



**Executive Board
of the
United Nations
Development Programme
and of the
United Nations
Population Fund**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1995/47/Add.1
24 July 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Third regular session 1995
11-15 September 1995, New York
Item 3 of the provisional agenda
UNDP

UNDP: COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND RELATED MATTERS

Mid-term review of the fifth cycle programme for
global and interregional programmes

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND A PERSPECTIVE ON GLOBAL AND AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES	1 - 6	2
II. THE FIFTH CYCLE PROGRAMME	7 - 29	3
A. HIV and development	14	4
B. Health research and development	15 - 18	5
C. Water and sanitation	19	6
D. Urban management	20	6
E. Debt management	21	7
F. Energy	22	7
G. Environment and sustainable agriculture	23 - 25	7
H. Innovative pilot programmes	26	8
I. Collaboration and execution	27	8
J. Internal collaboration	28 - 29	9
III. THE RELEVANCE OF THE GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES TO SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	30 - 32	9
IV. SUMMARY OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE EXPERIENCE GAINED AND FUTURE RELEVANCE OF GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES	33 - 37	10

Annexes

I. FINANCIAL SUMMARY	12
II. LIST OF FIFTH CYCLE GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS	15
III. MAJOR CO-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES	17

I. INTRODUCTION AND A PERSPECTIVE ON GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES

1. The present document reports on the mid-term review of the fifth cycle of global and interregional programmes, which were planned and initiated by the Division of Global and Interregional Programmes (DGIP). Under the UNDP reorganization plan described in document DP/1994/39, DGIP was eliminated. Thereafter, most of the global and some interregional projects were assigned to the new Science, Technology and Private Sector Division (STAPSD), while other interregional projects were transferred to a number of other units within UNDP. The review focused on the progress made on each project without regard to the administrative unit assigned to implement it.

2. The mid-term review was held during the period 17 April 1995 to 18 May 1995. A team of internal and external evaluators interviewed several of the current staff STAPSD; reviewed summaries of all global and interregional programme files, including programmes that were initiated in the fifth cycle as well as those carried forward from the fourth cycle; examined tripartite and external project reports and other pertinent documentation; consulted UNDP staff from the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific, the Regional Bureau for Latin American and the Caribbean, the Regional Bureau for Africa and Bureau for Policy and Programme Support; contacted executing agencies for global and interregional projects; interviewed multilateral and bilateral agencies (the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)); and visited two countries (Kenya and the Philippines) and two collaborating agencies (the World Bank and the World Health Organization (WHO)) involved in the execution and implementation of fifth cycle projects. The review concentrated on general strategy, relevance to UNDP-mandated priorities, progress, achievements, efficiency and focus. Although the emphasis was on projects of four years or longer in duration, selected projects of shorter duration were considered as well. Looking forward, the review also attempted to identify principles, concepts, strategies and tactics that may be useful for implementing Executive Board decision 94/14 on the future of UNDP.

3. The mid-term review was undertaken at a time when UNDP is restructuring, renewing and refocusing its overall programme. The global and interregional programmes, embodying a unique approach within UNDP and possibly within the United Nations system, have provided UNDP with a mechanism with which to focus on highly critical sectoral or intersectoral problems, the solutions to which are beyond the reach of a single country or even a region. Global and interregional programmes have been catalysts for the melding of the intellectual and financial resources of countries from the South and from the North to collaborate to solve problems. The fifth cycle programme has undoubtedly benefited from the legacy of co-sponsorships, professional contacts, experiences, prior successes and recognition it inherited from previous UNDP cycles.

4. The global and interregional programmes enjoyed substantial flexibility within the five-year programme and budgets approved by the Governing Council. Operating within UNDP policies and procedures, there was substantial freedom to promote innovation, entrepreneurship and novel partnerships and collaborations with countries, institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), bilateral and multilateral assistance organizations and United Nations agencies.

5. The global and interregional programmes are highly leveraged with contributions from other stakeholders. A modest contribution to a given venture was often greatly extended by financial contributions from the other partners.

