation drew on information from 10 other countries (and 1 territory), namely, the Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Iraq, Guatemala, Afghanistan, Nepal, and the Occupied Palestinian Territory — that have, or have had, a Security Council or Peacebuilding Commission mandate.

## **Achievements, recommendations and the way forward**

7. The evaluation finds that the UNDP comparative advantages are perceived to be its presence on the ground, close partnership with government, its role as a bridge between humanitarian, peacebuilding and sustainable development efforts, and its role in governance and institutional change in the management of conflict. It also underscores that UNDP work in conflict-affected countries and through integrated missions is highly relevant, and that UNDP is able to operate “at scale” across multiple programme areas, before, during and after the outbreak of conflict.

8. UNDP has built substantive capacity in many core areas of peacebuilding that are relevant to its development mandate, and demonstrated excellence in its support for rebuilding justice systems and bridging the legal divide with traditional dispute-resolution systems. It has spurred real and lasting security sector reform through civilian oversight, and has developed innovative programmes linking economic development with the reintegration of ex-combatants, members associated with

armed groups, as well other returnees, and groups such as internally displaced persons and refugees, while strengthening recovery and security through mine action and small arms control measures.

9. According to the evaluation, UNDP has demonstrated that it can be an effective partner and participant in peacebuilding through promoting dialogue among government and civil society at the national and local levels, thus enabling a broadening of the constituency for peacebuilding. The United Nations Inter-Agency Framework Team for Coordination on Preventive Action, hosted by UNDP, provides useful entry points for increased coherence in conflict prevention and peacebuilding work, and especially in supporting United Nations country teams in their work with national counterparts aimed at developing integrated strategies for conflict prevention.

10. The evaluation underscores that the eight-point agenda for gender equality has been an important effort to support empowerment of women, and that UNDP has achieved a measure of success with expanding opportunities for women to participate more fully in the emerging political and legal landscape of post-conflict countries. Notable successes include the expansion of women's access to justice in some countries, especially for survivors of sexual and gender-based violence. It also notes, however, that UNDP has been less successful in its efforts to improve the gender balance of its own staff working in conflict countries.

11. While recognizing the areas of current strengths, the evaluation also points to certain areas where UNDP can strengthen its impact. They include the ability to carry out detailed conflict analyses at the country level to help anticipate and prevent conflict outbreaks. Despite UNDP recognition of the importance of conflict analysis, and despite having developed its own conflict analysis tools, the evaluation found that as of the time of its review, no UNDP-based standard operating procedure existed for when and how to carry out such analyses at the country level.

12. The evaluation also finds that the UNDP presence in a country before, during and after a crisis builds expectations that the organization will respond positively to the wide-ranging requests for support that it receives. However, as a result of these expectations, UNDP embarks in some cases upon overly ambitious support programmes without sufficient financial and human resources, and this impedes UNDP performance and programme delivery.

13. Overall, the effectiveness of UNDP programming support in conflict-affected countries is found to be contingent upon events in the political and security realm, which are largely beyond the power of UNDP to influence. Where a modicum of political settlement has been reached and peacekeeping has maintained security, UNDP interventions have been able to support broader conflict resolution, peacebuilding and ultimately, the development agenda.

14. The evaluation finds that the UNDP immediate crisis response known as the SURGE initiative and fast-track procedures have contributed to addressing the challenge of a shortage of skilled staff at the outbreak of conflict. While temporary rapid deployment may help achieve short-term immediate recovery aims, there are trade-offs, as the very nature of fragile States demands the building of relationships and trust over a protracted period. The effectiveness of UNDP in conflict situations will remain contingent on the quality and capabilities of in-country management and staff and the resources at their disposal. Selecting skilled staff to fill appointments in countries at risk of conflict and carrying out robust training programmes for staff

in these countries constitute the critically important actions to ensure UNDP effectiveness.

15. In the light of the fact that United Nations Volunteers comprise one third of all international civilian personnel in eight of the nine primary case studies of the evaluation where there is an integrated mission present, it is important for UNDP to give greater recognition to the important contribution made by the Volunteers towards peace and development.

