

REFLECTIONS

LESSONS FROM EVALUATIONS: UNDP SUPPORT TO EMPOWERING MARGINALIZED GROUPS

Lead author: Jin Zhang

Research associate: Anna Kunová

INTRODUCTION

Some individuals and groups are at a heightened risk of discrimination and/or deprivation because of certain characteristics or their interplay, such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion, health status, disability, sexual orientation, education, income, or geographical location, among others. Who exactly is discriminated against or marginalized depends on context, including social norms and power relations in a given society or community. Some individuals or groups may do well on development indicators but are nevertheless discriminated against or stigmatized, thus denying their right to equal opportunities. More often, belonging (or being perceived to belong) to a marginalized group heightens the risk of deprivation based on inequalities in terms of access to rights and services. Supporting the empowerment of marginalized individuals and groups is therefore key to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is also central to advancing human development, which is “about empowering people to identify and pursue their own paths for a meaningful life”, anchored in expanding freedom and increasing agency.¹ Empowerment is a right in itself (having a voice that counts and making one’s own choices) and a means to an end (achieving development outcomes).²

To inform future initiatives, the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) has undertaken a review of lessons from past evaluations of initiatives related to empowering marginalized groups. The purpose of this paper is to provide evidence-based advice to UNDP country offices on ‘what works’ (or doesn’t) and ‘how’ regarding the design and implementation of such programmes. Instead of discussing lessons by target group,³ the paper looks at how marginalization was defined, how marginalized persons were targeted and reached and, subsequently, the lessons that can be identified from the process.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is a rapid evidence assessment⁴ designed to provide a balanced synthesis of evaluative evidence posted on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre over the past decade. UNDP IEO's Artificial Intelligence for Development Analysis (AIDA) prototype has been used to identify some of the documents relevant to this paper. Country-level evaluations conducted by the IEO were an important source, given their independence and high credibility. High-quality decentralized evaluations commissioned by country offices were considered as well as some additional resources. The emphasis was on identifying consistent findings, conclusions, and recommendations that capture relevant lessons for UNDP. The analysis seeks to offer practical and timely insights to support effective UNDP decision-making. It is not a comprehensive study of the general and scientific literature.

CONTEXT

Empowerment is the process of enabling people to gain ownership and control over the factors and decisions that shape their lives. It is meant to increase people's resources and build their capacities to gain access, partners, networks and a voice.⁵ There are different approaches to empowerment, such as economic, social, political and legal.⁶

Many UNDP interventions contribute to empowering marginalized groups in contributing to (em)power *within* (a sense of rights, dignity and voice, along with basic capabilities); (em)power *with* (ability to organize, express views) and (em)power *to* (ability to influence decision makers).⁷ These include economic empowerment and social protection programmes, enhancing the quality and accessibility of services, promoting civic and political participation, strengthening capacities and expanding opportunities for civil society and community networks to engage decision makers, building capacities of national and local authorities to be inclusive, responsive and accountable, and creating and supporting enabling environment (legal, policies, institutions), etc. These interventions either work directly with marginalized groups or do so indirectly by benefiting them.

AT A GLANCE – LESSONS LEARNED

1	UNDP was most impactful where it could clearly identify who was marginalized and measure results of empowerment beyond counting those targeted.	2	Addressing multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities contributes to more effective targeting and better results.	3	Interventions targeting marginalized groups were most transformative where they adapted to local context and addressed the root causes of vulnerability, including discrimination.
4	"Nothing about us without us." Inclusive and participatory processes give voice to marginalized people and strengthen their ability to influence decision makers.	5	Integrated approaches tend to better address complexity and to increase scalability and sustainability of empowerment results.	6	Empowerment requires long-term commitment with measurable pathways for achieving transformative and sustainable results, one milestone at a time.

Effective implementation of policy change in favour of marginalized groups is more likely where UNDP supports national and local government ownership and strengthens civil society organizations.

LESSONS LEARNED

1 UNDP was most impactful where it could clearly identify who was marginalized and measure results of empowerment beyond counting those targeted.

