UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

UNEG Evaluation of the Pilot Initiative for Delivering as One

Evaluability Assessment Report on Mozambique

December 2008

UNEG Evaluability Assessment Team for Mozambique:

Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, and DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.

Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO

Tristi Nichols, Consultant

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCA	Common Country Assessment
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DaO	Delivering as One UN
ExCom	Executive Committee
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GoM	Government of Mozambique
HLCP	High-level Committee on Programmes
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
INE	National Statistics Institute
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NRA	Non-resident Agency
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee
OHCHR	United Nations High Commission for Human Rights
OMT	Operational Management Team
PARPA II	Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty for 2006-2009
RC	Resident Coordinator
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound
TCPR	Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review
UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDESA	United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDGO	United Nations Development Group Office

UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNOCHA	United Nations Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
USD	United States Dollars
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

1.   The evaluability study of the Delivering as One UN (DaO) pilot initiatives is a technical assessment of the basic parameters that will make it possible to fully evaluate at a later stage both the processes and the results of the pilots.

2.   The evaluability mission to Mozambique took place from 28 January 2008 to 1 February 2008 and was composed of three individuals: two UN representatives representing the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Lucien Back (UNICEF) and Carla Henry (ILO); and one independent consultant, Tristi Nichols. Information from the following methods was used to produce this report: desk review; 34 interviews with representatives from the Government of Mozambique (GoM), UN organizations, donors, and civil society organizations (CSOs); and a self-administered survey to in-country contacts of UN organizations currently active in Mozambique.

3.   Mozambique has been viewed as one of Africa's most successful stories of post-war reconstruction and economic recovery, averaging an annual growth rate of 9 percent between 1997 and 2003. Despite such achievements, Mozambique still remains one of the poorest countries in the world, ranking 172 out of 177 in the 2006 Human Development Index. Mozambique suffers from protracted and repeated natural disasters resulting in floods and drought, an escalated HIV/AIDS prevalence rate that has increased from 8.2 percent in 1998 to 16.2 percent in 2004, and weakened national capacities.

4.   In total, there are 23 UN organizations that are active in Mozambique, including 9 resident and 14 non resident (with variable physical presence) and 422 UN staff. There has been significant progress in realizing the four aims of DaO - One Programme, One Budget, One Office, and One Leader - in Mozambique. In fact, a fifth aim, called 'Communicating as One', has also been created. Currently, six teams focus on developing the five aims. They work together to share vision and put in place mechanisms, processes, structures and instruments that are geared toward improving UN coherence.

5.   DaO was initiated roughly half way through the agreed United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2007-2009. At the inception of DaO in January 2007, it was infeasible to adapt the entire UNDAF into One Programme. Since its creation, an impressive amount of work has gone into designing the DaO and making it operational. The decisions and operational plans under each aim are also well documented, which has greatly aided in the assessment of its evaluability.

6.   DaO is a One Programme, which reflects roughly 25 percent, in USD terms, of the UNDAF. It covers all four substantive areas of the UNDAF: economic development, governance, human capital, and HIV/AIDS. The DaO Programme in Mozambique is embodied by 11 joint programmes, of which a little more than 50 percent is funded. The scope of the One Programme that can be the subject of evaluation efforts in 2009 -2011 may, however, be limited to evaluations conducted of the joint programmes. The One Programme with its 11 joint programmes is considered 'transitional' until the next UNDAF is designed, which is not expected to commence before 2010 or 2011.

7.   The One Programme (as part of UNDAF) supports GoM strategies to reduce poverty and has four areas of strategic focus linking the joint programmes: policy and advocacy, normative and technical support, capacity development, and strengthening civil society partnerships. This focus is not well supported in terms of a cohesive vision statement expressing a common purpose, substance and approach

of the UN contribution based on its comparative advantage in the country. The strategic focus areas have been operationalized as approval criteria for joint programme designs. It is difficult to understand the rationale for the selection of the 11 joint programmes. They are articulated around four substantive pillars of the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty for 2006-2009 (PARPA II) and UNDAF but lack explicit references to a common denominator of the fundamental UN contribution. In a possible future evaluation it would have to be demonstrated to what extent these joint programmes are more relevant and more efficient than projects and programmes implemented outside the One UN Programme. There are not yet benchmarks for such an evaluation.

8.   At the time of the mission, 3 of the 11 joint programmes had been signed by the government. Once approved, the individual joint programmes composing the One Programme will be evaluable. The UN Country Team (UNCT) can develop a clearer statement and strategy regarding the strategic intent of the overall pilot's design and clearer outcomes linked to the focus criteria for joint programmes that are part of the One Programme in preparation for the forthcoming evaluation exercises of 2009-2011. The statement and strategy could also articulate how a substantially improved quality and process for the 2010 UNDAF plan is a major outcome of the current pilot DaO. In addition, the strategic intent could also be better articulated and documented in terms of how DaO programme processes have changed through strategic alliances of UN organizations.

9.   There is also need to articulate a more deliberate strategy and outcome for strengthening and institutionalizing national ownership and leadership. One component of this may be a more formal DaO Steering Committee that, in addition to the three key ministries (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, the Ministry of Planning and Development, and the Ministry of Finance) better links to line ministries, CSOs, and regularly communicates with donors.

10.   Although the DaO processes have adopted the goal of inclusiveness, and all UN organizations are able to participate in many of the discussions and decisions (non-resident agencies [NRAs] are invited quarterly to join in expanded meetings), there may be need to revisit institutional arrangements and consider additional options for a more expanded UNCT. Specifically, systematically incorporating the contributions of specialized agencies and NRAs may be warranted.

11.   With regard to the five DaO aims, the absence of specific end targets, with time-frames and interim progress markers, could limit the scope and usefulness of a process evaluation in 2009. The RC Office should fill this gap and incorporate various contingencies to address risk factors. In addition, the existing draft indicators for monitoring progress should draw on both objective and subjective parameters, and include an external dimension to capture process effects on others outside UN Mozambique. The initial stages of business practices - such as human resources, resource mobilization, communication, and information technology - also deserve documentation and data should be compiled to provide trend analysis over the three-year period.

A. Introduction

12.   In November 2006, the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence published a report titled 'Delivering as One', which put forward a comprehensive set of recommendations including the establishment of One UN pilot initiatives at the country level with One Leader, One Programme, One Budget, and where appropriate, One Office. The recommendations were grounded in General Assembly resolution 59/250 adopted in 2004 that had provided guidance for joint offices and a rationalization of UN country presence.

13.   The recommendations to establish pilots at the country level were met with interest in the UN system. By the end of December 2006, eight governments had expressed interest to join this initiative: Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam. The Deputy Secretary-General and the chair of the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) committed support to these pilots and considered a rapid increase of the number of pilots as from 2008[1].

14.   Following discussions by the High-level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) on 20-21 March 2007, the Chief Executives Board, in a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland on 20 April 2007, called on the UNEG to undertake an evaluation of the pilots that would focus on progress, to be followed at a later date by an evaluation of results and impact[2]. Subsequently, the UNEG decided on a three-phase approach: an assessment of the evaluability of DaO by March 2008 at the country and UN systemic levels; an independent process evaluation of the pilot experience to be completed by September 2009[3]; and an independent evaluation of the results and impacts of the pilot experience by September 2011.

Objectives and purpose of the mission

15.   The evaluability study of the DaO pilots is a technical assessment of the basic parameters that will make it possible to fully evaluate at a later stage both the results of the pilots and of the processes that will lead to these results. These parameters comprise the following:

   a.   Quality of the design for the achievement of results, that is the existence of clear objectives and indicators to measure results at a later stage.

   b.   Initial appraisal of processes for the optimal involvement of relevant national and international stakeholders (including the governments of recipient countries; civil society; the private sector; UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies; and external aid agencies).

---

[1] An informal process of consultations among Member States took place during the 62nd Session of the General Assembly and will continue during the 63rd Session. A majority of Member Countries opposed a rapid expansion of the process.

[2] The exact phrasing was "called upon UNEG to urgently establish the substantive parameters and process for the evaluation of pilots, and requested to be kept fully informed of progress".

[3] The Synthesis Report due in September 2009 will contribute to the preparation of the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review in 2010.

c. Existence of adequate sources of information to assess the achievement of results and indicators as well as of the required processes.

d. National ownership and leadership in the evaluation process, and identification of independent and credible evaluators in pilot countries who can be involved in the evaluation of process and results of the DaO pilots at a later stage.

16.   After providing a brief overview of the origins and context of the DaO in Mozambique, this report considers the rationale and design of the various aims of the DaO pilot. This section is followed by a brief analysis of the processes set and put in motion to achieve DaO aims. Finally, the report closes with a short set of suggestions on how to improve the evaluability of the DaO.

Mission dates, composition and realized programme of mission

17.   The purposes and objectives of the evaluability mission in Mozambique are elaborated in the Terms of Reference (See Annex 1). The evaluability assessment team comprised three individuals: two UN representatives representing UNEG, Lucien Back (UNICEF) and Carla Henry (ILO) and one independent consultant, Tristi Nichols. The mission took place from 28 January 2008 to 1 February 2008.

18.   Information from the following methods was used to produce this report: desk review; 34 interviews with representatives of GoM, UN organizations, donors, and CSOs (see Annex 2 for the mission programme and Annex 3 for the list of interviewees); and a self-administered survey to in-country contacts of UN organizations currently active in Mozambique[4]. The mission concluded with brief presentations of preliminary findings to GoM and the UNCT.

Limitations

19.   The evaluability assessment has limitations. The week during which the mission took place coincided with emergency flooding in the central regions. Despite their involvement in the humanitarian response, the Resident Coordinator (RC) and UNCT provided generous support. Great efforts were made to conduct interviews with GoM officials, but the months of January and February represent vacation periods, rendering many officials unavailable. The short duration of the field mission also limited the team's ability to explore issues in greater detail.

Acknowledgements

20.   The team acknowledges the generous support from the Office of the RC and the UNCT and expresses sincere thanks to the GoM, CSO representatives and representatives and staff of UN organizations who participated in interviews.

---

[4] Ten agencies responded to the survey.