16. UNDP welcomes this evaluation and appreciates the lessons it provides for continuous organizational improvements. It agrees with the various issues outlined and the recommendations made. However, in accordance with the matrix in the annex to the present report, UNDP has already begun to address in 2012 some of the issues covered by the recommendations. In the light of this, and as reflected in the matrix below, most if not all of the recommendations are scheduled to be addressed by the end of 2013.

17. The annex to the present report outlines the evaluation's main recommendations and the UNDP responses.

## Annex. Key recommendations and management response

**Recommendation 1: UNDP should significantly enhance the quality and use of conflict analysis at the country level, including guidance and standard operating procedures detailing when and how analyses should be developed and periodically updated. Effective analyses of needs and risks should, crucially, lead directly to a sequence of activities and a means of measuring progress against objectives.**

*Rationale for the recommendation:* The evaluation concludes that at present there is no UNDP-based standard operating procedure for when and how to conduct conflict analysis. As a result, the conduct of conflict analysis in both substantive and procedural terms remains varied across UNDP. Nevertheless, there are country-level experiences that demonstrate the value of conducting and regularly updating conflict analyses. In Nepal, for example, an ongoing conflict analysis by the UNDP country office provided vital strategic oversight throughout the country's civil war and subsequent peacebuilding process.

**Management response:** UNDP country offices and regions have over the last decade developed various tailor-made approaches (such as the Political Analysis and Prospective Scenarios Project in Latin America (PAPEP)), to endow UNDP with a stronger capacity for conflict analysis and conflict mitigation strategies/initiatives. In order to further strengthen these capacities, UNDP has over the past few years supported country offices by deploying Peace and Development Advisers (PDAs) within UNDP offices and/or United Nations country teams to provide analytical expertise and advice to the offices of the United Nations Resident Coordinator. However, UNDP recognizes that this has not been sufficient to address the challenge raised in the recommendation. As such, UNDP has already initiated a review of the Conflict-related Development Analysis (CDA) tool and methodology, which is designed to support improved contextual and conflict analyses by UNDP country offices. The exercise will also include revisiting the standard terms of reference and profile for PDAs to strengthen analytical capacity for prevention. The exercise is led by the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) and is to be finalized by December 2012. Starting in January 2013, a comprehensive rollout plan to train UNDP programme staff in the use of the CDA tool will be initiated, beginning in UNDP priority countries. UNDP is also committed to reviewing the various approaches that have been developed by its various units to better inform a corporate strategy in this regard and to strengthen the relevance and the quality of the CDA tool. Importantly, UNDP has also begun to work on the development and establishment of an Early Warning and Early Action Corporate system, which should be operational by March 2013. The aim of the system is to ensure that UNDP better detects possible crises before they erupt and has an effective mechanism to respond adequately and coherently in a preventive manner to safeguard development gains and avoid possible strife.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1 Finalize the update of CDA tool, including review of other approaches that exist in UNDP	By June 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux, Bureau for Development Policy (BDP)		
1.2 Conduct formal training on conflict analysis across UNDP programme staff, starting with staff in CPR priority countries	Roll-out of training in March 2013	BCPR		
1.3 Review additional support to ensure the effective implementation of the CDA tool	June 2013	BCPR Regional Bureaux, BDP		
1.4 Identify two countries per region to undertake a systematic conflict analysis and put in place the capacities to periodically update the analysis. Monitor the usage of the analysis for UNDP programming	December 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux (in consultation with the Department of Political Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat (DPA))		
1.5 Develop and establish an Early Warning/Early Action system	March 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux		

**Recommendation 2: UNDP should make greater efforts to translate corporate management cooperation between UNDP, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the United Nations Secretariat (DPKO) and DPA to the specifics of country priorities and the sequencing of interventions. This would imply a more central role for UNDP in the planning stages at the beginning of integrated missions and then through the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and in the drawdown of an integrated mission. Clear corporate guidelines and criteria need to be developed in this regard.**

*Rationale for the recommendation:* The evaluation found that the Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP) has proved a useful and structured mechanism for ensuring UNDP involvement at the inception of a mission, yet the case studies indicate that UNDP influence in the process remains relatively small compared to the security and political concerns of other actors.