Universalism remains the aspiration within the UN family. But targeted actions are needed to reach those marginalized who are usually disproportionately represented among those left behind.⁸ A Global Environment Facility/UNDP evaluation⁹ found that the extent to which different groups in the same community benefited from the same intervention varied in the protected areas visited. For instance, in Sian Ka'an, Ria Lagartos, and Yum Balam in Mexico, salt mine operators, owners of tourist operations, and summer vacation homeowners (who usually had a higher economic status and educational level), were in a better position to exploit opportunities and take advantage of the new livelihood skills introduced, as they had sufficient capital, entrepreneurial knowledge, as well as access to information and political contacts. On the other hand, indigenous and small farmer communities were highly affected by constraints placed by the protected areas, as their livelihoods depended on natural resources. This situation helped to reignite old conflicts among the local population, which negatively affected the delivery of results. In order to put in place effective responses, five key factors (discrimination, geography, governance, socio-economic status, and shocks and fragility) should be assessed to understand who is vulnerable and why.¹⁰

How vulnerable groups and their challenges have been defined in UNDP-supported initiatives is a mixed picture. Some initiatives have been positive and inspiring. For instance, the 'Unified Beneficiary Registry', the national social registry in Malawi, is an example where the national identification system has been used to improve targeting and as an effective information system for social protection.¹¹ In Rwanda, UNDP used a traditional long-standing practice and culture of mutual assistance, *Ubudehe*, to identify the most vulnerable beneficiary populations and address inequality, especially in the disaster-affected districts.¹² After Hurricane Mitch in Nicaragua, working with the municipality, UNDP used a participatory process to select beneficiaries, and the local population was involved in the design and construction of 400 low-income housing units and basic services for victims affected by the catastrophe.¹³ A study of social welfare programmes in Indonesia (not a UNDP intervention) found that self-targeting was more effective, and more cost-effective, in targeting people living in poverty than proxy means test-based surveys, while community-based targeting was less effective. However, communities were more satisfied with community-based targeting than self-targeting, as allocations were closer to the community's beliefs on welfare.¹⁴

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, many country offices conducted analyses or assessments of the [socio-economic impact of COVID-19](#).¹⁵ This helped identify the most vulnerable groups and how the crisis has impacted them, and subsequently contributed to the development of evidence-based strategies. For instance, UNDP conducted a 'Rapid Socioeconomic Impact Assessment of COVID-19 on Vulnerable Groups and Value Chains in Mongolia' and evidence showed that it influenced the COVID-19 Law, which profiled the impact of the crisis on those 'left behind', such as the

elderly, women-headed households and the families of herders.¹⁶ In Viet Nam, UNDP conducted the socio-economic impact assessment of COVID-19 on micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, poor households and ethnic minorities. This fed into an assessment by the National Centre for Socioeconomic Information and Forecast under the Ministry of Planning and Investment and informed the socio-economic response plan.¹⁷ UNDP Ukraine developed an online tool, Compounded Vulnerability Index, which presents disaggregated analysis of the pandemic's consequences on socio-economic, demographic and other pertinent variables in all regions of Ukraine. It helps identify the most affected regions and inform evidence-based decision-making for UNDP and the Government of Ukraine.¹⁸

However, **vulnerable groups are sometimes identified on a more ad hoc basis**, which has led to mistargeting or simply missing the target groups. Some social protection systems are gender blind, thus short-changing women's and girls' rights and options.¹⁹ In entrepreneurship development in Ethiopia, although the selection criteria partly identified excluded and worse-off groups, such as women, youth, and other disadvantaged people, there was no clear guidance on how those living with HIV/AIDS and the elderly could be included by the project.²⁰

Identifying vulnerable groups without good coverage in implementation may create conflicts among the groups. For instance, in Nepal, out of the 30 percent identified as most vulnerable, excluded and economically disadvantaged (VEED) households, only 8 percent were covered midway through the project, leading to the situation in which the remaining 22 percent VEED households were reluctant to cooperate with the community members covered.²¹

In addition, **although targeted numbers are important indicators to measure the reach of interventions, they are not sufficient to reflect changes made at the outcome level, which require additional data and evidence.** For instance, as found in a 2013 evaluation,²² in some piloting projects in microfinance, the numbers of beneficiaries/participants were used as indicators of progress and no information was provided regarding effects on the economic situation (either short-term or long-term) of those involved. As a result, there was a lack of data considering the changes made to people's lives or impact. In Somalia, through UNDP-supported interventions, access to justice for women increased. However, UNDP and its Somali and international partners were unable to produce detailed evidence on the impact of rule-of-law interventions in building public trust and confidence in the police and justice system, on the shifting public support from insurgents to the Government or in reducing crime rates after many years' work. As a result, it is impossible to indicate with confidence whether the rule of law has improved over this period or whether Somali citizens feel safer or better served.²³

2

Addressing multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities contributes to more effective targeting and better results.

