




Democracy Support through the United Nations

Mapping Study

Report 10/2010 - Evaluation



Norad

Norwegian Agency for
Development Cooperation
P.O.Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 Oslo
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Phone: +47 22 24 20 30
Fax: +47 22 24 20 31

Photos: Sudanese march through the streets of the Southern capital Juba to mark the launch of voter registration for April 2010 elections – Peter Martell/IRIN

Design: Agendum See Design
Print: 07 Xpress AS, Oslo
ISBN: 978-82-7548-553-1

Democratic Support Development through the United Nations

Mapping Study

February 2011

Task Team:

Mr. Arne **Disch**, Scanteam, team leader
Ms. Marta **Foresti**, ODI, team leader/literature review
Mr. Hannes **Berts**, Stockholm Policy Group
Mr. Vegard **Bye**, Independent consultant (Scanteam)
Ms. Liv **Moberg**, Scanteam
Ms. Hanne Lotte **Moen**, Nord/Sør konsulentene
Mr. Manolo **Sanchez**, Scanteam
Mr. Endre **Vigeland**, Scanteam

Quality Assurors:

Mr. Erik **Whist**, Scanteam
Mr. Joël **Boutroue**, independent adviser

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | v |
| Executive Summary | ix |
| 1. Background and Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 The Mapping Study | 3 |
| 2. The Aid Database | 5 |
| 2.1 The Overall Database | 5 |
| 2.1.1 DemDev Assistance across Channels | 6 |
| 2.1.2 The UN as Channel for DemDev Assistance | 8 |
| 2.1.3 DemDev Assistance by Channel and Dimension over Time | 8 |
| 2.1.4 Findings and Conclusions | 9 |
| 2.2 Norwegian Support for Democratic Development through the UN | 12 |
| 2.2.1 Findings and Conclusions | 13 |
| 2.3 Support for the Nine Study Countries | 13 |
| 2.3.1 Distribution of DemDev Funding across the Nine Countries | 13 |
| 2.3.2 Distribution of Funding across DemDev Dimensions | 15 |
| 2.3.3 Findings and Conclusions | 17 |
| 2.4 Support through alternative UN Channels | 17 |
| 2.4.1 Findings and Conclusions | 19 |
| 3. Country Portfolios | 20 |
| 3.1 Afghanistan | 20 |
| 3.2 Guatemala | 21 |
| 3.3 Malawi | 22 |
| 3.4 Mozambique | 23 |
| 3.5 Nepal | 23 |
| 3.6 Pakistan | 23 |
| 3.7 Palestinian territories | 23 |
| 3.8 Sudan | 24 |
| 3.9 Timor-Leste | 24 |
| 3.10 Overall DemDev Portfolio | 24 |
| 3.10.1 Findings and Conclusions | 25 |
| 4. The Field Work | 26 |
| 4.1 Defining the Field Work Case Load | 27 |
| 4.2 Findings and Conclusions | 29 |
| Annexes | 33 |

Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| CAP | Consolidated Appeal |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DemDev | Democratic Development |
| ILKO | International Labour Office/Organisation |
| LOTFA | Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan |
| MFA | Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| NOK | Norwegian <i>Kroner</i> ¹ |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNFPA | United Nations Population Fund |
| UNHCHR | United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNIFEM | United Nations Development Fund for Women |

¹ Exchange rate January 2010: USD 1 = NOK 5.75 (approximately)

Executive Summary



Executive Summary


The team has reviewed Norad's aid database with regards to support to democratic development (DemDev) through the UN system, where the following are considered the main findings:

- During the ten years 1999-2008, Norway funded a total of 12,600 agreements in the field of Democratic Development (DemDev) with more than NOK 12 billion. This raises a question of the degree to which Norway's aid administration is able to process over 1200 DemDev proposals a year in a field that is considered among the most complex in development cooperation.
- Of these, 1,065 agreements for a total of almost NOK 2.9 billion went through multilateral agencies, of which UN agencies managed 780 agreements for nearly NOK 2.2 billion.
- Funding for DemDev through the UN has trebled over the period, but unevenly across the seven different DemDev dimensions.
- In terms of the UN's relative importance, it is by far the greatest in the field of electoral support where it handles over half the total funding. It is important when it comes to Public oversight institutions and Gender equality, and fairly unimportant in Civil society support and Free media. There are a number of possible explanations for the varied funding picture across DemDev dimensions, so the team will need to pursue this question in the field.
- There are no particular *trends or tendency* over time in terms of importance of the multilateral channel, and by extension the UN system.
- In the nine countries under study, Norway funded 235 agreements for a total of just over NOK 780 million. While Guatemala received NOK 172 million, the Palestinian territories got just over NOK 10 million. The reasons for the very different funding levels are probably case-specific, but may involve whether Norway has direct (bilateral) channels available, the degree to which the UN is receiving funding for other activities (crowding out DemDev funding), perhaps the quality and relevance of the DemDev projects being proposed for funding by the UN. The field work will address these issues.
- When it comes to DemDev dimensions, the funding pattern is different for the nine countries than for the UN as a whole, but not in a systematic way. Since the group of nine largely consists of fragile states, one might have expected some pattern within this group, yet there does not seem to be one. This raises a question of whether Norway or the UN has any strategy for support to DemDev in fragile state contexts. A possibility may be that the UN in fact has such a systematic approach but the Norwegian funding does not reflect this since it only funds a certain share/fragment of the UN DemDev portfolio – an issue to be pursued.