6. Since their inception, global and interregional programmes have received strong support. Resources allocated to the programmes have grown

significantly in each of the UNDP programming cycles, increasing from \$37.9 million in the 1972-1976 period, to \$125 million in the 1992-1996 period. The rate of increase is almost double the rate at which the organization's total programme funds increased, suggesting that Governments consider global and interregional programmes to be highly productive activities.

II. THE FIFTH CYCLE PROGRAMME

7. The fifth cycle indicative planning figures (IPFs) for the global and interregional programmes were originally established at \$112 million and \$67 million, respectively, but were reduced by 30 per cent in 1993, due to the organizations' overall resource constraints (see annex I). Because almost all interregional and global programmes are phased over a relative long period of time, generally from three to five years, and many were formulated in 1991 and 1992, the 1993 budget reduction has resulted in severe operational constraints. By the use of cost-cutting measures and the elimination of any new programming, it is hoped that global and interregional programmes will be within their reduced IPF entitlements. The global programme is devoted to research. Sustainable agriculture received approximately two thirds of the global IPF, and health one third (see annex II). Projects in those areas are often long term (at least five years and often renewed) because of the inherent long-term nature of biological research. The two areas, basic health and staple food, are acknowledged as fundamental building blocks for poverty alleviation. It was found that the global programme still needed to focus and leverage its research, since both needs and opportunities greatly exceeded its resources.

8. Interregional projects are often more applied in nature than are global research projects, and thus frequently linked to specific countries, UNDP regional bureaux, other bilateral and multilateral donors, regional projects, etc. Both global and interregional programmes demonstrate a deliberate emphasis on one or more of the six areas of focus approved by the Governing Council for the fifth cycle in decision 90/34 (poverty eradication and grass-roots participation; technology transfer and adaptation; women in development; technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC); management development; and environment and natural resource management).

9. While it is still too early to measure either impact or sustainability for projects and activities that began in the fifth cycle, some assessment of their efficiency, effectiveness and relevance is possible. In the case of fifth cycle projects that built on earlier global and interregional projects, the situation may be different. Given the collaborative nature of many of the programmes and projects, however, it may be difficult and indeed even counter-productive to the spirit of partnership, to focus too narrowly on the contribution of UNDP alone, at the risk of minimizing the role of other collaborators or of pre-existing infrastructure, institutions, and human resources. Some fifth cycle programmes that may merit particular attention because of their apparent relevance, effectiveness and potential for substantial (or demonstrated) impact, sustainability, and capacity-building, include the programmes for water and sanitation, HIV and development, the International Network for Genetic Evaluation of Rice, Tilapia improvement, tropical disease research and the control of diarrhoeal and acute respiratory diseases.

10. The mid-term review team appreciates that careful judgment must be exercised in global and interregional programmes in both the selection of new activities and in timely termination of ongoing projects. On the one hand, the programmes were given a degree flexibility by the Governing Council and management and are expected to respond to urgent situations in a responsible manner. On the other hand, a proliferation of projects of limited scope and potential is an ever-present danger. The review noted that a number of promising initiatives not anticipated in the original fifth cycle programme were subsequently included and others were dramatically expanded, including

the Children's Vaccine Initiative (CVI), the International Vaccine Institute (IVI), HIV and Development, Global Environment Facility (GEF) research projects and electoral assistance.

11. There were 26 new interregional projects in the fifth cycle, compared with 48 new projects in the fourth cycle. While this reduction may reflect a better-focused programme in the fifth cycle, other important factors must be considered, including the degree to which each sector, topic or project received sufficient financial resources, professional staffing and collaboration from essential complementary agencies, activities and programme countries. Synergies between individual projects can also be important. The fact that, in most cases, both global and interregional programmes have a number of co-sponsors suggests that most individual projects enjoyed a "critical mass" and were not constrained severely by insufficient support or working in isolation.

12. The global and interregional programmes have responded effectively to requests arising from programme countries and other sources by acting as catalysts for collaborative activities to pursue internationally agreed goals and critical country-based issues. Effective responses frequently included:

- (a) Mobilizing specialized and multisectoral knowledge and technologies;
- (b) Obtaining additional external financial resources;
- (c) Establishing free-standing international bodies to facilitate collaboration, implementation and information dissemination;
- (d) Serving as a neutral sponsor or co-sponsor for the undertaking.