Challenges of marginalized groups intersect, often compounding deprivation and reinforcing their disadvantage. For example, climate change and climate variability worsen existing poverty and exacerbate inequalities, especially for those disadvantaged by gender, age, race, class, caste, indigeneity, and disability.²⁴ In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has not only revealed how interconnected and vulnerable we all are, but has also amplified existing inequalities. Marginalized groups are disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.²⁵

Paying attention to intersecting disadvantages and challenges contributes to more effective targeting and better result. For example, UNDP identified youth in disadvantaged groups using criteria such as geography (poor regions, rural areas), gender, ethnic minorities, length of unemployment or in informal employment, educational attainment and work experience, in order to effectively engage them in technical and vocational training, as well as targeted active labour

market programmes (Kosovo, Kazakhstan, Albania, North Macedonia, Ethiopia).²⁶ For women's economic and political empowerment, increased efforts were made to address the intersection of vulnerabilities, including their access to productive resources and their participation in democratic processes. The UNDP programme for electoral support in Zimbabwe has shown that gender-focused interventions that addressed the intersection of vulnerabilities of women at government and community levels, while collaborating with the specialized the Zimbabwe Gender Commission, could bring notable results for both women's empowerment and for a successful democratic process.²⁷ Another promising example in Zimbabwe is the 3X6 plus approach used for sustainable livelihoods, where communities face drought, cyclone and floods amidst conflict.²⁸

However, **evaluations note that intersecting vulnerabilities are often not addressed through programming.** For instance, gender inequalities are often not analysed in relation to other social, economic and political inequalities.²⁹ A 2016 evaluation found that, in UNDP's work on gender, when disability is referenced at all, it tends to be an afterthought instead of being part and parcel of an integrated and systematic approach designed to secure effective and lasting change.³⁰ Another example is the fact that most efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria have not actively included individuals with disabilities as their beneficiaries. This explains why materials on ways to reduce the risk of contracting these diseases are often produced in inaccessible formats.³¹

A lack of processes to support a more integrated approach to planning and programming, which addresses intersecting elements of multiple crises, often resulted in multiple simultaneous responses to different drivers without complementarity and synergy.³² In conflict-affected countries, for example, in Mali and South Sudan, the intersection between conflict, drought, internal displacement and food insecurity was missed in UNDP-supported interventions. UNDP had projects on each driver of conflict and displacement, food insecurity and lack of services, but these were compartmentalized.³³ While supporting the Syrian refugee crisis, UNDP missed the opportunity to adopt an intersectional perspective to address concerns in different areas in some cases, such as economic, social and safety. This further discounts the multiple intersecting forms of discrimination and violence experienced by women, girls and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people in conflict-affected situations, and subsequently continues to reinforce deeply rooted inequalities and undermines efforts toward sustainable peace.³⁴

3 Interventions targeting marginalized groups were most transformative where they adapted to local context and addressed the root causes of vulnerability, including discrimination.

There are guidelines but no exact and universal standards for successful empowering interventions (this is context-specific). Therefore, to a significant extent, interventions must be tailor-made. They must be created adapting to local context and tackling the context-specific roots of inequities, including by being sensitive to the needs of the community members. In addition, **since interventions are context-specific, the negative influence of local cultures and practices, and biases concerning marginalized groups' engagement should be considered in the design and implementation of interventions.** For instance, women's involvement in waste management can generate income, but may also lead to stigma in some cultures. The percentage and experience of women involved in cash-for-work and waste recovery activities vary across countries, with higher sensitivities reported in Indonesia and Syria than in Haiti or in African countries (e.g. Malawi, Gabon, Ethiopia).³⁵

Evaluations found that interventions paying special attention to the needs and concerns of vulnerable groups had a clearer pathway in programme design and implementation for achieving results and were effective in informing more

inclusive intervention strategies and more equitable policies.³⁶ For example, in Kyrgyzstan, a peace and development programme focused significantly on empowering youth as agents of change, recognizing the role of disenfranchised and unemployed youth as drivers of conflict.³⁷ In Mauritania, in order to address the additional barriers that women and youth often face due to inadequate basic education, functional literacy training was provided to improve their access to income-generating activities.³⁸ In Azerbaijan, since lack of a formal qualification can impede employability and access to the formal education system, UNDP assisted the Government in identifying international assessment protocols to acknowledge evidence of previous learning, including the validation of non-formal and informal learning.³⁹ In Côte d'Ivoire, the strategy of adapting projects to local needs and taking into account the specific characteristics of each region strongly contributed to their success in improving income sources of vulnerable people (including the young, women, and internally displaced persons) and local communities.⁴⁰