- UNDP is by far the most important UN agency, representing over 80% of the funding and nearly three-quarters of the agreements with the UN family. The other agencies to note are UNICEF, UNHCHR and UNIFEM.
- UNDP handles all the election support and nearly all the funding for legal and judicial development, and over 80% of the funding for public oversight institutions and parliament, and civil society support. It handles only half the gender funding.
- The other half of the gender funding is largely divided between UNIFEM and UNFPA, while UNICEF most of the remaining funding for civil society, public oversight institutions and legal and judicial development. UNHCHR is the largest actor apart from UNDP when it comes to human rights support.
- Almost all the funding for Guatemala, Malawi and Mozambique has gone through UNDP while Palestine is the one country where UNDP is not engaged at all. In the other five countries there are two to four other UN agencies present.
- Moving from the statistical data and instead looking at the project portfolios, it is clear that while there are 235 agreements, the number of projects is much smaller: several agreements support one project. A number of projects are in turn linked to what can be considered a thematic program in a number of the countries. The Norwegian funded portfolios thus tend to focus on a few DemDev dimensions in each country, often with one particular theme or program dominant across time.
- The overall portfolio thus contains fewer independent cases than expected. This means on the one hand that the various cases may permit more in-depth results analyses, but also that the limited number means that there will be limited variation for cross-country analyses.
- Using a set of criteria – size and complexity of country program funded, coverage of DemDev dimensions in the overall portfolio being looked at, covering different framework conditions (in particular fragile states), and ensuring that the cases being looked at are the most “information rich” in the portfolio – the team is proposing that a more flexible program than one necessarily limited to five countries is considered.
- Given the resources available, the team is thus proposing to visit Guatemala, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan and Sudan, and add in whatever information is possible through a desk study of the support to Afghanistan, as laid out in the table below:

| Countries | Team and Dimensions to Review |
|------------------|---|
| GUA | Manolo (Civil society – gender), Hannes (justice sector) |
| MAL | Liv (civil society – human rights), Arne (parliamentary strengthening) - Pilot Country |
| MOZ | Arne (media) |
| NEP | Endre (human rights - gender) + desk study Afghanistan |
| PAK | Hanne Lotte (gender) |
| SUD | Vegard (human rights – electoral support) |

Main Report



1. Background and Introduction

Scanteam, in partnership with the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) of the UK, the Stockholm Policy Group (SPG) of Sweden, and Nord/Sør Konsulentene (NSK) of Norway, have been contracted by Norad's Evaluation Department to carry out the "Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Democratic Development through the United Nations", covering the period 1999 till today.

The first deliverable under this contract is a **Mapping Study of Norwegian support** through the United Nations to Democratic Development (DemDev). The study is to review funds disbursed by the embassies to UN organisations in-country and earmarked funds disbursed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to UN organisations, including (global/thematic) trust funds – so-called **multi-bilateral funding**. Norway's direct contributions to the core funds of UN organisations are thus not included.

The study is to provide an overview of the portfolio for the ten-year period 1999-2008. It is to include information regarding what kind of support has been provided through the UN in various countries during the period, and the scale of the support broken down according to the various dimensions of democratic development, UN agency, and years.

The terms of reference (TOR) provide seven dimensions of DemDev that should be included in this evaluation. These are according to sub-categories used by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) when classifying Official Development Assistance (ODA). The overarching category "151 – Government and civil society" covers the seven dimensions as follows (the sub-category classifier is given in parenthesis below):

- Access to justice and judicial development (sub-category 30);
- Government administration: Parliament and public watchdog institutions (sub-category 40);
- Strengthening civil society and "voice and accountability" (sub-category 50);
- Election processes and institutions (sub-category 61);
- Human rights (sub-category 62);
- Media and access to information (sub-category 63); and
- Women's organizations and women's empowerment (sub-category 64).

1.1 The Mapping Study

The Mapping Study is based on Norad's unified **aid database**. It covers all Norwegian ODA, including funding that is channelled through the United Nations.