B. History, context and scope of DaO in Mozambique

History and problem statement

21. Since the signing of the 1992 Peace Agreement, Mozambique has been viewed as one of Africa's most successful stories of post-war reconstruction and economic recovery. The country held its third peaceful and democratic legislative and presidential election in December 2004 and has engaged in an ambitious economic, social and political reform agenda. As a result, the country is experiencing strong economic growth, averaging an annual growth rate of 9 percent between 1997 and 2003[5]. Despite such achievements, Mozambique still remains one of the poorest countries in the world, ranking 172 out of 177 in the 2006 Human Development Index[6]. Fifty-four percent of the population is defined as 'poor', or those whose consumption falls below the national poverty line[7]. In addition, Mozambique suffers the combined effects of protracted and repeated natural disasters resulting in floods and drought; HIV/AIDS, where the prevalence rate increased from 8.2 percent in 1998 to 16.2 percent in 2004[8]; and weakened national capacities.

22. In May 2005, the GoM adopted PARPA II. PARPA II has the central objective of reducing the incidence of poverty to 45 percent. This medium term strategy is defined through three pillars: governance, human capital and economic development. The strategy also includes eight cross-cutting issues: de-mining, environment, HIV/AIDS, gender, food and nutritional security, science and technology, rural development and disaster risk management. The inclusion of disaster risk management highlights the need, as a development priority, for long-term planning to reduce the vulnerability of communities and infrastructure exposed to natural hazards.

23. Since Mozambique is naturally prone to calamities (such as drought and floods), the UNCT in Mozambique emphasized that humanitarian action related to emergencies is particularly important in Mozambique. Disaster risk management is a cross-cutting issue in the PARPA II, and Mozambique is also a signatory to the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, a global disaster risk reduction agenda. In line with the Hyogo Framework and the PARPA II, the Council of Ministers approved the National Master Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction in October 2006.

24. The National Institute for Disaster Management is the government body (under the management of the Ministry of State Administration) with primary responsibility for the coordination of natural disaster plans, policies and interventions. While the National Institute for Disaster Management has been identified as the leading government agency in disaster reduction and recovery, not all disaster

---

[5] World Bank estimates, 2007.

[6] Available online at http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf, page 232.

[7] Republic of Mozambique, 'PARPA II: Action Plan For The Reduction Of Absolute Poverty, 2006-2009', May 2006, Paragraph 50. This figure implies that roughly 10 million Mozambicans live in poverty.

[8] UNAIDS, 2006. Available online at www.unaids.org/en/CountryResponses/Countries/mozambique.asp. Prevalence rate is for 15-49 year olds.

preparedness and prevention actions are undertaken through this institution[9]. The Institute has developed an effective contingency planning process, with a dedicated budget for contingency activities. The Humanitarian Country Team, a part of the UNCT, works in partnership with and supports the National Institute for Disaster Management in the event of an emergency. Through support from UN Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee in February 2007, the Humanitarian Country Team adopted the 'cluster approach' and gained access to the Central Emergency Response Funds - two humanitarian reforms designed to minimize erratic coordination, insufficient accountability and inconsistent donor policies.

UN development system and other forms of external assistance or partnerships fora

25.   Approximately half of annual government spending is financed from external assistance[10]. International aid assistance in Mozambique has taken shape around the PARPA II, and there are clear, concerted efforts to increase harmonization and alignment of donor activity. Currently, 19 bi-lateral or multi-lateral donors (the Programme Aid Partnership or G19) provide direct budget support through a joint agreement signed in 2004. This is one of the largest joint programmes in size and in terms of the number of partners in Africa. The budget support accounts for approximately 25 percent of aid to the government. The Programme Aid Partnership is organized around 24 thematic areas or technical groups, in which the government, donors and CSOs participate to monitor progress against the PARPA II indicators—namely through a joint review process undertaken twice yearly.

26.   In addition to direct budget support, a Development Partners Group, formally established in 2003 and co-chaired by the UN RC and the World Bank Country Director, is the political forum where ambassadors and the heads of bi-lateral and multi-lateral organizations meet monthly. It is the united forum where donors can informally discuss and harmonize issues. Mozambique is also a pilot in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Harmonization and Alignment Initiative, and the OECD-DAC survey launched in the field was led by the RC Office.

---

[9] The Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Action, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Agriculture have developed their emergency response plans and are also engaged in disaster prevention and mitigation activities.

[10] Available online at www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mozambique-draft-cas.pdf, page 5 and Operational Plan of the UN System in Mozambique—2007-2009, page 6.

27.   Finally, UN representatives actively participate in various partner groups and coordination with the government in the context of wider development partnerships (with bi-lateral, multi-lateral, and non-governmental organization partners). There are 14 groups to which the United Nations is currently contributing, including in leading roles[11].

Composition and size of UNCT and relationship with NRAs

28.   The UN system in Mozambique comprises of eight resident agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and WHO) with international in-country presence and a UNAIDS Secretariat.. Twelve other agencies cover Mozambique with National Officer presence or from other countries, regional offices, or Headquarters (IFAD, ILO, UNDESA, UNEP, UNIDO, UNIFEM, UN-HABITAT, UNHCHR, UNOCHA, UNODCP, UNCDF, UNV)[12,13,14]. There are 422 UN staff in Mozambique[15]. In total, there are 23 agencies, including nine resident agencies and 14 NRA (with variable physical presence).

29.   Membership on the UNCT is restricted to head representatives of UN organizations accredited in Mozambique. A sub-set of the UNCT responds to emergencies, and they form part of the Humanitarian Country Team. An additional eight UN organizations are invited every three months to participate in meetings as part of an extended version of the core UNCT.

CCA and UNDAF

30.   The Common Country Assessment (CCA) is a tool used to analyze the national development situation and identify key development issues. It is intended to feed into, rather than duplicate, similar national work and priority-setting processes[16]. The UNCT decided collectively to refrain from conducting a CCA and instead use national assessments, as they wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to

---

[11] The groups are: HIV Partners Forum, Development Partners Group, Paris Declaration Working Group, Gender Coordination Group, Health Development Partners Group, Food Security Working Group, Education Sector Wide Approach, PAMS, GAS, Social Action Working Group, PROAGRI Partners Working Group, Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Country Coordination Mechanism, PARPA Human Capital Pillar, PARPA Cross Cutting Pillar.

[12] These organizations are spelled out in full in the list of Acronyms and Abbreviations.

[13] It is recognized that UNIDO has international representation although considered an NRA. The following agencies have National Officers: UNV, UNIDO, UN-HABITAT, UNCDF, ILO, IFAD, and UNIFEM.

[14] Note that IOM and UNICRI are unique cases considered part of the UN family.

[15] UN RC Office Records.

[16] 'UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework: Guidelines for UN Teams Preparing a CCA and UNDAF', February 2007, page 13.

simplify and align the UNDAF process with the PARPA II (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper)—both in terms of content and cycle, covering the period from 2007 to 2009[17].

31.   The current UNDAF covers the period 2007-2009. Its priority areas were developed at the UNDAF strategic planning retreat held in November 2005. The GoM, development partners, and civil society representatives participated in this exercise. The 2005 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) progress report, the PARPA II, recommendations from the 2004 UNDAF mid-term assessment, and collective discussions from the strategic planning retreat led to the proposal of three substantive areas, or pillars, produced in the third generation UNDAF: governance, human capital, and HIV/AIDS. Subsequent to further review, a fourth pillar, economic development, was added in early 2007. The current UNDAF will likely be extended through 2010. A mid-term review is anticipated in late 2008.

32.   CSO involvement with the UN system occurs at multiple levels, but they are not specifically linked to the DaO. Following the 2005 Summit, UNDP took the lead to create a Civil Society Advisory Committee, and within this framework, there are four smaller groups that correspond to and focus on evaluating the UNDAF pillars. There is also a fifth group that monitors the progress of the UN reform. In addition, CSOs are represented on the UNDAF Steering Committee and meet quarterly with the UN Civil Society Focal Points in Executive Committee (ExCom) Agencies to discuss challenges, experiences, working relations, and how to further align programmes and projects to CSO capacity development needs (including financial gaps and partnership issues). These structures enable a direct interface between the UN system and CSOs.

Request of the GoM to be a part of the DaO

33.   The President and the Prime Minister of the Republic of Mozambique have expressed strong interest in and commitment to the success of the DaO initiative[18]. The Prime Minister is also a strong advocate for sharing experiences among all DaO pilot countries.

34.   An official government stocktaking report conducted in December 2007 confirms that the design of the One UN Programme is in line with GoM defined priorities (PARPA II). Further, the official letter reports that the revised third generation UNDAF supports the strategies outlined in the PARPA II. The official document summarizes preliminary outputs and outcomes of the One UN Programme, including the finalization of 'Delivering as One—Operational Plan of the UN System in Mozambique 2007-2009', the development of 11 joint programmes, a feasibility assessment of common premises, and a joint communications strategy[19]. The document concludes with main challenges and recommendations for successful implementation of UN reform.

---

[17] 'Delivering As One: Operational Plan of the UN System in Mozambique, 2007-2009', 3 December 2007, page. 8.

[18] The Prime Minister of Mozambique, Her Excellency Luisa Dias Diogo, served as the Co-Chair of the High-level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance, and the Environment. Letter to the UN Secretary-General dated 13 November, 2006.

[19] Letter number 4227/GMNEC/07 dated 24 December, 2007.

35.   DaO is reflected in the Operational Plan of the UN system in Mozambique. It began in January 2007, which was roughly half way through the agreed UNDAF. However, as of January 2008, the GoM has not signed the DaO Programme.

Participation of National Stakeholders in DaO pilot

36.   The GoM has created a Steering Committee for UNDAF, which is also the body responsible for advancing and overseeing the One UN pilot. It is composed of three GoM ministries: Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Finance, and Planning and Development. Line ministries and CSOs are only involved in *ad hoc* Steering Committees around the 11 joint programmes.

37.   Donors that were involved in the UNDAF formulation were initially invited to be part of coordination through the UNDAF Steering Committee. Donors that made contributions to the UNDAF and the One UN budget through their representations in Maputo showed special interest in being involved in the process. It was, however, decided that the donors would not be members of the Steering Committee of the One UN. Donors will likely be members of the DaO Reference Group.

Realization of the four Ones—One Leader, One Office, One Programme, One Budget—and expected changes

38.   In Mozambique, the UNCT has adequately planned and documented strategies to realize the four aims of DaO—One Programme, One Budgetary Framework, One Office and One Leader. In fact, a fifth aim, called Communicating as One, has also been created.