Good results were also achieved when materials were in accessible formats (translation into local languages, braille, voice-assisted technologies, etc.), **addressing discrimination and using inclusive languages** (including in terms of gender).⁴¹ In the Dominican Republic and Cuba, ensuring that communications strategies use inclusive language (including acknowledgement of transgender people) and address stereotypes, stigma and socio-cultural patterns⁴² have helped women access health services.

Community interactions and addressing practical needs through service delivery and access to resources work best when the root causes of discrimination, inequalities and conflicts are addressed.⁴³ The ADR Jordan⁴⁴ found that despite some positive results and high participant numbers,⁴⁵ focusing primarily on the inclusion of women as beneficiaries or the number of women participants did not necessarily lead to gender equality or women's empowerment without distinguishing the needs or situations of men and women, addressing cultural and social roots of gender inequality, and supporting women's advocacy for better equality and empowerment and participation in decision-making processes. A better approach would have required addressing traditional norms and beliefs that are hindering girls and women from being treated as equals in all spheres of life, and soliciting support from civil society and community leaders.

Failure to address the causes of challenges leads to unsuccessful results. In Cameroon, women's participation in entrepreneurship innovation competition was low and failed to meet the targets not only in participation but also at the level of results because women do not have the same chances of initiating and managing business projects as men. This demonstrates the importance of integrating gender analyses and the adaptation of programmatic approaches that address the different needs of women who still face challenges overcoming traditional roles and societal expectations.⁴⁶

4 **“Nothing about us without us.” Inclusive and participatory processes give voice to marginalized people and strengthen their ability to influence decision makers.**

The most effective empowerment strategies are those that build on and reinforce voice and participation, ensuring autonomy in decision-making, sense of community and local bonding, and psychological empowerment of the community members themselves.⁴⁷ For instance, the formulation of effective disability-inclusive strategies requires consultations with people with disabilities and their representative organizations, and their participation in developing responses.⁴⁸ In Lebanon, UNDP brought together communities to undertake conflict assessments and identify solutions to address some of the conflict drivers. Months were spent in discussions and negotiations to guarantee buy-in and ownership from stakeholders, with good progress achieved in designing components for the professionalization of municipal police.⁴⁹ In Somalia, the introduction of social entrepreneurship, and particularly the focus on stimulating self-

directed livelihood generation ideas empowered beneficiaries while departing from a supply-driven approach.⁵⁰ Other examples are in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mongolia, and Sierra Leone, where participation in water governance committees ensured that the voices of the poor and the vulnerable were heard. This helped to improve water services.⁵¹

From a general standpoint, **marginalized groups should participate in the planning and implementation of interventions as active change agents.** However, this is not always the case. Individuals with disabilities have been typically addressed in UNDP-supported government social protection programmes, but often framed in a context of passivity and vulnerability, only as beneficiaries of services rather than as active and informed change agents to be consulted.⁵² Viewing marginalized groups as beneficiaries, rather than supporting them as agents of change, undermines transformative outcomes. For instance, viewing women simply as beneficiaries, a minimalist approach to gender equality and women's empowerment in conflict responses, early recovery, peacebuilding and state-building, has significantly undermined peace and security efforts.⁵³

5

Integrated approaches tend to better address complexity and to increase scalability and sustainability of empowerment results.

An integrated approach to development, different from a siloed approach, refers to its **cross-sectoral** nature and the broad range of actors involved (**multi-stakeholder**) at one or more than one level, for instance from national to local levels (**multilevel**). **Integrated approaches tend to address the complex context and roots of marginalization, fulfil the diversity of needs and priorities of targeted groups, and enable space for synergies. Successful integrated interventions increase the scalability and sustainability of results.** In contrast, evaluations found that **fragmented or siloed approaches undermine UNDP's contribution to government strategies and development results**, for instance, in poverty reduction.⁵⁴ For example, poor people depend disproportionately on access to natural resources for their livelihoods, and that development and poverty reduction programmes have significant effects on the environment. Therefore, addressing the poverty-environment nexus is essential.⁵⁵ In the San Pedro region in Côte d'Ivoire, the implementation of the joint programme for poverty reduction suffered from a siloed approach. This programme was not able to build synergies among different partners and consequently compromised the sustainability of the results achieved.⁵⁶

