

Chapter 1

Introduction

Conflict is a normal part of social and political interaction. It is, however, a failure of development when institutional and structural failures cause conflict to take violent forms. Indeed, armed conflict can be viewed as a failure of key institutions of governance—both of the state and in civil society. It is also often a result of economic stagnation and a failure to provide economic and social opportunity to significant portions of the population. As such, UNDP’s development, capacity-building and governance mandate should be central to the United Nations’—and, by extension, the international community’s—response to conflict.

This results-based evaluation has been conducted by the UNDP Evaluation Office to inform the policies and approaches that UNDP adopts in conflict-affected countries, especially countries under Security Council or General Assembly mandates. To do so, UNDP’s response was looked at in terms of its operations, its coordination of the UN system and its policy work, encompassing the entire organization and not just its Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR). More specifically, the evaluation was intended to:

1. Help UNDP document and analyse the post-conflict assistance it has provided in selected countries since 2000 in the sensitive and frequently fragile post-crisis (cease-fire) period. The analysis will focus on specific human security issues and their human development dimensions to reveal patterns of intervention that have been both successful and unsuccessful.
2. Provide critical guidance on improving the effectiveness of current programming approaches in the early recovery period by assessing the results of UNDP programming interventions to date. These

recommendations will take into account the implications of these approaches for longer-term development. The evaluation aims to highlight areas where UNDP’s comparative advantage has been proven or is emerging as well as to identify gaps and provide recommendations on how UNDP could address these gaps.

3. Indicate how UNDP has used partnerships at local, national and international levels and positioned itself vis-à-vis other actors, who provide both transition and longer-term development support. This will include suggestions as to what capacities and skills the organization most needs and that could be further developed to bring greater coherence and relevance to its post-crisis interventions.
4. Provide substantive insight on how lessons from programmes and strategies implemented in the immediate post-crisis period can be institutionalized within the organization through systematic monitoring and evaluation, and adapted and made more relevant to country needs.

This report was based on six case studies of countries in which UNDP was operating under a UN Security Council mandate: Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, Sierra Leone and Tajikistan. (Annex 1 provides a summary of each case study.) In addition, the report was asked to provide further evidence from selected countries receiving assistance from the BCPR. (The complete terms of reference, from which these points were drawn, can be found in Annex 2.)

1.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Human security means more than just the security of states. It is about the security of individuals and communities. It is

concerned with both physical and material security, and confronting the insecurities that arise from political violence as well as from poverty, disease and environmental degradation. Physical insecurity usually refers to threats emanating from the use of violence, while material insecurity is the consequence of threats emanating from lack of basic necessities, including food and water, shelter, and medical care. In an era of globalization, the concern with human security is linked to interdependence and the fact that no state can insulate itself any longer from insecurity in other parts of the world.

The idea of human security was first promulgated in the 1994 *Human Development Report*. The report argues that the concept of security has “for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from a nuclear holocaust. It has been related more to nation states than to people.”¹

In the Report of the Commission on Human Security,² human security is a narrower concept than either human development or human rights. In relation to human development, the report focuses on the ‘downside risks’: that is, the “insecurities that threaten human survival or the safety of daily life, or imperil the natural dignity of men and women, or expose human beings to the uncertainty of disease and pestilence, or subject vulnerable people to abrupt penury.” In relation to human rights, the report refers to “a class of human rights” that guarantee “freedom from basic insecurities—new and old.”³ Thus, human security could be conceptualized as incorporating minimum core aspects of both human development and human rights.

It is sometimes assumed that security is related to the absence of physical violence while development is related to the absence of material need. In fact, both concepts include ‘freedom from fear’ and ‘freedom from want’. Security is about confronting *extreme* vulnerability, not only in wars but in natural and man-made disasters, including famines, tsunamis and hurricanes. Development, as UNDP’s mandate makes clear, is concerned with constructing the capabilities needed to meet human need, especially the building of institutions. Human need means more than a decent and sustainable standard of living. It also means feeling safe on the streets and being able to influence political decision-making. Since violent conflicts are the consequence of a failure of development, the human security response not only has to include development, but the lessons learned may also indicate more general lessons for development. Crises expose the weaknesses and gaps in development efforts.