**Management response:** In February 2011, UNDP established the Executive Team (chaired by the Associate Administrator) to better address protracted crises and complex emergencies. The Executive Team is a forum for UNDP Senior Management to provide clearer guidance to Bureaux and country offices in all mission planning stages and promotes a common position for senior-level coordination with other United Nations partners. The new United Nations system-wide policy on transitions, currently being developed for mission contexts, and the revision of the IMPP guidelines, which involves the participation of UNDP, will further reinforce institutional relations between UNDP, DPKO and DPA. In parallel and to complement this exercise, UNDP is also drafting a lessons learned paper on its involvement in mission start-up and planning processes. Both reviews will help to strengthen collaboration between UNDP, DPKO and DPA around all aspects of United Nations interventions in mission settings. While the engagement with the development agencies of Member States has always been substantial, UNDP has recently increased its engagement with the political departments related to the Security Council. Beginning with the Syrian Arab Republic, UNDP is co-chairing with DPA integrated task forces to develop the United Nations response in situations characterized by violent conflict or post-conflict recovery, but without a peacekeeping mission. At least two additional task forces of this nature will be co-chaired by the end of 2013. In the process of development of the internal lessons learned paper, UNDP Senior Management will also assess how it will measure engagement in the planning and sequencing of missions, and identify at which point or what triggers will prompt additional management action to ensure effective participation in the planning of these integrated missions.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
2.1 Revise the IMPP guidelines jointly with DPKO, DPA and other United Nations Development Group (UNDG) members	By the end of 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux, BDP (engaging DPA and DPKO)		
2.2 Draft a common United Nations policy on transitions jointly with DPKO, DPA and other UNDG members	By June 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux, BDP (engaging DPA and DPKO)		
2.3 Engage systematically with Member States at key moments in the life of a United Nations mission (including mission planning; the drafting of resolutions of United Nations bodies related to peacekeeping operations and special political missions; and mission drawdown), to highlight a development perspective, the comparative advantages of development actors, in particular UNDP, as well as challenges and opportunities	Continuous	Regional Bureaux, BCPR		

2.4 UNDP needs to provide appropriate support to the new arrangements adopted by the Secretary-General's Policy Committee in September 2012 for the rule of law in crisis and post-crisis situations whereby UNDP and DPKO are appointed Global Focal Points and are expected to make sure that the whole United Nations acts together in peacekeeping, special political missions and other crisis situations	March 2013	BCPR, BDP		
2.5 A corporate UNDP Peacebuilding Strategy has been reviewed and approved by UNDP Senior Management as part of the formulation of the new strategic plan	October 2012	BCPR		
<p><b>Recommendation 3: UNDP should be unambiguous in establishing what recovery projects are eligible for inclusion in a Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) or its equivalent. UNDP should make better use of "situation teams" that convene quickly during the outbreak of conflicts.</b></p> <p><i>Rationale for the recommendation:</i> The evaluation found that UNDP support in setting up early recovery mechanisms and coordination faced numerous challenges. Experience with the Early Recovery Cluster in recent crisis events has highlighted confusion over the kinds of recovery projects that are deemed eligible for inclusion in a CAP or its equivalent. In some cases, critics contend that there has been too much attention paid to crisis, security, law and order measures and transitional justice, and not enough attention to longer-term planning and capacity -building efforts.</p> <p><b>Management response:</b> Early recovery remains a key part of UNDP work at the global and country levels. Interventions range from restoring core governance functions, providing support to livelihoods and income-generation activities, to mine action and the reintegration of demobilized soldiers. The ability of UNDP to link the humanitarian phase with long-term development efforts has led to increased CPR budgets over the past three years. However, based on the findings of the BCPR Portfolio Review, UNDP recognized the need to reassess its early recovery approach to better respond to the changing patterns of development aid in post-conflict and fragile environments. The review and update of the Guidance Note of the Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery (CWGER) and the UNDP policy on early recovery were launched in May 2012. The conclusions of the review will help UNDP to better identify initiatives that can be included in CAP processes and that provide a more effective link between recovery and development. Importantly, UNDP places great emphasis on working closely with the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) of the United Nations Secretariat and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in particular on both reviews to ensure that the roles and responsibilities undertaken by UNDP under early recovery are recognized, differentiated from and complementary to the work of humanitarian organizations. A better understanding between UNDP and other humanitarian actors on respective roles, a clearer common definition of early recovery, along with a common set of guiding principles both on the scope and funding mechanism for early recovery will prove an important way to facilitate the inclusion of commonly agreed early recovery projects in CAPs and other early recovery funding mechanisms. This closer partnership between UNDP and humanitarian partners could prove central in improving the mobilization of early recovery resources and more effectively bridging the relief-to-development continuum.</p>				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
3.1 Revise CWGER Guidance Note and the UNDP policy on early recovery, in close cooperation with OCHA, IASC, and the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs (ECHA), and start a global initiative for early recovery resource mobilization, focusing on the specific challenges of immediate post-conflict situations	To be completed by the end of 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux, BDP (engaging DPA and DPKO)		