13. The best known example of those collaborative activities is the Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research (CGIAR). There are many more examples, however, including the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme, the UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases, the Study of International Fisheries Research (SIFR), the Energy Sector Management Assistance Programme (ESMAP) and the Consultative Group on Locust Research (CGLR). Those initiatives have given UNDP a profile and expertise on international and global issues that are distinct from the organization's traditional country-based programmes.

A. HIV and development

14. The HIV and Development Programme has responded to opportunities to assist the UNDP regional bureaux, partner agencies and NGOs to structure their HIV programmes. The programme strongly advocated that the social and cultural dimensions of the global HIV epidemic must be addressed in the development process and has assisted in broadening the world's perspective on HIV. Other programmes on viral research and epidemiology are complemented by the HIV and Development Programme emphasis on cultural, social, and human behaviour issues. The global HIV effort is thus emerging as a multisectoral and multidisciplinary attack on the epidemic. For example, UNDP is collaborating with African NGOs and government organizations in creating people-focused initiatives that examine the impact of HIV/AIDS on individuals, families and communities. The mid-term review team was impressed with the global programme's active assistance to groups such as Women Fighting AIDS in Kenya (WOFAK), a network of women living with HIV. UNDP is helping those women and their families to cope with the social stigma of the disease as they attempt to live normal and productive lives. During a site visit, the review team noted that the UNDP assistance was highly appreciated by the Kenyan women. The programme also helped regional bureaux to plan and restructure regional networks to conceptualize the HIV/AIDS epidemic's impact on the social dimensions of development. The African Network, the Asia and Pacific Network and the Latin American and Caribbean Network are helping to shape regional and

country responses in the areas of ethics, law, human rights and HIV/AIDS. The mid-term review team was aware that the Joint and Co-Sponsored Programme on AIDS had been established, and expects that the UNDP efforts in the area of HIV/AIDS will contribute to insight into the new endeavour.

B. Health research and development

15. The global and interregional programme has been a co-sponsor and financial supporter of the UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases Research; the UNDP/United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)/United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)/World Bank/WHO Programme for the Control of Diarrhoeal and Acute Respiratory Diseases; and the UNDP/UNFPA/World Bank/WHO Special Programme on Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, all headquartered at WHO in Geneva. All of the programmes promote the application of research and development in varying degrees. Research has been directed at problems encountered in disease control or with respect to human reproduction, ranging from biomedical to operational research, including research in the social sciences. Research efforts have resulted in measurable improvements of control of diseases, with a significant impact on people's health. Because they are most at risk, poor people are likely to be the largest group of beneficiaries. All three programmes involved a heavy emphasis on research capacity-building through training and institution-strengthening activities in the programme countries.

16. Vaccines are one of the most powerful tools against disease. Global programmes have supported the UNDP/WHO Vaccine Development Programme since its inception in 1986. This programme is now part of the Global Programme on Vaccines (GPV), which also includes the former Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) and Vaccine Supply and Quality. The use of vaccines on a global scale has led to the eradication of smallpox, the approaching eradication of polio, the elimination of measles in some parts of the world and dramatic reductions in morbidity and mortality from other communicable diseases. There is tremendous scope, however, for further research efforts to improve existing vaccines and develop new ones (e.g., against malaria, shigella dysentery and pneumonia). Collaboration with private industry is indispensable, because vaccine development is an immensely costly undertaking, which cannot be handled by the public sector alone. Conversely, since industry cannot be assumed to be motivated to invest large sums of money in the development of vaccines for markets that do not offer a reasonable financial return, there remains an important role for public financing. In this interplay, UNDP has joined with WHO, in assuming a leadership role. UNDP not only supports the vaccine research and development component of the WHO GPV, but has also played an initiating role in the establishment of CVI, following the World Summit for Children in 1991, and, recently, of IVI, in Seoul, the Republic of Korea, as a part of CVI. CVI plays primarily an advocacy and fund-raising role in the attempt to develop new and improved vaccines and is a coalition of many partners (UNDP, WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank, the Rockefeller Foundation, bilateral donors and the private sector). It develops strategies, determines what resources are needed and encourages collaboration. It was not entirely clear to the mid-term review team to what extent CVI has led to the availability of financial resources which otherwise would not have become available. In addition, CVI should guard against overlap and duplication with the WHO GPV, and continued collaboration with WHO on all vaccine development and is encouraged.