A few examples show the benefits of an integrated approach. In Belarus, a project aiming to improve local governance systems and practices engaged with government institutions at the central and local level, civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, and academic/training institutions, with disability inclusion well integrated and reflected in the results framework.⁵⁷ In Albania, Roma and Egyptian communities have gained increased national ownership in intervention multiplication. They have benefited from integrated approaches in economic and social inclusion at multilevel (from grassroots to central), in multi-stakeholder partnerships including government, civil society, communities, and in cross-sector involvement including education, employment, health, social services, infrastructure, etc.⁵⁸

At the community level, in Rwanda, Green Villages have generated positive change to the relocated poor households from disaster-prone areas to safer places with basic and environmentally friendly infrastructure. This demonstrated how integrated sustainable natural resource management could help reduce poverty, enhance environmental sustainability, empower communities and improve the quality of life of the poor and the most vulnerable. Following the successful model, all district development plans in Rwanda include the objective of establishing at least one Green Village.⁵⁹ In

Tanzania, improved land-use practices, income-generating activities, and access to microfinance and microcredit were introduced to the highlands of Kilimanjaro, where 43,882 hectares of land were under sustainable land management. Activities have been streamlined and incorporated into the districts' annual plans which enhances the sustainability of results.⁶⁰

For all its positive aspects, an integrated approach has its own challenges, which have to be kept in mind. In particular, the integrated approach, while tackling a lot of issues, has to remain mindful of the need to coordinate the different fields of intervention, and to maintain a sense of priority among the different areas addressed. This is important to make the most of limited resources.

6

Empowerment requires long-term commitment with measurable pathways for achieving transformative and sustainable results, one milestone at a time.

Effective empowerment requires planning and long-term commitment. **Moving to transformational results is context-specific, takes time and requires a long-term programming perspective**, including approaches to monitoring, evaluation, and learning. A right balance must be found between following a clear plan and adapting to an evolving situation when needed. For instance, in Albania, UNDP has been learning and replicating/adapting pathways that work for different groups. UNDP's interventions in the economic and social inclusion of Roma and Egyptian communities have evolved gradually for several programme cycles. The theory of change of interventions in this regard follows the successful paths of how UNDP has promoted gender equality since the late 1990s in the country: a critical mass of awareness and demand for policies and services was established, followed by the implementation of these policies and legislation through capacity-development initiatives for the national Government as well as through direct support to local authorities and communities.⁶¹ In Cuba, because of continuous and holistic support, UNDP has been positioned as a key government partner for the implementation of the National Strategic Plan for STIs/HIV/AIDS, covering several priority areas and vulnerable target groups.⁶²

UNDP contribution has been limited when it focuses on short-term approaches. When it comes to employment generation for Syrian refugees, an evaluation found that a short-term approach to livelihoods, enterprise development and sustainable job creation did not enable viable solutions at scale, and considered that the impact would be higher if multi-year funding were available.⁶³ In Tunisia, with a limited scope of interventions due to constrained funding, UNDP's work on job creation and entrepreneurship development lacked the long-term focus required to achieve expected results.⁶⁴

7

Effective implementation of policy change in favour of marginalized groups is more likely where UNDP supports national and local government ownership and strengthens civil society organizations.

An important part of UNDP's interventions to empower marginalized groups is upstream work to enable legal and policy frameworks for inclusive development. Evaluations show that, in many cases, UNDP has been successful at aligning national policies with international frameworks. However, **transformation may not take place if there is inadequate implementation.** As found in a global UNDP IEO evaluation,⁶⁵ while important progress was made in different areas of

the justice sector, improved systems and policies did not always result in better justice services due to structural challenges in the implementation of legislation and policies, as well as to limited national ownership and sustained efforts by governments.