39.   Currently, six teams focus on developing the five aims: the UNCT, Programme Management Team (PMT), the Operational Management Team (OMT), the Communications Working Group, the Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group, and the One UN Task Force. The teams work together to "share vision and put in place mechanisms, processes, structures, and instruments that are geared to improving UN coherence"[20].

---

[20] Mozambique One UN Stocktaking Report, 2007.

C. Assessment of the substantive design of the DaO pilot

Substantive design of the DaO pilot

40.	This section of the report considers the structures and approaches put in place to develop the five aims at the country level: One Leader, One Programme, One Budget, One Office and One Communication. Possible challenges that directly influence the evaluability of the DaO in Mozambique are also noted and suggestions for resolving them are also presented.

One Leader

41.	The Terms of Reference and Core Management Principles for the UNCT have been developed, within which the scope, role and functions of the RC and his or her relationship to the UNCT are explicitly defined[21]. The UNCT adopted a 'cabinet' model, where the RC and UNCT act as the equivalent of 'Prime Minister' and 'Ministers' respectively.

42.	UNCT membership is reserved for heads of UN organizations represented in the country. Specialized agencies and NRAs that support Mozambique from their Headquarters, regional offices or through national officers, are explicitly excluded from UNCT membership.

43.	The cabinet model creates a two-tier participation in the DaO initiative within the UN system, which excludes many UN organizations from major decision making that essentially takes place in the UNCT. The semantics of the One Leader may also give rise to confusion with the leadership role that is to be exercised by the government.

One Office

44.	A feasibility study was conducted assessing the viability of, and the conditions for, building a UN House for all UN organizations based in Maputo. Currently, nine agencies and two additional entities are spread out over 11 different locations[22]. Calculations for total annual expenses for all agencies were estimated at USD 1,470,296[23]. Three sites were considered for UN House construction, and the residential compound proposed by WFP appears to be most suitable. There is overall agreement about the benefits of a UN House, but some note concerns about financial costs, particularly if the UN organization presently has free or subsidized office rent by GoM)[24].

45.	Based on the feasibility study, the UNCT decided that a long-term loan (ranging from 20 to 30 years) with mortgage payments was most appropriate, given needs and capacity. Further, the study estimated the cost for constructing a new office ranged from USD 7.9 million to USD 9.9 million.

---

[21] The Core Management Principles are equivalent to Code of Conduct for the UNCT.

[22] This figure includes the Secretariat for UNAIDS, RC Office, and the Field Security Office.

[23] The figure includes rent, security, electricity, water, telephone, internet, maintenance and fleet.

[24] FAO presently pays no rent for its offices.

Additional cost parameters were identified, including investment costs (up-front costs required to move into the new office) and transition costs (potential interest paid while the office is being built), but the parameters for savings are less evident. Estimates of annual savings based exclusively on annual recurrent costs ranged from approximately USD 300,000 to USD 580,000 per year. Construction will not commence before 2009 or 2010. A return on investment analysis—or a calculation of the estimated time required to recover costs from the overall investment of constructing a UN House—would greatly support future evaluation efforts.

46.   A feasibility study for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) was also conducted "to achieve maximum impact in cost reduction, harmonization of procedures, simplification of processes, and increased effectiveness and efficiency of ICT overall"[25]. The study establishes the parameters for expected one-time investments and operational costs for existing and new common services for a radio-room, Very High Frequency and Information Technology networks, and data connectivity, among other common services[26]. A thorough proposal was developed from the feasibility study that outlines a common budget, cost sharing parameters and estimated savings. Longer range planning is suggested that focuses on allocating resources purposively to fulfill all future resource requirements (in management, processes, technology, structures and instruments).

One Programme

47.   At the inception of DaO, the UNDAF 2007-2009 was on-going and the One Programme had to be created from within the UNDAF already formally signed by the GoM. The scope of the One UN therefore covers roughly 25 percent of the UNDAF. The One UN Programme addresses four substantive areas (economic development, governance, human capital, and HIV/AIDS) and is embodied by 11 joint programmes, of which 52.82 percent is funded[27]. The subject of substantive evaluation efforts in 2009-2011 will be limited to the assessment of the 11 joint programmes.

48.   The One Programme (as part of UNDAF) supports GoM strategies to reduce poverty, with four areas of strategic focus linking the joint programmes: policy and advocacy, normative and technical support, capacity development, and strengthening civil society partnerships. This focus, however, is not well supported in terms of a cohesive design around these elements, and specific outcomes linked to a higher strategic intent are not yet in place. The strategic focus areas have been operationalized in the joint programmes, however, so that activities can be used to gauge effectiveness once the higher-level results framework is refined.

49.   The PMT uses UNDG tools to establish quality assurance (ensuring consistency in logic, comparative advantage, strategy and format) and applies them to each joint programme on an individual basis. Some adaptation has been made to meet needs of specialized agencies as well. Though a

---

[25] ICT Support to "Delivering As One Un" Initiative Mozambique: Draft Implementation Plan.

[26] This study considered emergency related requirements.

[27] The UNDAF may not cover all agency mandates. For example, in the case of UNHCR, the United Nations is mandated to take care of refugees and therefore should not be included in the UNDAF. Other examples include regional programmes, worldwide initiatives and South-South cooperation.

much-needed practice, the information secured through the Quality Assurance Forms does not enable one to document and monitor the variability in approaches that will emerge while implementing the joint programmes. For example, there are questions inquiring about the joint programmes' consistency and alignment with GoM implementation strategies, but documentation of intra UN organization implementation strategies, coherence and partnerships are not yet present. Process indicators monitoring the degree to which all partners are moving toward DaO are not included. Such information would enhance the evaluability of DaO. For instance, process indicators could reflect the number or proportion of joint activities undertaken or funds expended jointly rather than a single agency reporting its contribution to a joint activity.

50.   In summary, the One Programme as an aggregation of the 11 joint programmes around the areas of strategic focus does not yet have well developed objectives and indicators to measure results in these terms at a later stage.

One Budgetary Framework

51.   Nearly all financial contributions have been consolidated, including core and unmarked funds for the UNDAF, including the joint programmes, as well as for change management in One UN Budgetary Framework. The One Budgetary Framework provides an overview of total programme resource availability for the UNDAF, disaggregated by UN organization and UNDAF pillar.

52.   In addition, a One Fund has been created for the funding the 11 joint programmes and for change management. The One Fund includes resources for joint programmes and the budget for change management, ICT, finance, procurement and administration, human resources, protocol, communicating as one, common premises, the RC Office staff, and other related activities (such asTown Halls, retreats, and meetings). The operational plan reflecting the One Fund has not been signed[28].

53.   The Terms of Reference for both budget instruments were formulated subsequent to a joint UN mission comprised of resource mobilization experts from several agencies[29]. The One Fund is currently administered by UNDP. It is expected that this arrangement will continue in the future. The Letter of Agreements and Memorandum of Understanding forms have been tailored to support fund administration.

54.   The administrative agent fee on incoming transfers amounts to one percent and the cost recovery fee is negotiated at seven percent, which may make the Fund unsustainable in the future, as the administrative cost is likely to exceed that rate. The transaction costs for the One Fund's administration should be monitored closely, so that future cost analyses are accurate and available for future evaluation efforts.

55.   A Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy has been developed to guide the UNCT to strategically leverage and raise funds for both the UNDAF and One Programme. It outlines the underlying principles

---

[28] Spanish funds have been pledged to contribute to the One Fund for USD 4 million but cannot be spent until the GoM signs the Operational Plan.

[29] The mission took place in April 2007 and included representatives from the following agencies: UNDP, UNFPA, WFP, UNESCO, UNIDO and UNICEF.

for establishing and maintaining donor relations to support the Budgetary Framework and the One Fund, including actions required to secure emergency funding (for example, from the Central Emergency Response Fund). The UNCT has begun to formulate targets designed to track the levels of unfunded/gap portions, and they appear specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). The composition, roles, and responsibilities of the Resource Mobilization Task Force members are important and need guidelines. Such guidelines would establish which agency representative advocates for donor support and for how long. Having such a guide would facilitate future evaluation efforts.

One Communication Strategy

56.   The Communication Working Group completed its Terms of Reference. It primarily communicates the vision and results of DaO through a newsletter called JUNTOS, among other communication products. Creating a platform through which to strategically communicate changes and achievements is innovative, but greater emphasis should be placed on promoting exchange among UN organizations[30], between the United Nations and donors, and between the United Nations and national partners in specific areas that would allow for a more meaningful process evaluation in the future. There is no evidence for capacity development of the UN system with national partners concerning communication strategies related to the DaO. There is room for improvement on how national ownership and leadership in the DaO initiative is reflected in the One UN communication strategy.

Reflection of national ownership and leadership in the design of DaO pilot

57.   The President, Prime Minister and the Mission of the Republic of Mozambique to the UN express strong commitment to DaO. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, the Ministry of Planning and Development, and to a lesser extent, the Ministry of Finance showed a general understanding of DaO. DaO was intended to make the United Nations a more efficient partner to the government through reductions in fragmentation, duplication and transaction costs. Some officials noted that they perceived the benefits of DaO to bring efficiencies in time management (that is, fewer meetings and reports) and financial resources administration. The GoM perceived that savings could become reassigned to programme resources. Additional government expectations linked to DaO included improved access to the richness of UN coverage, expertise in good practices in key development areas, improved resource mobilization from non-traditional sources, and an elevated influence of the United Nations as a neutral development partner.

58.   However, representatives from the line ministries had considerably less clarity about how DaO would be carried out. They were unaware of the institutional procedures subject to change to support DaO. UN stakeholders confirmed that GoM capacity was insufficient to effectively drive and lead DaO, as line ministries were unable to articulate vision on what the UN system should deliver or how. Further, within GoM, there is no functional institutional platform upon which to create vision, exchange information, resolve difficulties, or negotiate parameters against which to measure success or failures.

---

[30] Additional Town Hall meetings developed for UN organization exchange would broaden support and understanding for DaO.

59.   GoM representatives expressed a need for additional time and specific assistance to make the philosophy underpinning DaO more 'transformative'. Technical assistance to enable national partners to carry out concrete, actionable steps in support of DaO was requested. Others noted that DaO could be strengthened if UN representatives used One Language, whereby UN organizations providing substantively different technical assistance or playing variable roles could all speak a common language. The challenge of national ownership and leadership greatly influences the evaluability of DaO and should be addressed through improved institutional coordination on the national side.