17. Another example of the development of new partnerships which focus on innovative aspects of human development is the creation, through the interregional programme, of the Partnership for Child Development. The Partnership, which was initiated in 1992 by UNDP and the Rockefeller Foundation, is one of the first international efforts to institute school-based interventions to deliver drugs that eliminate parasitic worm infections and to provide micronutrients to school-age children. With a UNDP input of \$400,000, the effort is currently being tested on a pilot basis in six countries (Columbia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the United Republic of

Tanzania and Viet Nam). The UNDP financial contribution has been matched by \$5.5 million from collaborating institutions, including the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the James S. McDonnell Foundation, the Overseas Development Administration (United Kingdom), and the International Development Research Center by additional financial inputs at the country level from UNICEF. Early findings on the basis of the test activities indicate that the Partnership is a programme which could and should be brought to scale in many countries.

18. While acknowledging the significance of the inputs of global and interregional programmes in the health sector in general and the global programme's participation in WHO programmes in particular, the mid-term review raised concerns that the emphasis was biased in favour of technical, disease-oriented programmes. In the late 1980s, support was provided for the International Commission on Health Research for Development and subsequently for its successor, the Council on Health Research and Development. The Commission's emphasis on the need for essential national health research calls for the development and strengthening of health/systems research. The mid-term review team encourages increased attention by UNDP to that aspect of health research, including the development of social science expertise.

C. Water and sanitation

19. UNDP acted as the coordinating agency for United Nations activities undertaken during the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade, 1980-1990. During that period, the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme was initiated; it has now been extended to 40 countries. Operating on a decentralized basis, five regional teams assist countries in the development of policy in the sector, which, in turn, may lead to country-wide coverage. Over the past 10 years, the work of the programme has resulted in follow-up investments in excess of \$4 billion, targeted to reach more than 100 million people, primarily the poor. The Water and Sanitation Programme currently has an annual budget of \$12 million from 15 donors, with regional offices in Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia and Kenya. The programme has significantly contributed to a multilateral bank loan policy on water and sanitation.

D. Urban management

20. The Urban Management Programme (UMP) is a large interregional project with regional offices in Quito (Ecuador), Cairo (Egypt), Accra (Ghana) and Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia). It represents a unique mechanism for mobilizing national, regional and international support and expertise for capacity-building and research programmes in developing countries. The five principal themes (urban management, finance/administration, infrastructure management, management of the environment, land management and alleviation of urban poverty) are broad, and country requests for services exceed the project's capacity and budget. The UNDP interregional programme was strengthened by Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland in the provision of core funding. The budget for the five-year period is \$25 million. The programme is decentralized and demand-driven with regard to designing country and regional activities. Activities are planned at the city, country, regional and global levels. Environmental profiles have been prepared for Sao Paulo (Brazil), Tianjuin (China), Accra (Ghana), Jakarta (Indonesia), Katowice (Poland) and Tunis (Tunisia). UNDP interregional support has also contributed to the development of the Sustainable Cities Programme. Support has been provided for activities aimed at strengthening local government capacities for planning, implementing and managing urban development programmes. Land infrastructure activities have been undertaken in Dhaka and Chittagong (Bangladesh), urban land management in Recife/Curitiba (Brazil), land information systems and property taxes in the Punjab (India), garbage collection and disposal in Mali, land management and municipal finance

activities in Lagos (Nigeria), and land information database activities in Singapore.

E. Debt management

21. The Debt Management Programme is a collaboration between UNDP, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the World Bank. Each institution makes unique contributions to the management of this complex issue. There is a demand in many countries for technical cooperation in the management of external resources. Two subregional projects have been launched for 12 countries in Eastern and Southern Africa and for 3 Baltic States. In 1993, the central banks of 12 Eastern and Southern African States, supported by their Ministries of Finance, launched initiatives to upgrade significantly the management of their external debt and resources. Those programmes of advice, training and networking were financed by the countries themselves. The Debt Management Programme comprises country needs assessments, preparation of regional and subregional projects for training, advice and networking among country debt managers, as well as the development of software for debt data management. Those activities form the core of the UNDP initiatives in the interregional programme to strengthen the debt management capacities of developing countries. The programme links several indebted countries with similar portfolios to manage. The exchange of experiences is a useful vehicle for the transfer of information, management and negotiation skills.