In order to meet the terms of reference defined above, the evaluation adopts a demand-driven or bottom-up approach. Rather than starting with existing UNDP programmes and assessing their effectiveness, it began with human security needs in conflict countries and investigated how well UNDP was performing in relation to those needs. Since the role of UNDP was often difficult to separate from the role of the international community and the United Nations in general, the evaluation set out to answer the following questions:

1. What are the trends in human security and conflict in the case-study countries and other selected countries since 2000?
2. Since the absence of violent conflict is an important component of human security, what can this evaluation learn

1 *Human Development Report* 1994. 1994. New York: Oxford University Press for the United Nations Development Programme.

2 The 12-member Commission on Human Security was established in January 2001 and was co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen.

3 *Human Security Now, Final Report of the Commission on Human Security*. 2003. Pages 2-4. Available at: <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>

from these case studies about the character of conflict? Furthermore, can this study identify the underlying conditions that make violence more or less likely?

3. In countries where the United Nations has intervened before, during or after conflict, is it possible to conclude that the intervention as a whole has contributed to an improvement in human security? In particular, has the intervention addressed the conditions that are likely to exacerbate conflict?
4. Is it possible to identify a specific UNDP role in contributing to human security? Was UNDP assistance targeted at human security needs as identified above?
5. Did institutional arrangements within UNDP and with partners help or hinder UNDP's role in contributing to human security?
6. What lessons can UNDP learn for future strategy, institutional arrangements, and monitoring and evaluation?

Questions 1-5 were intended to address objectives 1-3 of the terms of reference. Question 6 was aimed at objective 4.

In Security Council-mandated countries, UNDP's performance has to be measured within the framework and the milestones established by the Security Council. As the leader of the Development Group and, by extension, usually the leader of the development and humanitarian pillars of peacekeeping and peace-building offices, UNDP's efforts in conflict-affected countries can also be judged by the extent to which it provides intellectual and substantive leadership to the rest of the system. It can be judged as well by the extent to which its programmes support the broader UN effort and the effectiveness with which it can support the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in marshalling the array of UN capabilities to address the most critical structural causes of human insecurity and conflict.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was based on studies in six countries preselected by the UNDP Evaluation Office and the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. All six cases—Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, Sierra Leone and Tajikistan—are countries in which the UN has or has had a Security Council mandate for peacekeeping and/or peace-building. In Guatemala, the UN peace operation was officially structured quite separately from the UNDP and the UN Country Team. In Tajikistan, the UN Security Council was involved in the establishment of a Peace-building Support Office managed by the UN Department of Political Affairs that was supposed to deliver on political responsibilities while drawing on the UN Country Team, composed of both humanitarian and development agencies. Afghanistan, Haiti, Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in many ways constitute the earliest trials of the concept of the integrated office for conflict prevention, peace-building and post-conflict recovery and development.

The case studies were supplemented by the collection of data on human security indicators, a questionnaire (see Annex 3) addressed to countries receiving assistance from the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery as well as the use of general sources. These included interviews in New York and Washington, documentary research and the collection of macroeconomic statistics on countries receiving assistance from BCPR.

1.2.1 Case studies

The evaluation assessed the relevance of UNDP's programmes in these six countries in light of the six questions mentioned above. The case studies investigated:

1. Trends in human security, including the character of the conflict and the conditions likely to lead to renewed or exacerbated conflict.

2. The overall role of the United Nations in contributing to human security and addressing the conditions conducive to conflict.
3. The role of UNDP, as measured by the following:
 - **Relevance and positioning:** The relevance of UNDP's programme strategy and programmes within the framework of the international community's response to the crisis in question.
 - **Results and effectiveness:** The ways and extent to which UNDP programmes have contributed to the achievement of human security. What did the programmes achieve and how well were they achieved?
 - **Efficiency:** The timeliness and cost-effectiveness of programmes (to the extent that the latter could be assessed).
 - **Management:** The capacity of the country office to manage its programmes and the effectiveness and efficiency of management structures and processes. Also considered are the effectiveness of modalities of execution and implementation.
 - **Coordination:** What mechanisms and tools did UNDP use to support coordination of external assistance to the country? What was its relationship to partners? How effective was the coordination?
 - **Substantive leadership and credibility:** To what extent did UNDP help to define the development agenda and priorities during the post-conflict period? How is UNDP perceived?

The evaluation was conducted using meta-evaluation techniques combined with the direct evaluation of programmes and projects. In the absence of systematically collected programme-related outcome data, the evaluation relied heavily on

secondary sources of information, output and input-based project information and qualitative structured and semi-structured interviews with stakeholders (partners, civil society, government, political parties, the media and programme beneficiaries).