The database registers data according to, among other variables, (i) year, (ii) agreement partner (i.e. UN agencies), (iii) implementing partner (i.e. government ministry), (iv) sector and sub-sector according to the DAC classifiers, (v) country, (vi) Norway's budget line, (vii) funds allocated/expenditures incurred.

Some of the relevant funding is presumably *not* registered appropriately in the database. The projects/activities are classified according to what the Norad desk officer entering the data considers to be the *major* objective of the funding. In reality many projects address multiple objectives. It will therefore be important to have the UN agencies on the ground verify the funding and classification, since they might well have other activities for which they have received Norwegian funding that they would include under the DemDev umbrella.

Another issue might be more general funding vehicles like multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs). In Afghanistan, for example, the Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA) is a pass-through window for the general Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF). LOTFA is largely funding police and prison services, which the UN may classify under the "legal and judicial development" category, but at the same time the ARTF, as the "mother fund", is administered by the World Bank while the LOTFA is UN administered. The Norad database may therefore (i) not register all LOTFA contributions as under the DemDev heading, or (ii) not register the funding as being UN (though in this case there is in fact one Norwegian contribution to LOTFA registered in the database).

In order to clarify such grey zone issues, a validation of the data with the UN agencies in the proposed study countries will be carried out. Whether the evaluation team will accept all the proposals for changes that may come from the field is a different matter, but it is important to ensure that the UN agencies' understanding of what Norway has funded in the field of DemDev is more or less in line with their own classification.

While the team expects some changes to the overall picture due to this dialogue with the UN agencies, it is not expected to provide large-scale shifts in the overall profile of the activities in a given country. One reason is that most of the relevant funds undoubtedly have gone through the UNDP, as will be seen later in this study. The definition the UNDP has for Democratic Governance is quite close to those operational categories used in the DAC database (see UNDP's web-site www.undp.org/governance). There are other aspects of Democratic Governance included in UNDP's category, but these are state building fields like decentralization and public administration reform which the Terms of Reference for this task have excluded.

The Mapping Study will focus on the nine countries identified as the key ones in the TOR: Afghanistan, Guatemala, Pakistan, Palestinian territories, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Sudan and Timor-Leste.

2. The Aid Database

The team received the part of Norad's database that covers all funding under category "151 – Government and civil society" for the ten-year period 1999-2008 from Norad's statistical department. The evaluation team takes it to be complete and that no relevant funding is excluded, as this database is certainly the most comprehensive and accurate dataset on Norwegian development cooperation. For purposes of this Mapping Study,

As noted above one might question the classification of some of the activities. In tables 4.1 through 4.9, each activity in the nine countries has been listed. In table 4.1, for example, the support to the Loya Jirga – the constitutional assembly to be elected – has been listed as support to civil society whereas it could just as easily have been classified as assistance to electoral processes or to constitutional development. A number of other cases in the other countries can also easily be found. While this may affect somewhat the distributional pattern among the selected DemDev dimensions within the nine countries, overall the finding is that it does not provide serious distortions to the picture being presented here.

2.1 The Overall Database

The database shows that total support to the category of "Government and civil society", whether through direct bilateral agreements or *multi-bilateral funding*, includes a total of about **14,500 agreements** for a total value of nearly **NOK 15.5 billion**.

This DAC category is broader than just support to democratic (or rights-based) development, since it includes assistance to the development of the public sector/ administration. Sub-category "40 – Government administration" includes dimensions like civil service reform and decentralization that are *not* to be included in this analysis. In addition there are two other sub-categories that also belong to public administration support: "10 – Economic and development policy and planning" and "20 – Public sector financial management". This database thus includes two different dimensions of support to societal development – of the state's general policy making and public finance management capacities, and of those functions of the state and civil society that are expected to hold the state accountable. As noted in the TOR, these two aspects of supporting the development of the public sector are related but not necessarily always compatible – though not an issue that this evaluation is to look into.

The team has therefore removed the non-applicable activities from the database before the analysis was begun. Removing the sub-categories “10” and “20” was simple, while in the case of sub-category “40” the team had to go through each of the over 1,000 projects to see from the project title or the project description (where this was provided) whether it belonged in the analysis or not. In most cases, in fact, the project was indeed *not* to be included – most of the support under this sub-category was for public sector strengthening. Once these projects were removed, the database then included a total of **12,600 agreements** for a total value of a little over **NOK 12 billion**.

This is a larger number of agreements than the team had anticipated, and shows a considerable fragmentation of the support. The average size of each agreement is just under NOK 1 million, but it also means that embassies, Norad² and the MFA entered into about 1,250 new agreements in this field every year – a considerable number. This is all the more noteworthy as this field is considered among the most difficult in terms of substance and need for good local knowledge in order to assess realism and relevance, hence requiring considerable substance assessments and internal processing.