F. Energy

22. UNDP and the World Bank continue to co-sponsor ESMAP, which is supported by modest funding from interregional IPF resources and some national IPF resources. In accordance with the recommendations of a high-level commission established in 1990 at the initiative of UNDP, a Consultative Group on Energy Assistance was formed and an external Technical Advisory Group was assembled. Those bodies have helped the new ESMAP management group to focus the ESMAP programmes on assisting countries in the preparation of energy assessments and strategies and in designing, implementing and funding significant follow-up activities. While financial constraints limited funding from the interregional programme, the guidelines agreed to by the two sponsors and the Consultative Group are being followed in responding to the needs of developing countries in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America. Since the beginning of the fifth cycle, some 42 country-specific and 4 global activities have been concluded by ESMAP.

G. Environmental and sustainable agriculture

23. During the fourth cycle, in conjunction with the World Resources Institute and a small group of bilateral donors and private foundations, interregional programmes contributed to the early research and planning which led to the establishment of GEF. Much of the planning for GEF was documented in a UNDP-financed report entitled "Natural endowments: financing resource conservation for development", which proposed the creation of an international environmental facility for conservation financing. Subsequently, GEF was established, and during the fifth cycle, the global programme suggested a number of projects for consideration for GEF funding, six of which have received financial resources from GEF. Research on such critical issues as methane emissions from flooded rice soils, with sites in China, India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand; alternatives to slash and burn subsistence agriculture, with sites in Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia; and monitoring of greenhouse gases at selected sites in Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, China, Kenya and Indonesia, were thereby introduced to the GEF programme. Thus, the mid-term review found that global GEF projects focus on issues that are critical and of common interest to many countries. They attract country co-financing, and encourage countries to develop policies, programmes and institutional capacity on critical environmental topics.

24. The global programme on food and agriculture in the fifth cycle emphasizes the development of environmentally acceptable sustainable technology for staple food crops. Examples include projects on integrated pest management (IPM) for cassava-growing in Latin America and West Africa; biological nitrogen fixation and IPM for rice-growing in Asia; tsetse traps using biological attractants as bait in Africa; the identification and use of natural products that interfere with the maturation of desert locusts; breeding insect pest resistance into tropical maize and wheat in Latin America; and breeding for plant disease resistance (Black Sigatoka) in plantains and bananas for local consumption and global exploitation. The projects all seek economical and effective alternatives to commercial chemicals (insecticides, fungicides and nitrogen fertilizer), in order to protect the health of farm families, prevent environmental degradation and provide a measure of crop protection to farmers who do not have access to or cannot afford commercial products. Other approaches to the development of environmentally acceptable technology that are especially appropriate for resource-poor farmers, men or women, include the breeding of fast-growing tropical fish (Tilapia), which have a 100 per cent greater growth rate and 50 per cent better survival rate than current local stock; a new and improved tropical rice plant which may prove to be the prototype for future rice varieties that will require fewer pesticides and offer better yields and grain quality; and the breeding of tropical wheat, maize and sorghum that are particularly well suited to resource-poor farmers with marginal soils in less favourable agricultural climates.

25. Time did not permit the assessment of the utilization of research results by the cooperating countries. The review team was aware, however, of independent studies that have associated the rice research network supported by UNDP with the remarkable global increase in rice production. Although it is too early to determine the utilization at the country level of the research results of other projects that began with the fifth cycle, it is urged that such assessments be made in the future.

H. Innovative pilot programmes

26. The interregional projects on strengthening electoral administration in developing countries, privatization, and a computer-mediated communications and information network (the Sustainable Development Network Programme (SDNP)) are examples of projects with modest budgets but the potential to make a great impact in the participating developing countries. While the contribution of each project is not decisive on a global scale, each project may add a critical dimension in certain developing countries. For example, it was noted that the interregional electoral administration project was conceived in response to a recent interest by many developing countries, and was deliberately structured to facilitate the availability of the services from the Electoral Assistance Division of the United Nations Secretariat. Certain UNDP field offices also were major contributors to the initiative. Similarly, SDNP and the United Nations Environment Programme's computer networking programme have recently agreed to collaborate in delivering and exchanging important data on sustainable development and the environment on a global basis. SDNP currently operates in 20 developing countries, serving Governments, NGOs and the private and academic sectors. The future joint network should assist developing countries to gain access to computer data on sustainable development.