Because the evaluation was results-based, it placed considerable emphasis on the importance of gaining an independent perspective. To achieve this, independent national consultants with a civil society background were recruited to help arrange interviews and meetings, and to contribute their own ideas to the study. In addition, the interviews and stakeholder meetings included as many independent commentators, practitioners and activists as possible.

The case studies involved four types of activities:

- *'Insider' stakeholder meetings.* In each country, workshops were held with four groups: representatives of political parties; non-governmental organizations (NGOs), activists and religious leaders; women's groups; and independent intellectuals, including journalists, academics and think-tank staff.
- *'Outsider' stakeholder meetings.* Workshops with UN Country Team, UN mission and UNDP staff, along with bilateral donors.
- *Semi-structured interviews.* Individual interviews were conducted with a range of key national actors, including relevant government ministry officials, police and military officers, religious leaders, leading political figures, the Resident Coordinator and/or the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.
- *Field visits.* On each mission, one or two UNDP programmes were visited in the field as a means of verifying the information received.

The following tools and sources of information were used in the evaluation:

- A survey of available statistical data pertaining to human security as defined

above (see Chapter 1.2.2), supplemented by national statistical data collected during the case studies

- Secondary sources of information pertaining to human security and the perceptions of people, including reports prepared by third parties, surveys and opinion polls and news articles
- Relevant past programme and project outcome evaluations and/or country reviews
- Financial budget and delivery data pertaining to UNDP programmes in relevant countries on a national and global basis

- Progress reports and other project documentation
- A list of general questions distributed in advance to all individuals and groups interviewed in each of the countries visited by the mission
- Semi-structured interviews with individuals
- Semi-structured interviews with groups
- Structured interviews with individuals
- Structured interviews with groups
- Project site visits.

The use of these sources of information to assess the various dimensions of UNDP performance is elaborated in Table 1.

TABLE 1. MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED TO ASSESS UNDP PERFORMANCE

Performance dimensions	Main sources of information
Relevance and positioning	Political analyses prepared by think tanks and independent academic sources. UN Security Council resolutions and reports. UNDP Country Programme Action Plans and Country Cooperation Frameworks. Interviews with UNDP and UN staff, government officials, political parties, and staff of international financial institutions and key multilateral and bilateral agencies.
Results and effectiveness	Project monitoring data. National and global human development reports. National statistical information. Reports of other UN agencies. UN Common Country Assessments. Evaluations conducted by academic institutions or other agencies. Third-party opinion polls. Interviews with UNDP staff, project personnel, project beneficiaries. Interviews with representatives of civil society, donor agencies, government, political parties and the media.
Efficiency	Budget and delivery data. Project documentation. Interviews with beneficiaries, government officials and project personnel.
Management	Management audit reports. Staffing tables. Interviews with UNDP staff, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/UN Resident Coordinator and the Country Director. Interviews with project personnel.
Coordination	Records of inter-agency meetings. Resident Coordinator reports. UN Development Assistance Frameworks. Records of thematic group meetings. Joint needs assessment reports. Interviews with government officials. Interviews with UN agencies. Interviews with bilateral and multilateral agency personnel. Interviews with staff of international NGOs.
Substantive leadership and credibility	Review of issues papers, country assessments, country reviews, and national or regional human development reports. Review of documentation on the Millennium Development Goals. Interviews with staff of UN agencies, the World Bank, bilateral and multilateral donors. Interviews with civil society actors and government representatives.

The evaluation conducted extensive semi-structured interviews with UNDP, the UN Department of Political Affairs, the UN

Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the UN Office for Project Services, the Office of the United Nations Development