2.1.1 DemDev Assistance across Channels

The first issue is to understand the importance of the UN as a channel for DemDev. Table 2.1 looks at total funding by the seven DemDev dimensions by main channel – bilateral versus multilateral organizations. Within the multilateral system, however, Norway does not only fund through UN agencies, but also other multilaterals, such as development banks and regional institutions like the Organization of American States. Table 3.1 thus shows funding through three different channels: direct bilateral assistance, multilateral assistance through UN agencies, and multilateral assistance through non-UN agencies.

2 While it is the embassies and the MFA that take funding allocation decisions today, it was Norad that played that role during the first years of this period. It was only with the reorganization of the MFA-Norad in early 2004 that this responsibility was moved from Norad to the MFA – an issue that the team will need to bear in mind when assessing the decision making process on the Norwegian side during the first period.

Table 2.1: Funding for DemDev by dimension and main channel, totals (NOK '000)


| Dimension | Bilateral | Share | UN system | Share | Other Multilat | Share | Sub-total | Share |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | 952 949.3 | 75.5 % | 228 302.9 | 18.1 % | 80 555.3 | 6.4 % | 1 261 807.5 | 10.5% |
| Govt admin | 303 587.9 | 62.2 % | 159 503.0 | 32.7 % | 24 854.9 | 5.1 % | 487 945.8 | 4.0% |
| Civil society support | 3 810 278.1 | 85.2 % | 408 675.5 | 9.1 % | 253 667.1 | 5.7 % | 4 472 620.7 | 37.0% |
| Elections | 308 874.9 | 44.2 % | 355 102.3 | 50.8 % | 34 732.0 | 5.0 % | 698 709.2 | 5.8% |
| Human rights | 2 606 749.1 | 78.3 % | 644 433.3 | 19.4 % | 77 901.4 | 2.3 % | 3 329 083.8 | 27.6% |
| Free media | 394 186.9 | 85.4 % | 40 297.8 | 8.7 % | 27 157.6 | 5.9 % | 461 642.3 | 3.8% |
| Gender equality | 847 059.5 | 62.2 % | 345 966.1 | 25.4 % | 169 236.6 | 12.4 % | 1 362 262.2 | 11.3% |
| Sub-total | 9 223 685.7 | 76.4 % | 2 182 280.9 | 18.1 % | 668 104.9 | 5.5 % | 12 074 071.5 | 100% |

Source: Norad aid database.

Table 2.1 shows that most funding is handled bilaterally: over **NOK 9.2 billion** or over 76% of the funding. Graph 2.1 shows that this ratio is fairly constant over time.

The distribution of agreements is even more skewed: 11,535 of the 12,600 agreements were bilateral – over 91% of the total (not shown in the table). This means that the typical bilateral project was just under NOK 800,000 versus nearly NOK 2.7 million on the 1,065 multilateral projects. This is because Norway funds many small activities from the embassies: studies, workshops, etc. The multilateral agencies tend to get funding for somewhat bigger projects that often have a two or three-year implementation period.

Graph 2.1: Bilateral versus Multilateral Channels for DemDev (NOK '000)



2.1.2 The UN as Channel for DemDev Assistance

The UN is the preferred channel within the multilateral system: it handles more than three times as much money as other multilateral bodies when it comes to DemDev activities: 18.1% of the total versus 5.5% for the other multilateral agencies.

But funding varies a lot across the different DemDev dimensions. Support to civil society is the single largest category (NOK 3.8 billion) but also the most troubling in terms of classifying the projects as DemDev. A number of the projects, judging from the title or description in the database, appear to be more general support for CSOs than necessarily targeted to those working directly on public sector accountability or activities directly relevant to DemDev. This is also a dimension where the UN is used the least: only a little over 9% of total funds for civil society support is channelled through the UN.

Human rights is the second biggest in terms of funding, with over a quarter of total DemDev funding. Most of this is again handled bilaterally, but nearly 20% goes through the UN, thus making this the *biggest* in terms of Norwegian funds through the UN.

On the other hand over 50% of the funds for elections are channelled through the UN. This reflects the preference by Norway to channel this funding through the international actor that has the mandate and legitimacy to support this politically sensitive activity. This is also a field where international observers and strong presence on the ground is often required, which the UN can deliver, and where the UN has established a set of “good practices” that the international donor community supports. This dimension is quite small, however, receiving less than 6% of total DemDev assistance from Norway.