Responsiveness to country needs and priorities

60.   The UNDAF, including the DaO joint programmes, are broadly responsive to national needs and priorities. However, the UN system is broader in terms of mandates, resources and expertise than what is currently covered in the UNDAF and, to a larger extent, the One UN Programme (that is, the 11 joint programmes). At the start of the DaO pilot, a fourth pillar, economic development was added to the UNDAF, offering an opportunity to respond to national needs and priorities not sufficiently covered by the UNDAF in the past. The fourth pillar in particular would mobilize contributions from specialized agencies and NRAs. While making the UN system potentially more responsive to a broader range of national needs and priorities, this inclusiveness carries the risk that the UN contribution becomes more diversified and less focused, which may run counter to the challenge of greater coherence of the DaO initiative.

Articulation of strategic intent

61.   The One Programme (as part of UNDAF) supports GoM strategies to reduce poverty, strengthen democratic governance, and achieve equitable growth and development. However, the One Programme lacks a common substantive vision, strategic intent and cohesive design. A common vision statement expressing a common purpose, substance and approach of the UN contribution based on its comparative advantage in the particular country would be helpful. The next UNDAF, which will commence in 2010 or 2011, should include a strategic intent that would describe the common substantive focus of the contribution of the UN system in the country.

62.   The UNCT indicated that the quality, coherence and national ownership of the next UNDAF through an improved design process should be a major outcome of the DaO initiative. A statement reflecting strategic intent along these lines will be necessary for meaningful evaluation efforts in the future. The strategic intent should articulate the common and unique contribution of the UN system based on its comparative advantage to poverty reduction and development in Mozambique.

63.   Given the absence of a common focus of the One UN Programme, it is difficult to understand the rationale of the selection of the 11 joint programmes. They are articulated around four substantive pillars of the PARPA II, but lack explicit references to a common denominator of the specific UN contribution, though all are embedded in the current UNDAF. In a possible future evaluation, it would have to be demonstrated to what extent these programmes are more relevant and more efficient than projects and programmes implemented outside the One Programme but within the UNDAF. At present, there are no benchmarks for such an evaluation.

64.   In preparation for the UNEG process evaluation, the UNCT should further refine how the consolidation of efforts and a clear articulation of the UN system's unique contribution and comparative advantage consistently lead to more efficient performance.

M&E system

65.   The Country Programme Action Plan (produced by all ExComs every four years) elaborates on the outputs of the UNDAF and is subject to annual reviews. All ExCom organizations produce annual work plans. All activities need to correspond to the Country Programme Action Plan - outputs and annual work plans are reviewed yearly.

66.   This approach is juxtaposed against the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks set up within each of the 11 joint programmes, which draw from the Country Programme Action Plans performance frameworks but rebundle indicators and performance targets according to joint programme designs. Currently, each joint programme is designated to undergo an independent evaluation, each of which is to be shaped according to the line ministries involved in it. As such, they are designated as 'sectoral evaluations'.

67.   It is not clear how the rebundling of joint programme results frameworks will be determined for future evaluations. Annual progress reviews of joint programmes are to be encompassed in the broader UNDAF annual reviews. These overlapping M&E frameworks and plans need further rationalization to arrive at a consolidated approach that limits and focuses the results for which the DaO can be held accountable. Finally, with less than half of joint programmes approved by the government as of January 2008 and just over half of the total resources in place for implementation, the basis upon which to gauge progress and results remains unclear.

68.   There is also a need to find balance between an inordinate amount of information that can assist in determining (in the future) if and how the DaO is more relevant and efficient as compared to the prior situation. There is also a need for more systematic documentation of how programme processes have changed through greater strategic alliance of UN organizations, versus practices followed under the broader UNDAF programme of work. Only with more rigorous documentation of before and after practices will evaluators be able to ascertain the benefits and costs of programmatic change in clearer terms by 2009.

69.   A concept note outlines the basic provisions related to the M&E of the UN system reform, which includes core success factors against which to measure administrative and operational change management. An annex details core success factors defined along the five Ones, and six methods have been identified to address when and how often data will be collected to measure the degree to which the One UN programme is performing efficiently.

70.   In essence, the core success factors selected reflect the basic parameters against which to monitor and evaluate change management. The current draft document draws heavily on UN internal aspects and sets measurement largely based on the perceptions of UNCT members as to how well processes are working. The framework, which is still under development, does not yet include monitoring indicators addressing longer term targets and specific process milestones to be achieved over designated time-frames, nor does it anticipate the need for more objective, trend-oriented data to capture relative

shifts in how changes are taking shape across the various UN organizations. Given the importance of improving processes for external government and CSO partners, M&E indicators capturing these dimensions also deserve inclusion.

71.   Assessment of efficiency and savings targets are anticipated to take place continually, but the M&E system should include information required to calculate costs and benefit analyses in 2009.

72.   The organizational approaches taken for the 11 joint programmes are diverse, and there is potential to learn from an assessment of what is and is not working to gather lessons learned and good practices linked to the various cases. For this, qualitative information outlining these differences will be needed. What joint programme experiences could be used to illustrate where DaO has worked effectively and where DaO has been less effective? In addition, in what way does DaO in Mozambique enable the UN to respond in a more flexible manner to help with priority needs?

Other substantive evaluability parameters

73.   In the case of emergency, forthcoming evaluation efforts may consider questions related to the appropriateness and relevance of steps taken to reduce the vulnerability of flood and drought victims as One UN or the degree to which the government's capacity was strengthened as a result of the consolidated effort (including DaO and the cluster approach). The Joint Programme on Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Response may provide evaluators with a unique case through which to consider factors behind improved coherence and focus, which many be taking shape already under the initiative.

D. Assessment of the pilot process and implementation

National ownership and leadership of DaO process

74.   The GoM created a Steering Committee (comprised of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance, and Ministry of Planning and Development) to address planning and coordination. At this point there has been little involvement by GoM to facilitate the coordination of line ministries with the exception of *ad hoc* steering committees for joint programmes. The government expressed the need to not over-accelerate the DaO process given what it noted as inflexible institutional structures within the government and United Nations and varying levels of "openness" to instituting DaO on the UN system's part.

75.   There is a need to create a broader platform comprised of line ministries, CSOs and the private sector to develop a common vision around DaO and to define strategic intent (in terms of substance), objectives and results areas by which joint programmes could be evaluated. Not only will this enhance national ownership at the operational level and develop capacities, but it will also strengthen the evaluability of DaO.

Inclusiveness of national stakeholders

76.   CSO involvement in the emergent process of implementing UNDAF and the DaO initiative is extensive at multiple levels within the United Nations. Strengthening CSO capacity is an area well integrated within all UNDAF pillars and specifically formulated into one joint programme. Linked to the DaO initiative is the Civil Society Advisory Committee, composed of 25 members, which meets quarterly with the Country Management Team.

77.   While some CSO representatives have a general understanding about DaO, some noted that they were unclear about how the vision translates into specific activities in which they are involved. There is great diversity within the Civil Society Advisory Committee membership, and it was mentioned that having one voice the Committee is important. CSO representatives noted that a 'road map' is not yet available to them and the pace of DaO has been fast with limited time to innovate. In preparation for the process evaluation, it is important to continue promoting CSO partnerships and to pay close attention to their capacity needs and ability to fulfill their roles.

Inclusiveness of UN stakeholders

78.   The UNDAF and DaO initiatives in Mozambique have brought UN organizations closer together within the UN system. DaO in particular has attempted to create space for specialized agencies and NRAs through the creation of a fourth pillar (economic development). The RC system is owned by the UN system to a certain extent, but the UNCT, composed primarily of ExCom agencies and a few resident

agencies, dominates the process[31]. Specifically, representatives from non-ExCom agencies (specialized and NRAs) reported that staff deficiencies and the high workload requirements to participate in meetings were the primary reasons limiting their participation. Some also noted inconsistencies in formulating a comprehensive programme strategy, while others raised concerns about the disregard for key issues that form part of the national priorities. In a quick, non-representative survey among resident and non-resident UN organizations [32], the overall rate of satisfaction with the DaO process averaged 6.5 on a scale ranging 1 to 10, where 1 is least satisfied and 10 is most satisfied (see Annex 4 for the survey used). The responses showed little deviation from the average, suggesting a general satisfaction level across agencies with the progress and approach taken so far.

Relationship with other forms of external assistance

79.   Donor stakeholders are diverse in Mozambique, many of which continue to fund UN action at individual organizational levels. The UN system's main partners within the DaO initiative, however, expressed frustration over the limited progress and transparency achieved so far. They noted that the speed at which the DaO is being carried out should be faster, action more focused, and efforts to consolidate functions and gain efficiencies more bold. There was a general sense that the approaches targeted 'low-hanging fruit', with too little attention being given to bolder, more systemic change. Several donors expressed reluctance to provide funding until the approaches are better articulated.

80.   These concerns contrast sharply with complaints from key national partners that the UNCT was moving too fast with the DaO. While direct participation of the donors in the Steering Committees may not be compatible with the aim of greatest possible national ownership and leadership of the process, there is need to increase communication and manage expectations involving greater efforts to keep national partners more informed and involved in other ways.

Support received from UNDGO, Headquarters and regional structures of UN organizations

81.   The RC Office was satisfied with UNDGO tools (the Memorandum of Understanding and Letter of Agreements), although their arrival was not timely, as DaO in Mozambique was farther along in the implementation process compared to other pilot countries. Tools were refined internally, and then each agency sent them to their respective Headquarters for review, commentary and approval, which ultimately delayed processes.

82.   Other support included training and joint missions which enabled staff to understand experiences about the progress and innovations from other pilots, receive feedback on DaO in Mozambique's systems. The RC Office was unaware of some of the support available from UN organizations' regional entities.

---

[31] These resident agencies are FAO (leading the Economic Development Pillar), UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNHCR, and WHO.

[32] Of the respondents, approximately two thirds were members of the UNCT and one third outside the UNCT but present in the country.

To evaluate support from the Headquarters level, key decisions that Headquarters needed to make should be prioritized and charted to establish a map of which decisions were delayed, at what level, and for how long. For instance, agency Headquarters did not authorize harmonized financial accounting procedures and system integration. The process and resources required to harmonize systems could be charted out in a matrix to facilitate subsequent evaluation of what was feasible versus what was desirable. In addition, several UN staff mentioned the continued inconsistencies between what their Headquarters was expecting of them in terms of individual performance and what was being asked of them to support the DaO pilot. Likewise, there was a lack of clarity in terms of how DaO outcomes would be understood by Headquarters—what would be rewarded and what would be seen as disappointing. Indicators linked to performance are needed to ensure an impartial and standard approach across UN organizations regarding staff support for DaO work.