3.2 Provide training and technical support to country office staff for understanding CAPs, project eligibility requirements, humanitarian funding, and the humanitarian system generally to capitalize on the presence of humanitarian actors (that often operate parallel to peacekeeping missions and conflict-related approaches)	Ongoing	OCHA/UNDP/(BCPR)		
3.3 Develop UNDP signature products for early recovery and provide training to country offices on the use of these products to allow for a level of predictability and uniformity in terms of its responses in early recovery and its possible inclusion in the Flash Appeals and CAPs	By the end of 2013	BCPR, UNDP country offices		
<b>Recommendation 4: Greater attention should be given to the institutional arrangements to more effectively manage and disseminate knowledge on pooled multi-donor trust funds at the corporate level — and how this can serve country offices requested to manage such funds.</b>  <i>Rationale for the recommendation:</i> The evaluation found that the UNDP global experience in managing multi-partner trust funds was not systematically captured. Such knowledge is useful when UNDP country offices need to understand and explain to their partners the various trust fund options and to know what they should do to set up a trust fund. Given the continued need for support where UNDP is expected to manage/administer trust funds not only in the context of post-conflict recovery, but also for post-disaster recovery, greater attention should be given to keeping partners aware of such institutional arrangements.				
<b>Management response:</b> Various sources of information are already available regarding institutional arrangements and knowledge on undg multi-donor trust funds and UNDP-specific trust funds, such as the Joint Funding approaches section on the undg website and the MPTF Office GATEWAY, and the CPR Thematic Trust Fund information on the UNDP/BCPR website. However, UNDP has taken note of the recommendation and the need to make information more readily available to partners on the various modalities that can be used to fund programmes both directly through UNDP, as well as through undg arrangements with the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office as the administrative agent.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
4.1 Additional guidance and information packages on different options for management of pooled trust funds in which UNDP is involved will be finalized and approved by the UNDP Senior Management. This guidance will elaborate specificities of a spectrum of CPR pooled funds (making a distinction between UNDP trust funds and MPTFs administered by the MPTF Office on behalf of undg, including Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF) and outline options that the country offices will take into account in proposing specific funding modalities for use in CPR environments	By May 2013	BCPR, MPTF Office/Bureau of Management (BoM), Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy (BERA)		



**Recommendation 5: To reinforce the importance of the United Nations Delivering as One initiative in post-conflict settings, the UNDP Executive Board should propose to the United Nations Secretariat and Security Council for consideration the importance of establishing clear guidance over division of labour and resources during the drawdown of integrated missions to ensure that individual agencies such as UNDP are adequately prepared for their enhanced role during and post-transition.**

*Rationale for the recommendation:* In 2011, the Secretary-General endorsed a report of the review by his Senior Advisory Group entitled “Civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict”, (see A/65/747-S/2011/85), which recommended enhancing the United Nations use of standing civilian capacities. The recommendations underscored the pivotal role of UNDP in resource mobilization and development support in post-conflict settings, and recommended that UNDP take the lead in clusters relating to core national governance functions, justice, and capacity development. For UNDP, transitions from peacekeeping operations represent a complex and sensitive operational period, where its support activities often take on elevated significance in consolidating a country’s progress away from conflict. The effective management of these transitions is of particular interest at present as several United Nations peacekeeping operations are soon to wind down, with support continuing through integrated peacebuilding offices, United Nations country teams and special political missions. New United Nations Transition Guidelines should provide an opportunity for more effective, actionable inter-agency planning and budgeting.