2.1.3 DemDev Assistance by Channel and Dimension over Time

Table 2.2 shows the development over time, where the category of multilateral institutions covers both UN and non-UN bodies. The **share of total funding** through the multilateral channel was about 17% in 1999 (last line in table 2.2) and rose to 25% the year after, but then fluctuated up and down between 19% and 28%. While the last two years had some of the highest values – 27% and 28% – this seems

more to have been a function of particular issues than any longer-term structural shift.

When it comes to the **shares** channelled through the multilateral system **according to DemDev dimension**, it is difficult to claim any particular trends. When looking at support to legal and judicial development, this has been one of the fastest growing areas, where the two-year average funding increased from around NOK 58 million 1999/2000 to NOK 188 million 2007/08 – that is, by a factor or more than three. Yet the share going through the multilateral channel has fluctuated wildly, from a low of 16% in 2000 and 2004 to highs of nearly 40% (2003) and 36.5% (2001).

A similar situation can be seen with respect to civil society support. There has been a rapid increase in funding levels from an average of NOK 242 million 1999/2000 to NOK 556 million 2007/08. The multilateral channel increased its share to over 30% in 2001, but then has fallen and remained in single-digit percentages the last couple of years.

In the field of human rights, the average funding level has remained more stable, from NOK 270 million the first two years to NOK 409 million the last two years, a rise of 50%. Here again the multilateral channel varied in importance, rising from less than 10% the first year to over 40% the following, to then drop down to an average of 15% over a three year period and then rise again towards the end of the period.

2.1.4 Findings and Conclusions

- During the ten years 1999-2008, Norway funded over 12,600 agreements in the field of Democratic Development (DemDev) with more than NOK 12 billion. This raises a question of the degree to which Norway's aid administration is able to process over 1200 DemDev proposals a year in a field that is considered among the most complex in development cooperation.
- Of these, 1,065 agreements for a total of almost NOK 2.9 billion were channelled through multilateral agencies.
- Of the seven dimensions for DemDev, two are significantly more important than the others, namely Civil society support, with 37% of total funding, and Human Rights, with nearly 28%. At the other end are support to Free media and Public oversight institutions, both with about 4% of Norwegian funding, and support to elections just marginally more.
- In terms of the UN's relative importance, it is by far the greatest in the field of Electoral support where it handles over half the total funding. It is important when it comes to Public oversight institutions and Gender equality, and fairly unimportant in Civil society support and Free media.
- There are no particular *trends or tendency* over time in terms of importance of the multilateral channel, and by extension the UN system.

Table 2.2: Norwegian Funding for Democratic Development, bilateral vs. multilateral channels, by year and dimension (NOK '000)

| Dimension | Type of assist | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Sub-total |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | Bilateral | 31 343.1 | 61 639.5 | 50 322.1 | 60 447.8 | 70 754.4 | 149 136.6 | 131 596.4 | 115 141.0 | 151 921.2 | 130 647.2 | 952 949.3 |
| | Multilateral | 9 287.4 | 12 328.3 | 28 933.0 | 26 074.5 | 46 170.3 | 28 877.1 | 40 653.8 | 24 568.5 | 37 399.9 | 54 565.4 | 308 558.2 |
| | M share (1) | 22.9 % | 16.7 % | 36.5 % | 30.1 % | 39.5 % | 16.2 % | 23.6 % | 17.6 % | 19.8 % | 29.5 % | 24.5 % |
| Govt admin | Bilateral | 33 016.4 | 38 359.7 | 34 161.1 | 14 358.7 | 20 281.5 | 20 487.9 | 53 496.5 | 18 518.7 | 22 907.5 | 47 999.9 | 303 567.9 |
| | Multilateral | 2 170.9 | 2 548.3 | 5 329.0 | 12 210.0 | 5 771.0 | 16 361.8 | 34 006.1 | 25 866.1 | 41 324.0 | 38 770.7 | 184 357.9 |
| | M share | 6.2 % | 6.2 % | 13.5 % | 46.0 % | 22.2 % | 44.4 % | 38.9 % | 58.3 % | 64.3 % | 44.7 % | 37.8 % |
| Civil society aid | Bilateral | 152 258.9 | 277 441.4 | 314 070.4 | 349 709.2 | 359 035.7 | 486 976.1 | 415 036.1 | 439 281.3 | 438 914.2 | 577 554.8 | 3 810 278.1 |
| | Multilateral | 11 321.0 | 43 131.5 | 143 133.0 | 143 601.6 | 53 398.9 | 63 539.7 | 53 140.9 | 55 667.7 | 44 375.1 | 51 033.2 | 662 342.6 |
| | M share | 6.9 % | 13.5 % | 31.3 % | 29.1 % | 12.9 % | 11.5 % | 11.4 % | 11.2 % | 9.2 % | 8.1 % | 14.8 % |
| Elections | Bilateral | 24 957.9 | 37 180.3 | 28 813.0 | 16 614.5 | 15 920.7 | 15 360.5 | 43 475.7 | 43 962.2 | 37 163.4 | 45 426.7 | 308 874.9 |
| | Multilateral | 32 200.7 | 8 000.0 | 13 571.2 | 25 966.3 | 17 124.0 | 64 009.6 | 64 329.5 | 16 285.7 | 33 260.0 | 115 087.3 | 389 834.3 |
| | M share | 56.3 % | 17.7 % | 32.0 % | 61.0 % | 51.8 % | 80.6 % | 59.7 % | 27.0 % | 47.2 % | 71.7 % | 55.8 % |
| Human rights | Bilateral | 186 832.3 | 198 726.1 | 257 966.6 | 346 188.4 | 310 858.0 | 201 692.0 | 221 357.8 | 274 213.3 | 298 645.3 | 310 269.3 | 2 606 749.1 |
| | Multilateral | 19 342.2 | 135 882.4 | 75 200.8 | 58 561.4 | 66 458.4 | 32 336.4 | 60 830.2 | 64 902.5 | 85 696.7 | 123 123.7 | 722 334.7 |
| | M share | 9.4 % | 40.6 % | 22.6 % | 14.5 % | 17.6 % | 13.8 % | 21.6 % | 19.1 % | 22.3 % | 28.4 % | 21.7 % |
| Free media | Bilateral | 23 006.5 | 25 600.2 | 33 312.8 | 28 422.5 | 19 416.5 | 45 536.4 | 52 174.7 | 64 233.7 | 48 792.0 | 53 691.6 | 394 186.9 |
| | Multilateral | 3 955.0 | 6 092.0 | 5 000.0 | 6 500.0 | 7 257.1 | 2 241.4 | 6 999.7 | 5 430.6 | 10 000.0 | 13 979.6 | 67 455.4 |
| | M share | 14.7 % | 19.2 % | 13.1 % | 18.6 % | 27.2 % | 4.7 % | 11.8 % | 7.8 % | 17.0 % | 20.7 % | 14.6 % |