Joint programmes and joint programming

83.   Of the 11 joint programmes developed, four are signed: Building Capacity of CSOs, including communication for empowerment; HIV Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS: Strengthening the HIV and AIDS Response in Mozambique; Environmental Mainstreaming and Adaptation to Climate Change; and Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality. The 1 joint programmes have a budget of USD 113 million (25 percent of UNDAF), and there is an unfunded gap of USD 53 million. The funding gap is based on cost of activities minus 'core' and 'non-core' (pledged) funds. Joint programme activities had not started as of January 2008. The UNCT will soon need to make decisions regarding start times and possible phasing of work based on resources in hand to ensure a reasonable match between results to be achieved against actual inputs realized. There is also a need to better document the processes being applied and expectations in terms of improved strategic alliances between UN organizations as well as value added in the form of substantive results.

Assessment of progress on the implementation of the five DaO aims

One Leader

84.   For practical reasons and to ensure that there was no potential for, or perception of, a conflict of interest, the RC moved into a separate office building. The RC Office is expanding its functions and capacities, the designs for which are still taking shape. As these are confirmed, opportunities should arise for assessing the added value of these approaches or the extent to which new functions may add bureaucratic layers and further overlap with existing capacities. The RC has also made attempts to establish an institutional firewall between the management of the UNDP programmatic role and management of the RC system. The separation has not taken shape as planned due to the absence of the UNDP country director (almost one year).

Appropriateness of the support systems and combined services

85.   The OMT has begun to promote common services by deliberately aiming first for low-hanging fruits, including common vehicle plates, medical services and security services outsourced to one sole provider; the establishment of a staff association, a common travel agency and banking system; one roster

of translators; standardized rates for consultants; and synchronized pay periods. The changes made so far have not required funding but have brought only marginal improvements in efficiencies, costs savings from which have been put back into programming. All agencies have also initiated the adoption of Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers to Implementing Partners as well as electronic bank transfers. Construction on the UN House will not commence before 2009 or 2010 and much of the more substantive changes envisioned are linked to its completion.

One Programme-joint programmes

86.   In late 2007, following the design of the UNDAF, there was a production of the draft document 'Delivering as One—Operational Plan of the UN System in Mozambique 2007-2009', which elaborates action plans corresponding to the UNDAF goals, indicators and outcomes. However, implementation has only recently started. Some of the UNDAF outputs and outcomes measuring the process of programme implementation are not SMART. The joint programme evaluation parameters should also include the process of establishing a partnership with GoM and CSOs where appropriate.

One Fund/One Budgetary Framework

87.   Contributions to the UNDAF and One Programme have been consolidated into the Budgetary Framework and One Fund. While the contributions have been identified to the extent possible, the means by which to proceed with disbursement of yet unfunded parts is not yet decided. The performance aspects by which to assess the process are still not clear. Guidelines should be developed that link performance to funds disbursement, so that the process is not subjected to personalities and those already well represented in the country are not likely to be funded first.

Change management of DaO and strategic intent

88.   The RC Office includes a new staffing matrix to support DaO. Some positions are currently under recruitment but will not be available until the GoM signs the Operational Plan. Given these restrictions, it is premature to assess progress but this should be possible once functions are established.

Investment and transaction costs

89.   Through five working groups[33], the OMT tracks current (annual) expenses and incurred and projected investment costs. Since the changes made thus far have not borne any costs, investment and transaction cost analyses have not yet been launched. However, when funding becomes available to harmonize finance, human resources, ICT, and procurement systems, all costs associated with instituting the change (investment costs) and maintaining the current systems until the new system is integrated (transaction costs) are expected to be documented and accounted for. In addition, rough estimates of the benefits of using the new system (savings) should be calculated. These main elements should facilitate some level of cost-savings analyses in future evaluation efforts, though the form and time-frame of larger scale institutional change is not yet articulated and much of what is under consideration remains contingent on factors outside of UNCT control.

---

[33] Working groups focus on the following themes: finance, human resources, ICT, procurement, and protocol (added later).

E. Identification of national resources to support future evaluations

90.   The mission identified a consulting firm capable of undertaking the future process evaluation, and one evaluation consultant referred by the National Statistics Institute (INE). However, more options will be needed (see Annex 5 for national resources to support future evaluations).

91.   The PARPA II is an essential document to refer to during the forthcoming process evaluation, as the substantive areas around which to measure DaO relevance, efficiency and impact are clearly elaborated. The list of key reference documents consulted should also prove useful (see Annex 4).

92.   In preparation for the process evaluation, please refer to the list of persons met (Annex 3) as a guide when formulating a stakeholder analysis.

F. Overall evaluability assessment of the DaO pilot

93.   The DaO Pilot in Mozambique has taken a somewhat pragmatic approach, given its introduction mid-course during an ongoing UNDAF. That said, from the documentation reviewed, there is compelling evidence of a high level of effort and commitment from UN staff supporting the DaO initiative.

94.   Once approved, the individual joint programmes composing the One Programme approach will be evaluable. At a higher level, the UNCT will need to develop a clearer statement and strategy regarding the strategic intent of the overall pilot's design and clearer criteria for joint programmes that are part of the One Programme, in preparation for the forthcoming evaluation exercises of 2009-2011. One such intent being discussed is the aim of a substantially improved quality and process for the 2010 UNDAF plan being a major outcome of the current pilot DaO. In addition, the strategic intent could also be articulated and documented as to how DaO processes have changed through strategic alliances of UN organizations.

95.   To address capacity and awareness issues, there is the need to articulate a more deliberate strategy and outcome for strengthening and institutionalizing national ownership and leadership. One component of this may be a more formal DaO Steering Committee that, in addition to the three key ministries, better links to line ministries and CSOs and regularly communicates with donors.

96.   Although the DaO processes have taken to heart the goal of inclusiveness, and all UN organizations are able to participate in many of the discussions and decisions, there may be need to revisit institutional arrangements and consider options for a more expanded UNCT that can regularize means of incorporating the contributions of specialized agencies and NRAs.

97.   With regard to the five aims, the absence of specific end targets with time-frames and interim progress markers could limit the scope and usefulness of a process evaluation in 2009. The RC Office should move to fill this gap and incorporate various contingencies to address risk factors. In addition, the existing draft indicators for monitoring progress should draw on both objective and subjective parameters and include an external dimension to capture process effects on others outside UN Mozambique. Starting situations for business practices such as human resources, resource mobilization, communication, and information technology, also deserve documentation and data should be compiled to provide trend analysis over the three-year period.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

UNEG Evaluation of DaO UN Pilots

Terms of reference for evaluability study in eight DaO Pilot Countries

(January -March 2008)

Background

In November 2006, the Secretary-General's High-level panel on UN System-wide coherence published the report 'Delivering as One'. It put forward a comprehensive set of recommendations including the establishment of One UN pilot initiatives at the country level, with One Leader, One Programme, One Budget, and where appropriate, One Office. The recommendations were largely grounded in General Assembly resolution 59/250 adopted in 2004, which provided guidance for joint offices and a rationalization of UN country presence.

The recommendations to establish pilots at the country level were met with great interest in the UN system, and by the end of December 2006, eight governments had expressed interest in joining this initiative. By February 2007, eight countries had asked the UNDP Administrator in his capacity of chair of the UNDG to support their pilot initiatives: Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

Following discussions by the High-level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) on 20-21 March 2007, the Chief Executives Board, in its meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, on 20 April 2007, called on UNEG to undertake an evaluation of the pilots that would focus on design and progress, to be followed at a later date by an evaluation of results and impact[1].

To this end, UNEG established a management group to oversee the design and implementation of the evaluation, co-chaired by the heads of the evaluation services of UNICEF and FAO[2]. A comprehensive process of consultations was initiated that resulted in the basic design of the evaluation. Main elements of the design were, as a first step, an evaluability study to be reported in March 2008 covering country and UN systemic mechanisms put in place for implementing the reforms. A second step would be a process evaluation of the pilot experience to be accomplished by September 2009. The last step would be an evaluation of the results and impacts of the pilot experience, for delivery to the HLCP by September 2011.

---

[1] Exact phrasing "called upon UNEG to urgently establish the substantive parameters and process for the evaluation of pilots, and requested to be kept fully informed of progress."

[2] A DaO evaluation interim manager/coordinator was appointed as from 1 January 2008 who is a senior staff member of the Evaluation Office of UNICEF.

At its meeting on 20-21 September 2007, the HLCP endorsed the overall evaluation in its report to the Chief Executives Board as well as the first step, an assessment of the evaluability of the Delivering as One Initiative by March 2008. This study would assess the process to date, plans, targets and tools. The study would provide lessons and independent advice to country teams to improve the quality of their planning. UNEG agreed that "the evaluability study to be completed in March 2008 would be substantive and would examine both the scope of the plans drawn up by country teams and criteria such as those indicated by members of the HLCP (including, inclusivity, diversity, openness of the process and how the single programme corresponded to national priorities)". This same meeting stressed the need for timely feedback from evaluation for management decision making on the future of Delivering as One.

The evaluability studies to be conducted by UNEG will benefit from a separate initiative launched by the Deputy Secretary-General to request governments of the eight pilot countries to provide additional information on the anticipated benefits and impact on national ownership so far. These assessments by governments will be complemented by a 'stocktaking' exercise to be conducted by the chair of the UNDG with UNCTs and organizations overseeing the pilots.

The new resolution of the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December 2007 encourages the Secretary-General to support programme country pilots countries to evaluate and exchange their experiences with the support of UNEG. The emphasis is hence on UN system support to the evaluation by the programme countries themselves. In addition, the resolution calls for an independent evaluation of lessons learned from these efforts for consideration of Member States, without prejudice to a future inter-governmental decision.

The self-assessments of the DaO pilots by the governments of the eight countries are now fully mandated by the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review and provide an important frame of reference for the UNEG evaluability studies. On the one hand, the UNEG evaluation process will closely follow these self-assessments and possible exchanges of experiences among DaO pilot countries. On the other hand, emerging findings of the UNEG evaluability studies can be brought to the attention of DaO pilot countries and contribute to the self-assessments.