**Management response:** Although UNDP has been actively involved in the development of Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One, to ensure that specific aspects of transition settings were taken into account, a new review by the United Nations Integration Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, is in the process of developing a common policy on transitions for United Nations missions based on lessons and good practices from across the United Nations system. UNDP is actively involved in this process. UNDP, together with DPKO, OCHA and UNICEF, is currently having regular meetings with key Security Council members, at which critical issues in mission settings including transitions are discussed. UNDP has also initiated a lessons learned study from past mission transitions aimed at developing guidelines for its future action in this area. Contributing to joint and/or collective United Nations activities remains an important priority for UNDP that underpins all activity. However, despite the good intentions of UNDP, it is also important to highlight the fact that any success in this areas will depend on the willingness of all agencies concerned to work together.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking**	
			Comments	Status
5.1 United Nations-wide policy on integrated mission transition to be developed	Approval by June 2013	Executive Office of the Administrator (EXO), Regional Bureaux, BCPR		
5.2 Lessons learned and guidance for UNDP engagement in integrated mission transitions being developed	By the end of 2013	BCPR		
5.3 Contribute to the development of UNDG Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One to ensure that they can be fully applied in transition settings	UNDG approval by the end of 2012	EXO, BCPR through UNDG-ECHA		

**Recommendation 6: Cooperation with international financial institutions (IFIs), including the World Bank, should be further developed in the areas of joint approaches to post-crisis needs assessments and crisis prevention planning.**

*Rationale for the recommendation:* UNDP has been expanding its partnerships with IFIs in post-conflict situations. For instance, Post-Crisis Needs Assessments (PCNAs) are getting developed through a collaborative scoping exercise undertaken by the UNDG and the World Bank. PCNAs help identify the infrastructure and government support activities that are needed to support countries as they move towards recovery. The IMPP has been designed by the United Nations to help achieve a common understanding of strategic objectives in a particular country by engaging all relevant parts of the United Nations system, and to provide an inclusive framework for action that can also serve to engage external partners, such as the IFIs, regional organizations and bilateral donors.

**Management response:** The issue covered by this recommendation has been a UNDP priority for several years. UNDP cooperation with the World Bank in crisis countries increased after the publication of the *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development* in the thematic areas of rule of law, employment creation, disaster risk reduction and crisis governance, including public sector administration and capacity development. UNDP is also chairing the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment Advisory Group, and leads in the United Nations system on joint work with the World Bank on Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA). The Advisory Group concentrates on further development of the PCNA methodology, and there are efforts to link the PCNA more closely with PDNA. UNDP is also an active participant in a system-wide effort that began in 2010 to strengthen cooperation with the World Bank on the ground in specific countries, supported by a Swiss Trust Fund. A review of this experience will be conducted by the end of 2013 to outline the impact of this cooperation and lessons learned in the first four pilot countries. The conclusions of the review will build on the closer cooperation that has been built between UNDP and the World Bank and will hopefully provide future avenues for increased collaboration.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
6.1 Further develop and finalize the PCNA methodology, in close cooperation with the Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) of the United Nations Secretariat, in particular regarding support to country exercises, development of monitoring methodology and involvement of other regional organizations, in particular the regional development banks	By the end of 2013	BCPR, DOCO		
6.2 Establish a forum for engagement in job creation in fragile States with the World Bank and other partners; and implement pilot programmes that seek to enhance complementarity and the impact of collaborative support in selected countries	2013-2014	BCPR, BERA, BDP, Regional Bureaux		
6.3 Engage in joint analysis with the World Bank to identify countries where the PCNA approach might be limited to and would benefit from a more coherent United Nations/IFIs joint analysis	Continuous	BERA, BCPR; Regional Bureaux (in consultation with DPA and DPKO as appropriate)		
6.4 Provide guidance and direction through the UNDP Executive Team for protracted crisis and complex emergencies on country-specific situations regarding engagement with the IFIs	Continuous	Executive Team; Executive Team secretariat; Regional Bureaux; BCPR		