TABLE 2. CATEGORIES OF ACTORS INTERVIEWED FOR COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

Actors	Main evaluative questions	Type of meeting
Civil society leaders, politicians, national NGOs	To what degree have conditions of human development and human security improved or worsened during the period in question? What do you think of the overall peace-building strategy adopted by the parties involved, the international community and UNDP in particular? What do you think of the role and performance of UNDP and its programmes?	Separate semi-structured group meetings with each subgroup: national civil society organizations; representatives of political parties; national NGOs.
Government	What aspects of UNDP's role did the government appreciate the most? How could UNDP raise its value-added? What does the government think of UNDP's programmes in terms of their relevance to needs, effectiveness, and efficiency? What arrangements have been made to ensure sustainability of externally funded programmes? How should UNDP change?	Individual meetings with ministers and government officials directly involved with UNDP programmes. Group meetings with members of the judiciary. Group meetings with members of parliament.
Multilateral and bilateral UN partners	What are your views on trends and progress made towards peace-building and human security? What are your views regarding the performance (effectiveness, efficiency, competence, strategic role) of the UN and of UNDP in particular? How could UNDP have been more effective? What value-added did UNDP provide? What substantive leadership did UNDP provide?	Semi-structured individual meetings with agencies that contribute to UNDP programmes or those that have taken a lead role in the process of peace-building. Semi-structured group meetings with others.
UN peace-keeping or peace-building support office	Describe the peace process and its successes and failures. What inherent dangers are there in the current situation for a return to conflict? What role did UNDP play in peace-building? What was your relationship with UNDP? What were the strengths and weaknesses of the relationship? How effective was UNDP? How did UNDP support the peace process? How did UNDP support your role? What handover arrangements do you envisage upon completion of your mandate?	Semi-structured individual meetings with senior officials of the UN operation.
UN agencies and Bretton Woods institutions	What are your views on trends and progress made towards peace-building and human security? What role did UNDP play? What is the value-added of UNDP? How effective was it in supporting the coordination of the UN system? What was your experience of joint strategy development/resource mobilization/programme implementation? How did UNDP contribute to the effectiveness of the UN system? What could it have done better? What do you think of the capacity of UNDP? What substantive role did UNDP play?	Semi-structured group meetings with UN agencies. Semi-structured bilateral meetings with senior officials of the UN peacekeeping or peace-building support office. Semi-structured bilateral meetings with World Bank representatives.
UNDP programme beneficiaries	How has your situation improved? How specifically have you benefited from UNDP's projects/programmes? Overall, are you optimistic or pessimistic about your future? How did UNDP contribute to development in your area? What did it do right? What did it do wrong? How could it improve?	Semi-structured group meetings at project sites.

Group, and a selection of UN fund and programme staff in New York. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the senior management of UNDP as well as desk officers responsible for the case-study countries and relevant staff in the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, Bureau of Management and elsewhere in the organization. One mission member also conducted semi-structured interviews with World Bank and US Agency for International Development staff in Washington, DC. (See Annex 4 for a comprehensive list of people interviewed.)

The evaluation team met and interviewed six categories of actors in each country, as described in Table 2.

In general, because much of the information collected was qualitative, the evaluation sought to cross-reference and verify information obtained by repeating questions from different angles and by asking similar questions to different actors.

1.2.2 Selected statistics relating to human security

The case studies were partly informed by a survey of available statistics relating to human security for the six countries. The statistics covered four central aspects of human security: deaths from armed conflict, human rights violations, refugees and internally displaced persons, and victims of natural and technological disasters. The indicators were chosen with Amartya Sen's definition in mind—for their immediacy in relation to the physical security of the individual, but with a broader focus than battle deaths. The data chosen reveal the difficulty of distinguishing physical and material security. Population displacement data reflect both types of insecurity. Likewise, natural and technological disasters include famine or homelessness as a consequence of floods or earthquakes, for example. (See Annex 5 for a list of printed and web-based resources consulted.)

The information does not include more comprehensive data on aspects of human

development. First, data on human development tend not to distinguish between immediate threats to human life and longer-term threats, which are a consequence of underdevelopment. This report focused on the 'downside risks' to human beings, which is a much narrower concept than human development. Second, human development indicators are more readily available through the *Human Development Reports* and the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) indicators; both sources of information were used for the case studies. Third, to choose particular human development or MDG indicators as more suggestive than others of downside risks is a major conceptual task—well worth doing but beyond the scope of this report.

The data also leave out some important aspects of human security, namely violent crime and domestic violence, because of the difficulty in identifying relatively comprehensive data.

In general, there is a paucity of data on human security, especially in relation to the most insecure countries, which includes the case-study countries. Moreover, the data tend to reflect earlier analytical paradigms. Just as data on gross national product (GNP) or government expenditure are much more readily available than data on human development, so, too, data on physical insecurity tend to focus on battle deaths, even though most deaths in contemporary conflicts are the result of violence deliberately inflicted on civilians or of disease and hunger associated with war. Perhaps the best indicator of human security is population displacement, including both refugees and internally displaced persons, since it encompasses both physical and material security and since relatively good, comprehensive data are available.

1.2.3 The questionnaire

A questionnaire was sent to UNDP country offices of the 46 countries or areas that receive assistance from UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. The questions were designed after the case studies were completed and were aimed at

verifying some of the findings from the case studies. Country offices for 24 countries or areas responded to the questionnaire (Table 3).

For a fuller analysis of the responses, the reader may refer to the online version of this report on the UNDP Evaluation Office website (www.undp.org/eo).