I. Collaboration and execution

27. The execution and implementation of global and interregional programmes involved a group of executing and implementing agencies and countries, including the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS); the World Bank, WHO, FAO and other specialized United Nations agencies; CGIAR institutes; many developing countries; and selected advanced laboratories in both the North and the South. Most of the global health research is executed

by WHO. Agricultural research is executed by either UNOPS or the World Bank and is implemented by International Agricultural Research Institutes (most of which participate in CGIAR), and often in close collaboration with specific programme countries and a select number of advanced laboratories. All health and agricultural projects are reviewed by external teams of scientists and management specialists. In addition, UNOPS sends annual external review missions to CGIAR institutes and collaborating institutes in the programme countries. Annual work plans and budgets are required and must reflect both research progress to date and the recommendations of the external review panel before payment is authorized. Annex III lists 16 major co-sponsors of global and interregional programmes.

J. Internal collaboration

28. Global and interregional programmes appear to have been better recognized and appreciated by the Governing Council and by external co-sponsors than by units within UNDP. The panel noted that the UNDP regional bureaux and country offices often had less than the desired level of knowledge about most global and interregional activities. Nevertheless, exceptions to this general statement indicate the future potential to expedite global research and facilitate the use of the results of that research by countries. Improved collaboration within UNDP should enhance the "value-added" component of UNDP financing of global research and interregional activities. The mid-term review team was not able to clearly identify why there was not better collaboration within UNDP in carrying out the research and development activities in the field. One possible reason may have to do with the system of communication as well as the overall working relations between the different bureaux. The Bureau for Programme and Policy Support ought to pay special attention to this.

29. There was also some concern that regional bureaux and country programmes may not be using effectively the improved products and processes resulting from the global research programmes in their development projects. The relatively small proportion of UNDP resources (2 to 4 per cent of total IPF) being implemented through global and interregional programmes may be a factor, as well as the differences in modes of operation in planning and implementing projects. Likewise, the lack of ownership of global and interregional projects by any single country or region may be involved. In any case, there appear to be stronger collaborative ties outside UNDP than internally. This situation should be examined by UNDP to determine what steps could be taken to improve active cooperation among UNDP units concerned with either the creation or use of new and improved technologies, processes and practices.

III. THE RELEVANCE OF GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES TO SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

30. In its decision 90/34, the Governing Council identified areas of focus for the fifth cycle. The mid-term review noted that, in particular, the goals of the advancement of women, the alleviation of poverty, and the protection/regeneration of the environment were clearly emphasized in fifth cycle global and interregional programmes. The exceptionally high degree of financial leverage employed was critical in mounting a meaningful response to the goals, and the fifth cycle capitalized successfully on the progress and experience of global and interregional programmes in prior cycles. Global research in the areas of health and food is positioned to provide the greatest benefit to the urban poor, the rural landless, women and children.

31. In view of Governing Council decision 90/34 and Executive Board decision 94/14, the means by which global and interregional programmes strive towards their goals merit comment. The programmes are goal-oriented and pragmatic. At the same time, scientific research in such areas as advanced genetics, cell biology and biochemistry are often used to facilitate planning. Where appropriate, in the areas of tropical maize insect resistance and

vaccine development, for example, the private sector is involved. Participatory approaches have been successful in the Water and Sanitation Programme, and the use of research and testing networks linking developing countries together, effective forms of TCDC, is a common strategy in the areas of agriculture and health. Thus, the International Network for the Genetic Evaluation of Rice (INGER), initiated with UNDP support, is seen by developing countries in Asia as the single most important activity involving the International Rice Research Institute. Gender concerns were addressed through several approaches, including through the programmes for the reduction of maternal mortality, HIV and development, water and sanitation, and special training for African women in integrated pest management.