6.5 Undertake at least two joint assessments with the World Bank of the capacity needs for implementation of peace agreements, and establish joint mechanisms to mobilize resources to meet these needs	2013- 2014	BERA, BCPR, Regional Bureaux, the World Bank, Resident Coordinators in concerned countries.		
6.6 Provide joint implementation support to New Deal pilot countries with the World Bank through donor funded G7+ support mechanism	2013-2014	BCPR, Regional Bureaux		
<b>Recommendation 7: UNDP should establish an internal human resources programme designed to prepare and place female staff in conflict settings, and should set tighter benchmarks for offices to meet gender targets.</b> <i>Rationale for the recommendation:</i> The evaluation found that UNDP has a mixed record of accomplishment in terms of the gender balance of its workforce in some conflict-affected countries. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2010 only 23 per cent of the staff were women. In post-crisis Côte d'Ivoire, the vast majority of Professional staff in 2011 were male, with only two women employed, and neither of them in key posts. This poor gender ratio is replicated in the integrated United Nations mission in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI). The reasons given relate to difficulties in finding French-speaking and experienced women willing to work in unstable environments.				
<b>Management response:</b> The requirements of ensuring gender equality are already included in the UNDP recruitment policies and procedures. However, it has proven continually difficult to attract female candidates to CPR settings. UNDP will address this challenge and provide additional training for the female UNDP staff and female consultants to be placed in conflict settings.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
7.1 Organize training/skills enhancement activities for female UNDP staff selected to be posted in crisis environments	2013-2014	Office of Human Resources/BoM, BCPR		
7.2 Analyze issues pertaining to attraction and retention of female personnel in crisis environments; develop and implement targeted response actions	2013-2014	BoM, Regional Bureaux		
<b>Recommendation 8: All programming for conflict-affected countries should articulate a clear exit strategy. Direct implementation projects should be required to justify why they cannot be nationally executed, and include capacity-development measures and a time frame for transitioning to national implementation modalities.</b> <i>Rationale for the recommendation:</i> The evaluation found that UNDP has yet to strike an optimal balance between direct programme implementation and national implementation in many conflict countries. The issue of sustainability can sometimes clash with the desire to “get the job done”, particularly in countries where capacity constraints are profound. Direct service delivery can escalate the achievement of specific outcomes; however, it also runs the risk of weakening institutions that countries must rely on over the long term. The capacity for governing that gets built through UNDP support can be quickly eroded by the brain drain that takes trained national counterparts to new jobs either in the private sector or, perversely, in international aid organizations such as the United Nations.				

**Management response:** UNDP agrees with the need to ensure that all its projects, whether national implementation (NIM) or direct implementation (DIM), have an appropriate exit strategy and foster capacity-building. This is an important consideration under the current approval process for direct implementation of projects, which is granted to the country offices by their respective Regional Bureaux after consideration of the nature of the special development situation and specific comparative advantages of the country office in managing projects. It is important to clarify that the DIM modality has as much of an emphasis on capacity-building as does NIM. However, in crisis or post-crisis settings, national authorities are least able to cope with procedures imposed upon them by the NIM modality, which are, moreover, different from their normal operating procedures. It is, however, important that both NIM and DIM projects clearly outline their capacity-building objectives in line with the exit strategy. UNDP will also review the programme- operating modalities to ensure that there is no misunderstanding concerning how they contribute to national capacity-building.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
8.1 Review a selected number of country offices to determine their compliance with the implementation of UNDP procedures on DIM from the perspective of their impact on national capacity development	By the end of 2013	OSG/Evaluation Office, Regional Bureaux		
8.2 Refine approval process for DIM by adding a strong national capacity assessment requirement and a clear strategy for capacity enhancement as well as a timeline for transition to NIM	Starting in 2014	Regional Bureaux, OSG, EXO		
8.3 UNDP Senior Management to assess project implementation modalities for CPR settings in the UNDP programme manual	January 2013	EXO/OSG/BCPR		

**Recommendation 9:** UNDP should expand its staff training programmes for countries identified as at risk for conflict, revise hiring procedures for staff that stresses experience in conflict settings, and provide additional incentives for experienced staff to continue working in conflict-affected hardship posts.