1.2.4 Limitations of the evaluation

Evaluating UNDP’s activities in conflict-affected countries is a massive and complex

task. The evaluation team faced the following key constraints:

- **Appropriateness of the sample:** The six case-study countries selected for the evaluation team by UNDP emphasize UNDP’s role in Security Council-mandated missions and serve to support an analysis that can generate conclusions about UNDP’s participation in integrated UN peacekeeping and peace-building missions. This is important for assessing the direction of future UNDP strategies

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Country or area	Region
Angola	Africa
Burundi	Africa
Chad	Africa
Congo	Africa
Eritrea	Africa
Rwanda	Africa
Uganda	Africa
Zimbabwe	Africa
Cambodia	Asia and the Pacific
Indonesia*	Asia and the Pacific
Lao PDR	Asia and the Pacific
Nepal	Asia and the Pacific
Papua New Guinea	Asia and the Pacific
Philippines	Asia and the Pacific
Djibouti	Arab States
Somalia	Arab States
Bosnia and Herzegovina*	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Croatia	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Georgia	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Kosovo	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Kyrgyzstan	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Macedonia (TFYR)	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Serbia and Montenegro	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
Guyana	Latin America and the Caribbean

*Two entries were received for each of these countries.

in conflict-affected countries within the context of UN reform. However, it does not fully reflect the role that UNDP plays at present in other countries faced with major or incipient internal conflicts or in areas affected by conflict in neighbouring countries.

- **Limitations of the survey:** In order to address the above limitation, the evaluation team issued a questionnaire to conflict-affected countries that are not under Security Council mandates. The list was limited to those countries in which the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery has provided technical support; 24 of the 46 countries/ areas contacted responded.
- **Time limitations:** Five of the six case studies involved country visits of one week each. Despite the extremely intensive nature of the visits and the considerable volume of information and evidence collected, it is fair to say that the team, without exception, would have benefited from more time in each country, particularly to verify documentary evidence.
- **Scope:** The terms of reference stipulated that the evaluation team was to review UNDP activities during the period 2000-2005. Yet key events in some of the case-study countries, such as Guatemala and Tajikistan, took place before this period. In such instances, the team reviewed activities in 2000 and prior years, compounding the difficulties faced in conducting a thorough review in the time allotted. Furthermore, the quality of data on UNDP performance prior to 2000 was uneven.
- **Absence of systematic monitoring data:** Although programme outputs were better documented in the countries visited than in some other UNDP programmes, the absence of monitoring systems at the project or programme level to verify the achievement of outcomes (as defined in the Strategic

Results Framework/Results-oriented Annual Report, project documents or action plans) presented a problem. This required the evaluators to identify potential indicators of performance and seek third-party sources for the information collected or to attempt to define and collect information on a snapshot basis. Furthermore, outcomes were rarely explicitly presented in terms of human security indicators, meaning that the evaluation team had to identify and develop appropriate human security indicators. Data was then collected from a variety of sources of varying degrees of reliability. The limitations of the human security data are presented along with an analysis of the data on the online version of this report available on the UNDP Evaluation Office website.

- **Limitations of financial data:** It has been virtually impossible to obtain reliable, comprehensive, aggregate figures on resources managed by UNDP in conflict-affected countries. While information pertaining to core resources is readily available, the fragmented nature of cost-sharing and trust fund resources has rendered reliable financial data very difficult to come by.
- **Aggregation of data:** The varied sources of data used has made it difficult to aggregate quantitative indicators in a meaningful way when attempting to measure performance or make inter-country comparisons of performance. Where broad national indicators were used, attribution to the UNDP programmes was a problem.
- **Meta-evaluation:** In accordance with the overall intent of the evaluation, this study did not include direct verification of programme outputs. Rather, the evaluation used data collected and presented in progress reports and prior evaluations of individual programmes and projects.

1.2.5 Review process

This evaluation report was subject to a rigorous quality assurance process. The draft report was shared with UNDP senior management at Headquarters and in country offices and with key stakeholders in all case-study countries for verification of facts and accuracy in the interpretation of data. In addition, the draft report was presented to the UNDP Executive Board in an informal session and benefited from

the comments of delegates. It was also reviewed internally by the UNDP Evaluation Office and externally by an Advisory Panel comprising international development experts working in the area of peace and human security as well as evaluation experts. These reviews focused on the operationalization of the terms of reference and the conceptual framework, the methodology employed, and the validity of evidence used in the study.