32. Because sustainable human development is people-centred, one important aspect for measuring the impact of the programmes is the number of people affected. For instance, hundreds of millions of people are better off because of the high-yield varieties of rice, wheat and other staple crops developed by the international agricultural research centres and supported in part by UNDP global programmes. Sector policy work in the field of water and sanitation, together with capacity-building and investment programme preparation supported by the interregional programme, will benefit at least 100 million people over the next 10 years. Vaccines, drugs, diagnostic tests and vector-control techniques, also developed with support from global programmes, find their way into national primary health care programmes and have potentially benefited millions of people. Thousands of scientists and other specialists from programme countries, trained with the support of the global and interregional programmes, contribute to long-term capacity-building efforts in those countries.

IV. SUMMARY OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS ON EXPERIENCE GAINED AND THE FUTURE RELEVANCE OF GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES

33. It was concluded that global and interregional programmes in the fifth cycle reflected the spirit and substance described in the initial programme document (DP/INT/GLO/2, dated 12 December 1991) and appeared to be making good progress. Global and interregional programmes also seemed to enjoy extensive collaboration with bilateral and multilateral assistance agencies and private foundations. There was a major focus on sustainable human development in both global research activities and interregional programmes, through goals such as health, staple foods, environmentally appropriate technology, community-based water and sanitation, HIV prevention, urban management and development, trade expansion and electoral assistance. Major programme themes included the advancement of women, a focus on urban and rural landless poor, popular participation, capacity-building, TCDC and job creation. In general, the overall directions for UNDP activities contained in Governing Council decision 90/34 and Executive Board decision 94/14 are reflected in fifth cycle global and interregional programmes.

34. The mid-term review saw no reason to recommend that any of the ongoing research projects be terminated prematurely, since both the content (sustainable human development) and execution appear to be appropriate and satisfactory. Indeed, the review was concerned that certain very promising global and interregional projects have been adversely affected by the 30 per cent reduction of IPF entitlements in the fifth cycle.

35. Several of the principles and strategies that appear to have been important to recent successes in global and interregional programmes are summarized below:

(a) In the areas of health, water and sanitation, urban development, sustainable food production, energy, fisheries, etc, there was a pattern of responding to an urgent common need of several programme countries by

mobilizing financial and professional resources in a collaborative endeavour with partner external support agencies;

(b) Steps were taken to increase the focus of the programmes on issues of global and/or interregional concern where UNDP and its partners had a comparative advantage;

(c) Because of the heavy reliance on collaborative arrangements, the IPF (2 to 4 per cent of total UNDP resources) is highly leveraged by joint funding from external sources;

(d) Several programmes are recognized widely as highly successful and are likely to have a major impact in developing countries. The programmes for tropical diseases research, water and sanitation and CGIAR agricultural research and development are examples. In addition, those programmes have contributed to the policies and strategies governing loans or grants by other donors. A \$4 billion water and sanitation effort by a major development bank is an example;

(e) In all cases, the long-term major beneficiaries were low-income and disadvantaged members of society, especially women and children, who suffer the most from poverty, hunger, sickness and lack of educational opportunities;

(f) The importance of including the potential beneficiaries in the research, testing, adaption and delivery of technology was recognized. Collaborative networks were often used to ensure active participation;

(g) The staff involved appeared to use considerable innovation in developing concepts and structuring programmes, as in the early stages of planning that led to the establishment of GEF.

36. As discussed in paragraphs 29 and 34 above, it was noted during the mid-term review that the improved products and processes resulting from global research were used more by external institutions than by units within UNDP. UNDP should assess the reasons for this and seek remedies that would increase internal collaboration without compromising the basic portfolios and existing strengths of each partner.