*Rationale for the recommendation:* While the evaluation underscores the importance of the UNDP crisis response initiative known as SURGE in addressing the challenge of a shortage of skilled staff on hand at the outbreak of conflict, it notes that the effectiveness of UNDP in conflict situations will remain contingent on the quality and capabilities of in-country management and staff. Selecting skilled staff to fill appointments in countries at risk for conflict and carrying out robust training programmes for staff in those countries constitute the two most important actions to ensure UNDP effectiveness.

**Management response:** UNDP recognizes the need to continue improving the competencies and quality of staff assigned to conflict settings and will continue to improve training, recruitment systems and incentives within the framework and limits of related regulations.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
9.1 Define specific skills and competencies required for posts in conflict-affected hardship duty stations	2013	BCPR, OHR/BoM		
9.2 Engage BCPR during the selection and appointment of senior managers for crisis country offices (deputies and above)	2013-2014	OHR/BoM, BCPR		

9.3 Develop and introduce a team approach for assigning senior managers to crisis country offices, taking into account the capacities of the country office management team as a whole with the goal of filling capacity gaps	2013-2014	OHR/BoM		
9.4 Ensure that a staff member with skills in political analysis, facilitation, and conflict resolution is available to support the Resident Coordinator/Resident Representative in at least half (i.e., 20) of 40 priority countries	By December 2014	BCPR, DPA, Regional Bureaux		
<p><b>Recommendation 10: UNDP should establish new guidance for project development in crisis-affected countries, including generic sets of benchmarks and indicators. This should also include monitoring, evaluation and reporting on progress in conflict settings. These tools should build from programme indicators developed in non-conflict contexts, and then be revised in consideration of the changed circumstances brought about by conflict.</b></p> <p><i>Rationale for the recommendation:</i> The evaluation suggested that new guidance is needed as UNDP currently lacks a coherent and systematic assessment of progress towards CPR objectives within country support programmes. Specific indicators or benchmarks have not been established for UNDP work in crisis environments and there is no consistent practice regarding the setting of baselines at the outset of country-based projects in order to track progress.</p> <p><b>Management response:</b> UNDP guidelines for planning, monitoring and evaluation of interventions in crisis settings are contained in the “Compendium #1 — Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Prevention and Recovery Settings”. However, UNDP acknowledges the point made in the recommendation and the fact that the current Compendium does not address the specific issues of programme effectiveness, particularly in post-disaster settings. A recent review of the BCPR programme portfolio in CPR settings conducted jointly with Regional and Central Bureaux further stressed the need to implement existing guidance in this area in order to strengthen programme relevance and effectiveness, identify areas for strategic investment to maximize impact, and refocus on capacity development in CPR settings. A detailed action plan was established to implement the recommendations for the review, and includes the development of a special monitoring and evaluation system for crisis-affected countries that includes crisis-sensitive indicators, frequent contextual analyses, and more frequent monitoring visits. BCPR is also undertaking a pilot initiative to spearhead a new approach to monitoring and evaluation in conflict settings.</p>				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
10.1 Introduce and roll out a new results-based management support package to country offices	January 2013	Operations Support Group (OSG)		
10.2 The definition of CPR relevant indicators will be part of the formulation of results chains for the new UNDP strategic plan	January 2013.	OSG/BCPR/BDP		
10.3 BCPR to spearhead pilot phase of new monitoring and evaluation approach in two pilot countries	Starting in January 2013	BCPR, Regional Bureaux, OSG		

\* Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database.