Evaluation of the DaO Programme and pilots (2007-2011)

The main elements of the evaluation design include the following:

a) An evaluability study to be carried out at the country and UN systemic levels, that is, a technical assessment of design of the pilots and mechanisms put in place for implementing the reforms (mission reports are to be made available as soon as possible and the synthesis report is due in March 2008)[3].

b) In 2009, a synthesis of the self-assessments done by the pilots during 2008 and a UN systemic process evaluation of the pilot initiative for delivery to the HLCP (the synthesis

___

[3] Due to a delay in the start-up of the DaO evaluation process and constraints to the planning of country visits the overall study is not likely to be completed before the end of April 2008.

report is due in September 2009 and will contribute to the preparation of the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review[4] of 2010).

c) An overall evaluation of the results and impacts of the pilot experience, for submission to the HLCP (due in September 2010/2011).

First step: Conduct of evaluability studies (January-March 2008)

The evaluability study of the Delivering as One of each of the pilots and as a whole is a technical assessment of the basic parameters that will make it possible to fully evaluate at a later stage both the results of the programmes and of the pilots, and of the processes that will lead to these results. These parameters comprise:

a) Quality of the design for the achievement of results, that is, the existence of clear objectives and indicators to measure results at a later stage.

b) Initial appraisal of processes for the optimal involvement of relevant national and international stakeholders (including the governments of recipient countries; civil society; the private sector; UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies; and external aid agencies).

c) Existence of adequate sources of information to assess the achievement of results and indicators as well as of the required processes.

d) National ownership and leadership in the evaluation process, identification of independent and credible evaluators in pilot countries who can be involved in the evaluation of process and results of the Delivering as One pilots at a later stage.

The purposes and objectives of the evaluability study include the following:

a) Support governments and other stakeholders in the pilot countries as well UNCTs and the UN development system in identifying strengths and weaknesses in the design of their respective Delivering as One initiatives to inform immediate corrective measures, monitor progress and enable self-assessments.

b) Allow governments, other stakeholders as well as the UNCT and the UN development system to receive immediate feedback on processes for the involvement of relevant and international stakeholders.

c) Allow stakeholders to establish baselines and progress measurement during the implementation of the pilots for the assessment of results achievement.

d) Allow governments, other stakeholders, and the UN development system as well as UNEG to identify national evaluators in pilot countries.

---

[4] The Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review was undertaken by the Economic & Social Committee of the United Nations.

e) Allow UNEG to compile information from all eight pilot countries and to synthesize information as part of a comprehensive evaluability study that will facilitate the planning of subsequent stages of the overall evaluation.

Conduct of evaluability study field missions to pilot countries (January-March 2008)

The field missions to pilot countries will take place within a very short timeframe (January-March 2008). Due to time constraints, some will have to take place in parallel.

The field missions to pilot countries will be consultative of the national government, other national and external stakeholders, all members of the UNCT and, where possible, NRAs and funding agencies.

The mission will begin its work with a series of briefings on the UNEG evaluation and will hold wind-up sessions to share its main findings and conclusions with the main stakeholders in line with purposes and objectives described above.

The reports of the missions will be provided to the UNEG coordinator within 10 days of the completion of the country visit (period to be adjusted where country visits are organized back-to-back). The reports will be structured around the parameters of the evaluability study described above. UNEG will share the reports with concerned stakeholders as soon as possible.

Requests from UNCTs to address weaknesses and shortcomings in the design and process of the Delivering as One will be shared with appropriate support mechanisms, for example UNDGO.

Conduct of the evaluability study of the UN system support to Delivering as One (January-March 2008)

Measures taken by the UN organizations to support the Delivering as One initiative will be mapped. The evaluations done by UN organizations in order to distill lessons and best practices will be reviewed. The information gathered will enable UNEG to prepare the evaluation design of the process evaluation to be conducted during 2008-2009 on the readiness of the whole UN system to support the Delivering as One Initiative.

The report to be submitted in March 2008 will cover the adequacy of the scope of the plans drawn by the UNCTs and the UN system as a whole. It will include the criteria indicated by HLCP (for example, response to national needs and priorities, inclusiveness, diversity and openness of the process).

Annex 1.a Mission checklist and coverage of the reports of the field missions

A. Basic facts—history, context and scope of the DaO pilot

a. What was the pre-pilot situation with respect to CCA, UNDAF and the RC system?

b. When and how was the DaO pilot conceptualized and how has it been implemented? Which national stakeholders are involved in the process (government, civil society, private sector)?

c. What are the priorities of the government concerning DaO?

d. What has changed since the pilot started? What has been the progress in the implementation of the 'Ones'?

e. What organizations are members of the UNCT? What is the role of NRAs?

f. What is the size of the UN programme, its main characteristics and its relative importance to the country (taking into account ODA, South-South cooperation, etc.)?

B. Assessment of the substantive design of the DaO pilot (4-5 pages)

a. What is the vision of the government and other national partners concerning DaO and what are specific expectations?

b. To what extent does the UN system respond to specific needs and priorities of the country? How 'tailor-made' is the UN contribution?

c. What is the relationship of the DaO pilot with national development plans and strategies (including poverty reduction strategy papers, sector-wide approaches, and national plans related to internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs)?

d. To what extent is there a strategic intent for the totality of the contribution of the UN development system?

e. What is the relationship of the DaO pilot with other forms of external aid (e.g., budget support)?

f. How 'SMART' (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound) are the objectives and indicators of the DaO pilot?

g. How adequate is the M&E system?

h. What other parameters need to be taken into consideration to assess the design of the DaO pilot?

C. Initial assessment of the DaO pilot processes and implementation (4-5 pages)

a. To the extent that is there a formal agreement between the government and the UN development system concerning the objectives, the plan, and at what level in government decisions are being taken, what are the scope and main features of that agreement?

b. What is the process in place at the national level to plan and develop the pilot concerning, for example, interaction between various parts and levels of government and the UN system, interaction of the UN system with other national stakeholders (civil society, private sector), and interaction between the UN system and other external aid agencies?

c. How does the UN system interact with other forms of external aid (OECD-DAC and South/South)? How is the UN system perceived by other partners?

d. How are needs and priorities of the countries reflected? What needs to be responded to by NRAs of the UN development system?

e. How is joint programming conducted (CCA/UNDAF)? What is the importance of joint programmes?

f. What support has there been to the process from UNDG, UNDGO and from UN regional teams and Headquarters?

g. What has been the progress in the implementation of the Ones (One Programme, One Leader, One Budgetary Framework, One Office)?

h. To what extent do the support systems (for example, financial and administrative procedures, human resources, information technology, procurement) support the DaO?

i. How can the cost of the DaO pilot be assessed? How is the cost perceived by different stakeholders?

j. What are the basic parameters that need to guide an ulterior evaluation of process?

D. Assessment of the adequacy of sources of information

a. What are the key documents that guide the DaO pilot (government policies and strategies, UN programme documents, budgetary frameworks, documents of individual UN organizations, etc.)?

b. What national and international stakeholders need to be interviewed for a full-fledged process evaluation?

c. What other methods (apart from document review and interviews) should be considered to allow for greater triangulation and objectivity of information (e.g., field visits, surveys)?

Note: The mission will also contact national institutions and individuals that are specialized in evaluation and that can potentially play a role in subsequent stages of the evaluation process.

Annex 1.b Views of stakeholders on the start-up process

The mission will meet with representatives of government, the UN system and other major stakeholders, including donors and seek their views on the following.

Objectives and strategic intent of the One UN pilots and the coordinated or joint programme:

    a.   Are all agencies and the government well aware of the objectives and strategic intent?

    b.   Do all agencies and the government agree on what the objectives of the pilot are?

    c.   If not, what are the divergent views?

    d.   Do all partners fully subscribe to the objectives?

With respect to plan(s) for achieving the objectives of the pilot, the coordinated or joint programme, budget and relationship to the government and UN priorities:

    a.   Are all partners fully aware of the content and the implications?

    b.   Do all partners subscribe to the plans, budgets, etc.?

    c.   If any, what are the divergences of view?

One Leader:

    a.   How is this working in practice?

Participation and process:

    a.   What is the level of participation as viewed by each of the stakeholders, for their own participation and for the participation of others?

    b.   What is the level of satisfaction of each of the stakeholders with the system in place for development of concepts and plans and for decision making?

Support:

    a.   What is the level of satisfaction with the central UN system guidance, support with tools and methods, and monitoring and reporting requirements?

    b.   Individual agencies of the UN system?

    c.   How do concerned government departments view their roles in the pilot?

Annex 2: Mission programme in Mozambique, 28 January -1 February 2008

Thursday 24 January			
Time	Activity	Location	Remarks
10h45	Arrival of Ms. Tristi Nichols—Flight SA 142 from Johannesburg		
Friday 25 January			
08hrs30	Meeting with FAO Representative	FAO	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Ms. Maria Zimmermann, FAO Representative
10hrs00	Meeting with the Communications Officer in the UN RC Office	RC Office	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Luis Zaqueu, UN RC Office Communications Officer
Saturday 26 January			
20h10	Arrival of Ms. Carla Henry—Flight TM 306 from Johannesburg		
Sunday 27 January			
12h25	Arrival of Mr. Lucien Back—Flight KQ 440 from Nairobi		
Monday 28 January			
08h30	Meeting with the UN RC	RC Office	Mission members Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant Mayisha Mangueira, RC Office Coordinator
09h00	Briefing meeting with UNCT	RC Office	Mission Members UNCT members (UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and WHO)

10h00	Meeting with donors	Embassy of Spain	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			H.E. Ambassador of the Netherlands, Mr. Frans Bijvoet Lamothe
			H.E. Ambassador of Spain, Mr. Juan M. Molina
11h00	Meeting with IFAD Country Officer	FAO	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Mr. Custódio Mucavele, IFAD Country Officer—**cancelled**
12h00	Lunch		
13h00	Meeting with UN-HABITAT Country Programme Manager	UN-HABITAT	Mission members
			Mr. Jaime Comiche, UN-HABITAT Country Project Manager
14h00	Meeting with the Director of Directorate of International Organizations and Conferences (DOIC)	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Mission members
			Mr. Manuel Gonçalves, Director of DOIC
15h00	Briefing meeting with CSOs	Service Center	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Isabel Ramos, CSOs UN Coordinator
			Mr. Leonardo Simão, Joaquim Chissano Foundation
			Ms. Terezinha da Silva, Wilsa
			Ms. Graca Samo, Fórum Mulher
			Ms. Eufriginia Manoela, Grupo da Divida
			Eduardo Munhequete, National Youth Council