Annex I

I. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	\$	\$
A. <u>Resources available for programme period</u>		
IPF a/	124 825 000	
Estimated cost-sharing	<u>42 550 000</u>	
Total		167 375 000
B. <u>Commitments</u>		
<u>Approved programmes/project budgets b/</u>		
Approved and allocated IPF	135 641 000	
Approved and unallocated IPF	<u>-</u>	
Subtotal		135 641 000
Approved and allocated cost-sharing	42 550 000	
Approved and unallocated cost-sharing	<u>-</u>	
Subtotal		<u>42 550 000</u>
<u>Pipeline programmes/projects</u>		
IPF	-	
Cost-sharing	<u>-</u>	
Total		178 191 000
C. <u>Balance of resources available for further programming c/</u>		
IPF		(10 816 000)
Cost-sharing		-
Balance of resources available		<u>(10 816 000)</u>

a/ Inclusive of carry-over or borrowing from the fourth cycle.

b/ "Approved and allocated" refer to those programmes and projects approved by the Action Committee or Bureau Project Appraisal Committees for which there exist detailed, signed project documents and budgets. "Approved and unallocated" represent the balance of funds available to the programme or project which have yet to be reflected in specific budget lines.

c/ It is anticipated that through increased cost-sharing contributions, further budgetary reductions and rephasings of approved budgets to the successor programming period, IPF expenditures will not exceed IPF resources available during the programme period.

II. PROPOSED (P) AND ACTUAL (A) ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES BY AREA OF CONCENTRATION

Area of concentration	IPF		Cost-sharing		Total		Percentage of total	
	(P)	(A)	(P)	(A)	(P)	(A)	(P)	(A)
Social development	60 000	50 000	20 000	32 000	80 000	82 000	34.5	48.8
Environment and natural resources	83 000	66 000	20 000	9 000	103 000	75 000	44.4	44.6
Public sector management	25 000	9 000	10 000	2 000	35 000	11 000	15.1	6.6
Unprogrammed resources	14 000	-	-	-	14 000	-	6.0	-
Total	182 000	125 000	50 000	43 000	232 000	168 000	100.0	100.0

/...

Annex II (continued)

	<u>Amount</u>
<u>Public sector management</u>	
INT/92/004 Sustainable development	260
INT/92/005 Urban management	5 599
INT/92/010 International Parliamentarian Union	130
INT/92/013 Urban forum	69
INT/92/021 Collaborative Council	400
INT/92/025 Task force	166
INT/92/027 Human development	100
INT/92/028 Sustainable Development Network	245
GLO/92/024 Azimuths (information awareness)	100
GLO/92/027 Development communication	100
<u>Employment</u>	
INT/92/011 Employment opportunities	375
INT/92/012 Rubberwood industry	400
INT/92/020 Enterprise development	250
INT/92/029 Intellectual property	166
INT/92/038 World maritime	200
<u>Debt Management</u>	
INT/92/026 Debt management	2 173
<u>Education</u>	
INT/92/007 Basic education	150
INT/92/022 Health learning	250
INT/92/031 Educational forum	232
INT/92/043 Basin education	397
GLO/92/031 Education for All	230

Annex III

CO-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES - GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROGRAMMES

1. Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR):
FAO/World Bank/UNDP
2. UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in
Tropical Diseases Research
3. Diarrhoeal Disease Control and Acute Respiratory Infections: World
Bank/UNICEF/UNDP/WHO
4. UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme
5. Partnership for Child Development: UNDP/Rockefeller Foundation/Clark
Foundation/McDonnell Foundation
6. Joint and Co-Sponsored Programme on AIDS: UNDP/UNICEF/WHO/UNESCO/World
Bank/UNFPA
7. Maternal Mortality and Morbidity: UNICEF/WHO/UNDP
8. UNDP/World Bank Energy Management Assistance Programme
9. Tuberculosis Control Programme: UNDP/WHO
10. Human Reproduction Programme: WHO/UNFPA/World Bank/UNDP
11. Micronutrient Initiative: International Development Research Centre
(IDRC)/Canadian International Development Agency/World Bank/UNICEF/UNDP
12. Strategy for International Fisheries Research (SIFR):
World Bank/IDRC/European Community/Norwegian Agency for International
Development/World Bank/UNDP
13. Task Force for Child Survival: Rockefeller
Foundation/World Bank/WHO/UNICEF/UNDP
14. International Programme for Training and Research in Irrigation and
Drainage (IPTRID): World Bank/UNDP
15. International Programme on Debt Management: UNCTAD/World Bank/UNDP
16. Urban Management Programme: UNDP/World Bank/UNCHS
17. International Initiative Against Avoidable Disabilities (IMPACT):
WHO/UNDP/UNICEF