| Dimension | Type of assist | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Sub-total |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Gender equality | Bilateral | 51 139.2 | 49 044.5 | 62 892.2 | 66 206.2 | 74 221.2 | 70 028.5 | 92 494.1 | 80 601.6 | 156 201.3 | 144 230.7 | 847 059.5 |
| | Multilateral | 22 136.9 | 21 855.3 | 20 633.7 | 15 239.4 | 29 420.3 | 30 340.0 | 32 765.2 | 48 635.2 | 175 533.2 | 118 643.5 | 515 202.7 |
| | Mshare | 30.2 % | 30.8 % | 24.7 % | 18.7 % | 28.4 % | 30.2 % | 26.2 % | 37.6 % | 52.9 % | 45.1 % | 37.8 % |
| Totals | | 602 969.6 | 917 830.6 | 1 073 340.4 | 1 170 102.5 | 1 096 089.7 | 1 226 925.7 | 1 302 358.4 | 1 277 309.5 | 1 582 135.6 | 1 825 025.6 | 12 074 087.6 |
| Sub-totals | Bilateral | 502 554.3 | 687 991.7 | 781 538.2 | 881 947.3 | 870 488.0 | 989 218.0 | 1 009 631.3 | 1 035 951.8 | 1 154 544.9 | 1 309 820.2 | 9 223 685.7 |
| | Multilateral | 100 414.1 | 229 837.8 | 291 800.7 | 288 153.2 | 225 600.0 | 237 706.0 | 292 725.4 | 241 356.3 | 427 588.9 | 515 203.4 | 2 850 385.8 |
| | Mshare | 16.7 % | 25.0 % | 27.2 % | 24.6 % | 20.6 % | 19.4 % | 22.5 % | 18.9 % | 27.0 % | 28.2 % | 23.6 % |

(1): Mshare: share of total funding through the multilateral channel.


2.2 Norwegian Support for Democratic Development through the UN

Looking only at UN agencies within the multilateral channel, they handled just over **780 agreements** for a total value of **NOK 2.2 billion**. These agreements are shown broken down by the seven dimensions and the ten years in Annex table A.1.

When looking at the general funding trend, it is clear that Norway has been increasing its support through the UN substantially – from an average of NOK 156 million in 1999/2000 to almost three times as much, NOK 440 million, for the last two years 2007/2008 (two-year moving averages are used to “wash out” year-to-year variations).