16hrs00	Meeting with UN Task Force	RC Office	Mission members
			Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC
			Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative
			Mr. Frans Va de Ven, FAO Adviser
			Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant
			Ms. Catherine Masaka, Chair of the OMT
			Ms. Ratidzai Ndlovu, Chair of the PMT
Tuesday 29 January			
08h00	Meeting with ILO/UNDP Liaison Officer	UNDP	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Celeste Guambe, ILO/UNDP Liaison Officer
09h00	Meeting with UNICEF Representative	UNICEF	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative
10h00	Meeting with Ministry of Public Work and Housing	National Directorate for Water	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Suzana Saranga Loforte, Deputy Director of National Directorate of Water
10h00	Meeting with M&E Reference Group Secretariat	RC Office	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Mayisha Mangueira, M&E RG Secretariat
11h00	Meeting with UNDP Country Director	UNDP Office	Mission members
			Ms. Naomi Kitahara, UNDP Country Director a.i
12h00	Lunch with Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant and Mayisha Mangueira, RC Office Coordinator		
13h00	Meeting with Mr. Karin Merali (civil society)	Hotel Polana	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Mr. Karim Merali, Director of Aga Khan Foundation

13h00	Meeting with Ministry of Interior	Ministry of Interior	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Lurdes Mabunda, Head of Dept., Victim Support Centers - **cancelled**
14h00	Meeting with the Ministry of Planning and Development	Ministry of Planning and Development 10th floor, flat 102	Mission members
			Mr. Gune, Deputy National Director of Planning and Development
16h00	Meeting with H.E. the Ambassador of Japan	Embassy of Japan	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			H. E. Ambassador of Japan, Mr. Tatsuya Miki
			Ms. Rei Sakumoto, Coordinator for Economic Cooperation
16h00	Meeting with UNFPA	UNFPA	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Petra Lantz, UNFPA Representative
17h00	Meeting with UNCEF M&E Officer	UNICEF	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Mr. Stefano Visani, M&E Officer
Wednesday 30 January			
08h00	Meeting with UNAIDS Country Coordinator	UNAIDS	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Mr. Mauricio Cysne , UNAIDS Country Coordinator
09h00	Meeting with UNHCR Representative	UNHCR	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Victoria Akyeampong, UNHCR Representative
10h00	Meeting with WHO Representative	WHO	Mission members
			Dr. El Hadi Benzerroug, WHO Representative

			Dr. Abdul Moha, HIV/AIDS Country Officer
Monday 28 January			
08h30	Meeting with the UN RC	RC Office	Mission members Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant Mayisha Mangueira, RC Office Coordinator
09h00	Briefing meeting with UNCT	RC Office	Mission Members UNCT members (UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and WHO)
10h00	Meeting with donors	Embassy of Spain	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO H.E. Ambassador of the Netherlands, Mr. Frans Bijvoet Lamothe H.E. Ambassador of Spain, Mr. Juan M. Molina
11h00	Meeting with IFAD Country Officer	FAO	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Custódio Mucavele, IFAD Country Officer—**cancelled**
12h00	Lunch		
13h00	Meeting with UN-HABITAT Country Programme Manager	UN-HABITAT	Mission members Mr. Jaime Comiche, UN-HABITAT Country Project Manager
14h00	Meeting with the Director of Directorate of International Organizations and Conferences (DOIC)	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Mission members Mr. Manuel Gonçalves, Director of DOIC
15h00	Briefing meeting with CSOs	Service Center	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.

			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Isabel Ramos, CSOs UN Coordinator
			Mr. Leonardo Simão, Joaquim Chissano Foundation
			Ms. Terezinha da Silva,Wilsa
			Ms. Graca Samo, Fórum Mulher
			Ms. Eufriginia Manoela, Grupo da Divida
			Eduardo Munhequete, National Youth Council
16h00	Meeting with UN Task Force	RC Office	Mission members
			Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC
			Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative
			Mr. Frans Va de Ven, FAO Adviser
			Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant
			Ms. Catherine Masaka, Chair of the OMT
			Ms. Ratidzai Ndlovu, Chair of the PMT
Tuesday 29 January			
08h00	Meeting with ILO/UNDP Liaison Officer	UNDP	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Celeste Guambe, ILO/UNDP Liaison Officer
09h00	Meeting with UNICEF Representative	UNICEF	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative
10h00	Meeting with Ministry of Public Work and Housing	National Directorate for Water	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Ms. Suzana Saranga Loforte, Deputy Director of National Directorate of Water
10h00	Meeting with M&E Reference Group Secretariat	RC Office	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Mayisha Mangueira, M&E RG Secretariat

11h00	Meeting with UNDP Country Director	UNDP Office	Mission members Ms. Naomi Kitahara, UNDP Country Director a.i
12h00	Lunch with Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant and Mayisha Mangueira, RC Office Coordinator		
13h00	Meeting with Mr. Karin Merali (civil society)	Hotel Polana	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Mr. Karim Merali, Director of Aga Khan Foundation
13h00	Meeting with Ministry of Interior	Ministry of Interior	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Ms. Lurdes Mabunda, Head of Dept., Victim Support Centers - **cancelled**
14h00	Meeting with the Ministry of Planning and Development	Ministry of Planning and Development 10th floor, flat 102	Mission members Mr. Gune, Deputy National Director of Planning and Development
16h00	Meeting with H.E. the Ambassador of Japan	Embassy of Japan	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. H. E. Ambassador of Japan, Mr. Tatsuya Miki Ms. Rei Sakumoto, Coordinator for Economic Cooperation
16h00	Meeting with UNFPA	UNFPA	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Ms. Petra Lantz, UNFPA Representative
17h00	Meeting with UNCEF M&E Officer	UNICEF	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Stefano Visani, M&E Officer
Wednesday 30 January			
08h00	Meeting with UNAIDS Country Coordinator	UNAIDS	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Mr. Mauricio Cysne , UNAIDS Country Coordinator

09h00	Meeting with UNHCR Representative	UNHCR	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Ms. Victoria Akyeampong, UNHCR Representative
10h00	Meeting with WHO Representative	WHO	Mission members Dr. El Hadi Benzerroug, WHO Representative Dr. Abdul Moha, HIV/AIDS Country Officer
11h00	Meeting with WFP Representative	WFP	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Ken Davies, WFP Representative
12h00	Lunch		
13h00	Meeting with the Vice-President of the National Institute of Statistics (INE)	INE	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Valeriano Levene, Vice President of INE Ms. Destina Uinge, Director of Integration and Coordination, INE
14h00	Meeting with OMT	UNDP	Mission Members Catherine Masaka, OMT Chair (UNDP), Mr. Abilio Afleu (UNFPA), Mr. Karen Barsamian (WFP), Armando Paz (UNICEF), Ryan Pittock (WFP)
15h00	Meeting with UN Programme Management Team	UNFPA Office	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant PMT members (FAO, IFAD, RC Office, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIDO, WFP, and WHO)
18h30	Meeting with Ministry of Agriculture	Holiday Inn	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.

			Mr. Vitorino Xavier, Director of the National Directorate of Economics
Thursday, 31 January			
08h00	Meeting with Head of Department For International Development (DfID)	DfID	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Ms. Rachel Turner, Head of DfID
09h00	Meeting with UNESCO Representative	UNESCO	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Benoit Sossou, UNESCO Representative
09h00	Meeting with Norway Focal Point on the UN Reforms	Embassy of Norway	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Mr. Per Mogstad, Norway Focal Point on the UN Reforms
10h00	Meeting with the Deputy Executive Secretary of the National AIDS Council (NAC)	CNCS	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Mr. Diogo Milagre, Deputy Executive Secretary of NAC
11h00	Synthesis meeting with UNCT	RC Office	Mission members UNCT members (FAO, UNDP, UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP)
12h00	Lunch		
13h00	Meeting with UNIDO Programme Coordinator	UNIDO	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO Mr. Steven Dils, UNIDO Programme Coordinator
13h00	Meeting with Vice Minister of Public Works and Housing	Ministry of Public Works and Housing	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i. Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant Vice-Minister, H.E. Mr. Gabriel Muthisse
14h00	Meeting with UNCDF Programme Specialist	UNDP	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO

			Jacob Massuanganhe, UNCDF Programme Specialist
14h00	Meeting with the Ministry of Women and Social Action	Ministry of Women and Social Action	Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Mr. Agostinho Pessane, Permanent Secretary
			Mr. Sansao Buque, National Director for Planning and Cooperation
15h00	Meeting with the Ministry of Labour	Ministry of Labour	Ms. Carla Henry, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO
			Ms. Tristi Nichols, Consultant
			Mr. Anibal Lucas, Coordination Office Officer
			Jeronimo Pires Mahoque, Director of the Studies Department
15h00	Meeting with the Ministry of Education and Culture	Ministry of Education and Culture	Mr. Lucien Back, Evaluation Office, UNICEF, DaO Evaluation Manager a.i.
			Mr. Cremildo Binana, National Deputy Director of Planning and Cooperation
Friday 1 February			
08h00	Meeting on the Humanitarian Coordination Practices	RC Office	Mission members
			Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC
			Mr. Ken Davies, WFP Representative
			Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative
			Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant
09h30	Synthesis meeting with government officials	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Mission members
			Mr. Manuel Gonçalves, Director of DOIC
			Mr. Valeriano Levene, Vice President of INE
			Destina Uinge, Director of Integration and Coordination, INE
			Mr. Gune, Deputy National Director of Planning and

			Development
			Representative from the Ministry of the Environment
			Mr. Anibal Lucas, Coordination Office Officer
12h00	Lunch		
14h30	Departure: Pick up of Ms. Carla Henry at Holiday Inn to airport		
	Dinner with the UN RC, Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey		
Saturday 2 February			
10h00	Departure: Pick up of Ms. Tristi Nichols @ Holiday Inn to airport		
Sunday 3 February			
10h00	Departure: Pick up of Mr. Lucien Back @ Holiday Inn to airport		