Because many of the implementation solutions are decentralized, **the ownership and capacity of local government and communities to take initiatives forward, along with adequate resources are critical.** For instance, UNDP's '4M'⁶⁶ economic empowerment initiative in Viet Nam developed a platform for local authorities, business sectors and local ethnic minority women to meet, discuss and match supply and demand. This grassroots model and the lessons learned have been integrated into the National Targeted Programme on Social Economic Development in Ethnic Minority and Mountainous Areas for further scale-up. However, due to lack of funding and leadership changes, the follow-up plan to further support the application of the multidimensional poverty concept in an urban setting was delayed, thus generating gaps in the knowledge, understanding and models of how multidimensional poverty approach analysis could be implemented in urban settings.⁶⁷ In Thailand, UNDP's community-based policy implementation involving and mobilizing stakeholders' participation, whether in demonstrative environment projects, HIV/AIDS prevention, or the restoration of tsunami-affected areas, has been found to be highly effective. However, if local government ownership is not strong, in areas such as public utilities that require financial resources to maintain, sustainability of the community-based approach is limited.⁶⁸

In addition, CSOs with sufficient capacity contribute significantly to effective policy implementation, especially when there is a lack of government ownership and resources. In Albania, UNDP's systematic support to mainstreaming policies around diverse communities at all government levels has been appreciated. However, even though awareness of the challenges associated with improving opportunities for minorities has significantly increased across different government levels, the implementation of laws and strategies⁶⁹ has been hampered by inadequate resources, insufficient and inefficient coordination at local and central levels and among different institutions (such as various registration entities, birth and residency), as well as by limited awareness and attention by local government actors. Critical services for Roma are largely provided by CSOs and financed by international donors.⁷⁰ In Viet Nam, notable achievements were observed in the integration of human rights principles and a rights-based approach to key legal documents. But implementation mechanisms for programmes to safeguard legal rights and access to justice was limited. To advance this, UNDP provided support to **strengthen CSOs**, which in turn provided a preliminary and meaningful contribution to raising awareness and enhanced legal aid, although still limited, for vulnerable groups.⁷¹

In brief, UNDP's role could be critical in advocating and supporting the formalization of governments' visions for social inclusion and empowerment of marginalized groups, including proper budgeting, as well as in strengthening CSOs in empowering marginalized groups and providing services. In an innovative example from Cambodia, UNDP in partnership with UN Children's Fund and World Health Organization, worked with the Government to support the inclusion of disability provision in the national budgeting process and buttressed strong national ownership from national to provincial to grassroots level, in addition to empowering organizations of people with disabilities.⁷²

REFERENCES

- ¹ *Human Development Report 2020: The Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene*, UNDP 2020. “Expansion of freedom is viewed [...] both as the primary end and as the principal means of development”, according to *Development as Freedoms (1999)* by Amartya Sen. Agency is “the ability to participate in decision-making and to make one’s desired choices,” based on UNDP Human Development Report 2020.
- ² United Nations, ‘Empowerment Booklet’, United Nations 2012, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/ngo/outreachmaterials/empowerment-booklet.pdf>
- ³ Many lessons in this regard have been discussed in other Reflections papers focusing on a specific theme. The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) also presents evidence on what works in international development based on evaluations and synthesis of studies.
- ⁴ Rapid evidence assessment (REA) is a process of bringing together information and knowledge from a range of sources to inform debates and urgent policy decisions on specific issues. Like better-known systematic reviews, REAs synthesize the findings of single studies following a standard protocol but do not analyse the full literature on a topic: REAs make concessions in relation to the breadth, depth, and comprehensiveness of the search to produce a quicker result.
- ⁵ United Nations, ‘Empowerment Booklet’, United Nations 2012, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/ngo/outreachmaterials/empowerment-booklet.pdf>
- ⁶ Green D, King, S, ‘The Role of the State in Empowering Poor and Excluded Groups and Individuals’, Oxfam 2013, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/egms/docs//2013/EmpowermentPolicies/Duncan%20Green%20presentation.pdf>. Paper prepared for the Expert Group Meeting on “Policies and strategies to promote empowerment of people in achieving poverty eradication, social integration and full employment and decent work for all”, organized by the Division for Social Policy and Development of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 10-11 September 2013, New York.
- ⁷ Green D, King, S, ‘The Role of the State in Empowering Poor and Excluded Groups and Individuals’, Oxfam 2013, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/egms/docs//2013/EmpowermentPolicies/Duncan%20Green%20presentation.pdf>. Paper prepared for the Expert Group Meeting on “Policies and strategies to promote empowerment of people in achieving poverty eradication, social integration and full employment and decent work for all”, organized by the Division for Social Policy and Development of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 10-11 September 2013, New York.
- ⁸ United Nations Development Programme, ‘Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone.’ UNDP 2016, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/2016-report>.
- ⁹ Global Environment Facility, ‘Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems’, GEF 2016, <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/impact-evaluation-gef-support-protected-areas-and-protected-area-systems>.
- ¹⁰ United Nations Development Programme, ‘What Does It Mean to Leave No One Behind? A UNDP discussion paper and framework for implementation’, UNDP 2018, <https://www.undp.org/publications/what-does-it-mean-leave-no-one-behind>.
- ¹¹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, ‘Evaluation of UNDP Support to Poverty Reduction in the Least Developed Countries’ UNDP 2018, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/poverty-ldc.shtml>.
- ¹² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, ‘Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Rwanda’, UNDP 2017, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9416>.
- ¹³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, ‘Assessment of Development Results: Nicaragua’, UNDP 2007, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/2688>. The sustainability of this intervention, according to the evaluation, depended on the existence of ongoing flow of resources for housing, which at that time were not fully secured.
- ¹⁴ International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), Improving targeting in social welfare programmes in Indonesia (online summary), Evidence Impact Summaries, New Delhi: 3ie 2019, <https://www.3ieimpact.org/evidence-hub/Evidence-impact-summaries/improving-targeting-social-welfare-programmes-indonesia>.
Self-targeting imposes requirements on the programme that have differing costs for poor and rich people, dissuading the rich but not the poor from participating. Proxy means testing collects information on assets and demographic characteristics to create a proxy for household consumption or income. This proxy is then used for targeting. Community targeting allows the community or some part of it (for example, local leaders) to select the beneficiaries through a pre-specified process.
- ¹⁵ United Nations Development Programme, ‘COVID-19: Socio-Economic Impact’, UNDP 2020 <https://www.undp.org/coronavirus/socio-economic-impact-covid-19>.