When reviewing how this has been allocated across DemDev dimensions, graph 2.2 shows that trends over time vary considerably from one dimension to another. While Legal and Judicial development has received a fairly constant though low level of support, support to Human rights was bigger at the beginning of the period and then tapered off to a more stable but lower level of funding. A similar pattern can be seen with regards to Civil society support, while support to Gender equality and Public oversight bodies (“Govt admin”) both have increased over the last part of the period. Support to elections has shown a lot more variability since it obviously is a function of when elections actually take place.

Graph 2.2: Norwegian Funding for DemDev Dimensions through UN (NOK ‘000)



One of the issues the team will be looking at is exactly what kinds of decision processes the embassies and MFA have when it comes to DemDev initiatives. The UN system presumably presents project proposals addressing many different problems, so the embassies have a wide range of issues to choose between. The framework conditions for likely success of different DemDev initiatives also change, especially in volatile situations like in fragile states, so an initiative that was rejected one year may have been accepted the next.

As will be seen in chapter 4, Norway has funded a number of programmatic themes through the UN. What the team will need to understand better is the extent to which Norway complements UN funding with any direct bilateral funding, if Norway is co-funding with other donors, and if so to what extent this has influenced Norwegian decision making (for example as a means of risk-sharing or reducing own transac-

tion/administration costs, or a wish to reduce collective transaction costs on a larger program).

Other more pragmatic reasons may include the well-known need to disburse allocated funds by the end of the year. It is convenient to use the UN for this purpose, since once the funds have been transferred, even if project activities may not have begun, the transfer is recorded as a disbursement.

These various explanatory models need to be explored because they may lead to quite different conclusions and “lessons learned” regarding how Norway can best support efforts at Democratic Development through the UN system.

2.2.1 Findings and Conclusions

- Norway has funded 780 agreements for a total of NOK 2.2 billion via UN agencies. Funding has trebled over the period, but unevenly across DemDev dimensions.
- There are a number of possible explanations for the varied funding picture across DemDev dimensions, so the team will need to pursue this question in the field.

2.3 Support for the Nine Study Countries

Annex Tables A.2 through A.4 provide information on the funding to only the nine countries in the TOR. They have together **235 agreements** for a total value of **NOK 782.7 million** – that is, 30% of the number of agreements and nearly 36% of the funding.


Table A.2 has the same structure as A.1: funding broken down by year and sub-dimension of DemDev, but for the nine study countries only. Table A.3 shows funding by country by year, and thus shows the funding pattern over time with regards to the various countries while table A.4 shows funding for each DemDev dimension by country.

2.3.1 Distribution of DemDev Funding across the Nine Countries

When looking at table A.2, it is clear that funding has been quite different to the nine countries, both in terms of size and consistency over time. Whereas Norway has funded over NOK 172 million to DemDev through the UN in Guatemala, just over NOK 10 million has gone to the Palestinian territories and just under NOK 47 million to Timor-Leste.

These nine countries have somewhat different relations with Norway. A first group of countries have had bilateral relations for some time, and Norway could therefore have used bilateral channels rather than go through the UN (Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal and the Palestinian territories). In other cases, bilateral relations began developing during the period in question so Norway could have chosen to focus on these emerging channels (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Timor-Leste and Sudan). With Guatemala, Norway had a bilateral program but began phasing out yet continues support to various programs, and thus has used the UN as a major channel (some Norwegian support is continuing through Norwegian NGOs).

Graph 2.3: Norwegian Funding to DemDev by Country over Time (NOK '000)



As can be seen in graph 2.3, Guatemala, Pakistan and Malawi are the countries that have seen the most consistent funding, and Afghanistan to a large extent as well. While Mozambique received considerable funding at the beginning of the period, that has tapered off to nearly zero the last half of the period.

The major surprise is the low level of funding in the Palestinian territories. The first question is therefore if Norwegian funding for DemDev in Palestine in general is low. The database shows, however, that over NOK 837 million was spent on activities classified as DemDev in Palestine over these ten years. This means that only a little over one percent of Norwegian funding has gone through the UN.

Another question is if Norway provides an unusually small share of its aid to Palestine through the UN in general – that this is not a particular issue for the field of DemDev. The team does not have access to the overall aid database to see if the distributional pattern of Norwegian assistance in other fields also shows this very small share through the UN, but the impression is that Norway is an active partner with the UN in a number of fields such as support for refugees through the UNWRA, but also other programs.

The reasons for Norway using the UN so little in this field in Palestine may be the result of a number of factors: Norway has very good and strong bilateral relations that it prefers to use; the UN has not asked for much support in this field from Norway; the UN has asked but Norway has not agreed to funding UN-sponsored programmes either because they were not seen as sufficiently important (low relevance), or not good enough (poor expected effectiveness and impact), or requests came at a time when Norway did not have funds available. The team would therefore have to inquire into what may have been the specific reasons for the low share of funding through the UN to Palestine territories, if this becomes one of the five study countries.