Annex 3: People consulted

Government of Mozambique

Mr. Cremildo Binana, National Deputy Director of Planning and Cooperation, Ministry of Education and Culture

Mr. Sansao Buque, National Director for Planning and Cooperation, Ministry of Women and Social Action

Mr. Manuel Gonçalves , Director of the Directorate of International Organizations and conferences (DOIC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation

Mr. Gune, Deputy National Director of Planning, Ministry of Planning and Development

Mr. Valeriano Levene, Vice President of National Statistics Institute (INE)

Ms. Suzana Saranga Loforte, Water and Environmental Manager, Deputy National Director, Ministry of Public Works and Housing

Mr. Anibal Lucas, Coordination Office Officer, Ministry of Labour

Mr. Jeronimo Pires Mahoque, Director of the Studies Department, Ministry of Labour

Mr. Diogo Milagre, Deputy Executive Secretary of the National AIDS Council (NAC)

H.E. Mr. Gabriel Muthisse, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Public Works and Housing

Ms. Destina Uinge, Director of Integration and Coordination, National Statistics Institute (INE)

Mr. Vitorino Xavier, Director of the National Directorate of Economics, Ministry of Agriculture

UN organizations

Mr. Abilio Afleu, UNFPA

Ms. Victoria Akyeampong, UNHCR Representative

Mr. Karen Barsamian, WFP

Dr. El Hadi Benzerroug, WHO Representative

Mr. Jaime Comiche, UNHABITAT Country Project Manager

Mr. Mauricio Cysne, UNAIDS Country Coordinator

Mr. Ken Davies, WFP Representative

Mr. Steven Dils, UNIDO Programme Coordinator

Ms. Celeste Guambe, ILO/UNDP Liaison Officer

Ms. Naomi Kitahara, Acting UNDP Country Director

Ms. Petra Lantz, UNFPA Representative

Ms. Mayisha Mangueira, M&E RG Secretariat and RC Office Coordination Officer

Ms. Catherine Masaka, Chair of the OMT and UNDP

Mr. Jacob Massuanganhe, UNCDF Programme Specialist

Dr. Abdul Moha, HIV/AIDS Country Officer, WHO

Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN RC

Ms. Ratidzai Ndlovu, Chair of the PMT and UNFPA

Ms. Leila Pakkala, UNICEF Representative

Mr. Armando Paz, Chief of Operations, UNICEF

Mr. Ryan Pittock, Finance and Administration Officer, WFP

Ms. Isabel Ramos, CSOs UN Coordinator in RC Office

Mr. Peter Reeh, RC Special Assistant

Mr. Benoit Sossou, UNESCO Representative

Mr. Stefano Visani, M&E Officer for UNICEF

Mr. Luis Zaqueu, Communications Officer, RC Office

Ms. Maria José de Oliveira Zimmerman, FAO Representative in Mozambique and Swaziland

Donors

H.E. Ambassador of the Netherlands, Mr. Frans Bijvoet , Embassy of the Netherlands

H.E. Ambassador of Spain, Mr. Juan M. Molina Lamothe, Embassy of Spain

H. E. Ambassador of Japan, Mr. Tatsuya Miki, Embassy of Japan

Mr. Per Mogstad, Focal Point on the UN Reforms, Royal Norwegian Embassy

Ms. Rei Sakumoto, Coordinator for Economic Cooperation, Embassy of Japan

Ms. Rachel Turner, Head of Office of the Department for International Development (DfID) in Mozambique

CSOs

Ms. Eufriginia Manoela, Grupo da Divida

Mr. Karim Merali, Director of Aga Khan Foundation

Mr. Eduardo Munhequete, Head of National Youth Council

Ms. Graça Samo, Vice-President, Fórum Mulher

Ms. Terezinha da Silva, National Coordinator, Wilsa-Mozambique, Women and Law in Southern Africa

Mr. Leonardo Simão, Director of Joaquim Chissano Foundation

Annex 4: Key documents consulted

General, UNDG Documents, and UNEG Documents

Chief Executives Board, 'High-level Committee on Programmes, Follow-up to HLCP Decisions and Emerging Issues: (c) Evaluation of the "One United Nations" Pilot Projects', Fourteenth Session, New York, New York, 20-21 September 2007, Agenda item 4 (c). CEB/2007/HLCP-XIV/CRP.13.

Terms of Reference for the Evaluability Assessments of Delivering as One Pilot Initiative.
'UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework: Guidelines for UN teams Preparing a CCA and UNDAF', February 2007.

UN General Assembly, 'Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System', 17 August 2005, GA/RES/A/59/250.

UN General Assembly, 'Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System', 19 December 2007, GA/A/C.2/62/L.63.

UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on UN system-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment, 'Delivering as One', November 2006.

UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on UN system-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment, 'Ten Ways for the UN to "Deliver as One": Recommendations in Brief'.

Mozambique—Government of Mozambique Specific

Letter to the UN Secretary-General from Her Excellency Luisa Dias Diogo, 3 November 2006.

Letter number 4227/GMNEC/07, 24 December 2007.

Republic of Mozambique, 'PARPA II: Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty—2006-2009', May 2006.

Mozambique—United Nations in Mozambique Specific

'Delivering As One: Operational Plan of the UN System in Mozambique', 2007-2009, 3 December 2007.

ICT, 'Support to "Delivering As One UN" Initiative Mozambique: Draft Implementation Plan'.

ICT, 'Delivering as One UN, Project Business Case', November 2007.

Miguel C, 'United Nations Common Premises—An Assessment of Needs, Solutions, Costs and Benefits', June 2007.

'Revised United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), 2007-2009', revised as of 07 December 2007.

UNCT, 'Stocktaking Report on the One UN Initiative', Mozambique, 2007.

UNCT, 'Concept Paper', One United Nations in Mozambique, December 2006.

'United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), 2002-2006', 27 April 2001.

United Nations in Mozambique—Adapted Tools—Terms of References

Civil Society Advisory Committee in Mozambique

One UN Initiative in Mozambique—Success Factors Monitoring and Evaluation Table

Programme Management Team Joint Programme Quality Assurance Form

Terms of Reference: UN Steering Committee, UNCT, One Budgetary Framework and One Fund for Mozambique, Core Management Principles (equivalent to Code of Conduct for the UNCT), Communications Working Group, Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy 2007-2009, and Capacity Assessment for the Implementation of the UNDAF

Annex 5: Survey to all UN organisations

Survey among UN organizations – Mozambique

The United Nations Development Group (UNEG) is currently implementing the first phase of the evaluation of the Delivering as One UN (DaO) pilots. The first phase consists of an assessment of the evaluability of the pilots, i.e. the identification of the basic parameters against which the pilots can be evaluated.

As part of this first phase, the UNEG team would like to gauge views and perspectives of all UN organizations (funds, programmes, specialized agencies, NRAs) that are active in Mozambique.

This questionnaire should be completed by the resident representative of any UN organization represented in Mozambique and by the focal point for support to Mozambique in the case of NRAs.

Please send the completed questionnaire back to us before COB Friday 01 February 2008. The questionnaire should be sent to:

tnichols@manitouinc.com

henryc@ilo.org

lback@unicef.org

Name of organization

Name and function of the respondent to this survey:

E-mail address:

Date:

1.   How has your organization been involved in the DaO pilot?

ORGANIZATION was invited to join as the process was initiated. The Senior Management made a decision to engage fully in the One UN pilots.

ORGANIZATION has been invited by the UNCT to participate in the discussions retreats and Joint Preogrammes concerning the DaO pilot together with other UN NRAs

2.   How strongly have your immediate national partners (government, civil society, private sector etc.) been involved in the DaO pilot?

They were actively involved in the preparation of the Economic Development Pillar and in the design and formulation of the related joint programmes for this pillar as presented in the Delivering as One: Operational Plan for the UN System.

The national partners of ORGANIZATION have not been directly involved in the DaO but the process as well as key issues have been discussed with them.

The involvement of our counterpart in the process seems weak and appears to be limited at High level. More could be done at the technical level.

3.   What have been the **top three** factors affecting the involvement of your organization in the DaO pilot?

ORGANIZATION has limited capacity and staff in the country and is not member of the UNCT. Most of the DaO discussions have been held under extreme pressure, tight deadlines and simultaneous (thematic) discussions.

(On the one hand), the enthusiasm of colleagues in other agencies trying to explore opportunities for closer collaboration. On the other hand, the number of staff in ORGANIZATION is relatively small and the staff had to take upon related responsibilities on top of their regular and heavy workload.

The variable size of the different UN organizations affects the decision making process.

4.   What are the **top three** benefits you think will the DaO pilot have?

Better alignment and harmonization of UN system support at country level with Government planning, programming and implementation modalities and mechanisms.

Improved collaboration in terms of our organization's involvement in joint programme design, formulation and implementation.

Positive impact on deepening of reform and decentralization processes at corporate level.

It enhanced the ability of NRAs for mobilizing resources for implementing their respective mandates. The pilot will provide better understanding of the challenges related to Common Premises.

5.   What are the **top three** risks or possible disadvantages that may exist in your view?

The additional workload and focus on processes might distract the attention of the UN on achieving results at country level.

Too high expectations on reforming a UN system configuration that has been allowed to develop into its current unwieldy structure over the last 60 years and will need considerably more than a DaO to achieve functional and organizational reform at country, regional or global level.

If the process is expected to develop too hastily, according to deadlines established outside of Mozambique, the risk is that concerned government partners and civil society will not be able to remain engaged and at par with the process.

Non respect of mandate and lost of identity and the UN diversity.

6.   Please rate your overall satisfaction with the DaO pilot process on a scale of 1-10 (1 the least and 10 the most).

Rating _____Please explain your rating.

Average from 10 responses was 6.5.

First stages were very inclusive for NRA in an inclusive environment and we hope this will continue.

The key focus in 2007 was the development of the mechanisms, processes, structures and instruments needed to operationalize the DaO UN initiative. This process was necessary as it brought a sense of togetherness among the UN organizations. It is felt however that it could have been faster…..

7.   What suggestions do you have for improvement of the DaO pilot?

More involvement of Government counterpart to One UN process (in the Driving seat).

There is a need to balance between prioritizing / focusing and being inclusive, as we run the risk of achieving the opposite effect intended by the coherence agenda.

The development of common M&E framework and comparable reporting modalities should facilitate an improved understanding of outcomes and impact across agencies and by the UN as a whole.

Genuine inclusiveness of NRAs.