-
- ¹⁶ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Mongolia', UNDP 2011, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/4375>.
- ¹⁷ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Viet Nam', UNDP 2020, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12781>.
- ¹⁸ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Ukraine', UNDP (forthcoming).
- ¹⁹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Programmes' UNDP 2017, <https://www.un-ilibrary.org/content/books/9789213618868>.
- ²⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Ethiopia', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/ethiopia.shtml>.
- ²¹ UNDP Nepal, 'Livelihood Recovery for Peace Project (LRP): Mid-term Evaluation', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6747>.
- ²² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Poverty Reduction', UNDP 2018, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/poverty-ldc.shtml>.
- ²³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Somalia', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12286>.
- ²⁴ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support for Climate Change Adaptation', UNDP 2020, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9525>.
- ²⁵ UNDP Human Development Reports, 'Global Preparedness and Vulnerability Dashboards: COVID-19 and Human Development', UNDP 2021, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/global-preparedness-and-vulnerability-dashboards>.
- ²⁶ UNDP Kosovo, 'Impact Evaluation of the Active Labour Market Programme for Youth', UNDP 2012, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6368>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Kazakhstan', UNDP 2019, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/kazakhstan.shtml>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Albania', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/albania.shtml>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: North Macedonia', UNDP 2019, http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/north_macedonia.shtml.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Ethiopia', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/ethiopia.shtml>.
- ²⁷ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Zimbabwe', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7860>.
- ²⁸ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ²⁹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ³⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ³¹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ³² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ³³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ³⁴ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to the Syrian Refugee Crisis Response and Promoting an Integrated Resilience Approach', UNDP 2021, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9898>.
- ³⁵ UNDP Malawi, 'Final Evaluation: Waste for Wealth Project: Promoting a Zero Waste Environment', UNDP 2012, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/5822>.
- ³⁶ UNDP Lao PDR, 'Terminal evaluation: Effective governance for small-scale rural infrastructure and disaster preparedness in a changing climate' UNDP 2018, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8652>.
- UNDP Lao PDR, Mid-term review: Effective governance for small-scale rural infrastructure and disaster preparedness in a changing climate', UNDP 2016, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7879>.

-
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Colombia', UNDP 2018, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9396>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Albania', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7852>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Ethiopia', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/ethiopia.shtml>.
- ³⁷ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Kyrgyzstan', UNDP 2016, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8473>.
- ³⁸ UNDP Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Mauritania', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/mauritania.shtml>.
- ³⁹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Azerbaijan', UNDP 2019, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/azerbaijan.shtml>.
- ⁴⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Cote d'Ivoire', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6534>.
- ⁴¹ UNDP Liberia, 'Terminal evaluation: Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change by Mainstreaming Adaptation Concerns into Agriculture Sector Development' UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9530>;
- UNDP Guinea, 'Final assessment of the Project Strengthening resilience of farming communities' livelihoods against climate changes in the Guinean Prefectures of Gaoual, Koundara and Mali', UNDP 2018, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/documents/detail/11990>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Egypt UNDP 2012', <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/4372>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Dominican Republic' UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7853>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Cuba', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9398>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ⁴² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Dominican Republic' UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7853>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Cuba', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9398>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ⁴³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment', UNDP 2015, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/gender.shtml>.
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ⁴⁴ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Jordan', UNDP 2016, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8472>.
- ⁴⁵ For example, 80 percent of the youth participating in internship and civic engagement programmes were female, and 85 percent were female in the vocational training; training women parliamentarians while building the capacities of MPs on gender issues and human rights conventions. Women were involved in meetings to discuss the new property tax law. Gender-disaggregated data were used and a gender strategy was developed.
- ⁴⁶ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Cameroon', UNDP 2019, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/cameroon.shtml>.
- ⁴⁷ Wallerstein, N., 'What is the evidence on effectiveness of empowerment to improve health?' WHO Regional Office for Europe 2006, https://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/74656/E88086.pdf.
- ⁴⁸ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ⁴⁹ UNDP Lebanon, 'Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Crisis Prevention and Recovery Programme in Lebanon', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8723>.

-
- ⁵⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Somalia', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12286>.
- ⁵¹ UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina, 'MDG-F - Democratic Economic Governance - Securing Access to Water Through Institutional Development', UNDP, 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/4759>.
- UNDP Sierra Leone, 'Terminal Evaluation of Adaptive Capacity of Water Services to Climate Change', UNDP 2020, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12452>.
- ⁵² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ⁵³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>.
- ⁵⁴ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries', UNDP 2013, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6420>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Somalia', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12286>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Albania', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7852>;
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Viet Nam', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7859>.
- ⁵⁵ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Environmental Management for Poverty Reduction: The Poverty-Environment Nexus', UNDP 2010, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/4784>;
- Global Environment Facility, 'Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems', GEF 2016, <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/impact-evaluation-gef-support-protected-areas-and-protected-area-systems>.
- ⁵⁶ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Côte d'Ivoire', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12270>.
- ⁵⁷ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of Disability-Inclusive Development at UNDP', UNDP 2016, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml>.
- ⁵⁸ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Albania', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7852>;
- UNDP Albania, 'Evaluation of Economic and Social Empowerment for Roma and Egyptians – A Booster for Social Inclusion Project', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9074>.
- ⁵⁹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Rwanda', UNDP 2017, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9416>.
- "As a result of the introduction rainwater harvesting systems to the Green Villages, the use of biogas residue as fertilizer, tree planting and terracing, food security for the community has increased and excess production is being sold to generate income. Terracing has helped to reduce landslides which used to cause damage to property and, in extreme cases, loss of lives. The sale of milk and fertilizer has brought in additional income, improving the livelihoods of the households. Having water closer to home and biogas for cooking has saved significant time, and women and children can spend their time on more productive activities including schoolwork, as they no longer travel long distances to fetch water and/or collect firewood." (pp. 18-19)
- ⁶⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Tanzania', UNDP 2015 <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7074>.
- With the multi-pronged interventions, beneficiaries reported increased economic activities and incomes (i.e. the adoption of alternative income-generating activities such as bee-keeping; improved coffee farming through trainings; development of markets for products such as honey, coffee and mushrooms, etc.) and better sustainable land management (i.e., increased awareness for sustainable land management practices, rehabilitated gullies to reserve soil loss; more households with woodlots; increased use of alternative sources of energy and maize harvest; improved conservation of the water catchment areas; development of Land Management Policy).
- ⁶¹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Albania', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7852>.
- ⁶² UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Cuba', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9398>.

-
- ⁶³ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Lebanon', UNDP 2019, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12277>.
- ⁶⁴ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Tunisia', UNDP 2018, <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/adr/tunisia.shtml>.
- ⁶⁵ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Programmes' UNDP 2017, <https://www.un-ilibrary.org/content/books/9789213618868>.
- ⁶⁶ 4M refers to meet, match, mentor and move.
- ⁶⁷ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Viet Nam', UNDP 2020, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12781>.
- ⁶⁸ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Thailand', UNDP 2011, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/4376>.
- ⁶⁹ Such as the Law Against Discrimination (2010), the National Strategy on Roma (2003) and the Plan of Action for the Decade of Roma Inclusion (2009).
- ⁷⁰ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Albania', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7852>.
- ⁷¹ UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results: Viet Nam', UNDP 2015, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7859>.