In the case of Guatemala, 35% of DemDev assistance – NOK 172 million out of a total of NOK 495 million – has been channelled through the UN, while in Afghanistan the NOK 138 million through the UN make up just over half the total of NOK 268 million provided for DemDev. But in Guatemala Norway had a fairly strong presence on the ground for most of the period while in Afghanistan much of the funding has had to go

through the multilateral system – the bilateral funding has either been through NGOs or to Faryab province where the Norwegian troops are stationed (the only multi-bilateral funding that did not go through the UN was NOK 15 million to justice sector reform through the World-Bank administered Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund in 2008).


The reasons for the use of the UN as a channel for DemDev may thus be due to a series of different factors that are determined by either country- or situation-specific factors. The field work will therefore, in accordance also with the TOR, need to uncover what have been the drivers in the decision making processes in each country.

2.3.2 Distribution of Funding across DemDev Dimensions

When it comes to which dimensions of Democratic Development Norway has funded through the UN in the nine study countries compared to overall, the picture varies. While the nine countries represent 36% of total DemDev funding through the UN, a comparison of Annex tables A.1 and A.2 shows that along three dimensions these nine countries represent over 50% of the funding (legal and judicial aid, support to civil society, and support to elections), and in one case in fact 75% of total funding (access to media). Along two dimensions, the nine countries represent about one quarter of the funding - support to public watchdog institutions and gender equity – while for human rights about 16% of all UN funding.


The support to the different dimensions in these nine countries over time is shown in graph 2.4 below. Since this now covers only about one third of the total funding to the UN (graph 2.2), the picture is a little different in terms of the profile over time but the overall story is similar: funding to legal and judicial development, human rights and to civil society is fairly constant, gender support increases towards the end of the period, election support is periodic. The limited support to free media largely disappears after the first half of the period.

Graph 2.4: Support to DemDev in Nine Countries, by Dimension (NOK '000)



Annex table A.4 looks at this from another angle, by presenting country support according to sub-dimensions. Here it can be seen that the high share of support to free media through the UN in these nine countries is due to a particular program in Mozambique (a six-year UNDP-UNESCO program to strengthen decentralized radio and other media).

Graph 2.5: Norwegian DemDev Funding by Dimension by Country, 1999-2008 (NOK '000)



The single largest beneficiary dimension is support to civil society, which received over NOK 210 million. A third of this was spent in Pakistan, but Guatemala, Malawi, Nepal and Sudan also received substantial support. This may be the more interesting dimension to look at, both because it presumably covers very different kinds of activities, but also because the societal settings for the support seem to vary considerably and thus it is difficult to immediately see what has caused for example so much support in Malawi and so little in Mozambique, why so much in Sudan and so little in Afghanistan or Timor-Leste.

When it comes to the second-best funded dimension, electoral support, it is not difficult to understand why almost half of the nearly NOK 178 million went for various elections in Afghanistan. Of total funding for elections, only NOK 309 million has been handled bilaterally while NOK 390 went through multilateral channels. Of this again, over NOK 350 went through the UN (the remaining NOK 38 million was either for elections in the Balkans where the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, was used, or other regional bodies like SADC in Southern Africa and the OAS in Central America, or for more general global bodies like the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, IDEA). So here a more general principle may have been at play – that when support for elections comes up, the UN may be the “vehicle of choice”, depending on what the countries in question themselves have stated as their preferred partner.

Graph 2.5/Annex table A.4 also show that well over half the support for judicial reform went to Guatemala, which was a function of a comprehensive legal sector reform programme being implemented in that country. A similar share went for gender equality in Pakistan.

When it comes to supporting parliaments and public watchdog institutions, the picture varies from one country to another in terms of the relative importance of the UN channel. In Afghanistan and Timor-Leste, all Norwegian support in this category was through the UN while in Guatemala 65% was handled bilaterally and the rest through the UN. In the two neighbouring countries of Malawi and Mozambique, all support was handled bilaterally in Malawi and all was handled through the UN in Mozambique. Again the explanations are probably very particular to the situation on

the ground at the time the support was requested. But another point that needs to be borne in mind, and may be particularly pertinent in this case, is that Norway is but one small funding agency in the larger picture, and that while **Norway** may have some policy or priority concerns regarding public watchdog institutions, other funding agencies may have been the preferred partners in these countries which hence explains the rather limited funding for this objective – though this also remains a hypothesis to explore.

There is clearly no reason why support patterns should be similar across different countries (like the selected nine) but rather be determined by the situation on the ground. The various comments or questions above are therefore not very significant. What they do point to is exactly that the team will have to understand the specificities of each country before it can draw any particular conclusions regarding the decisions and patterns of support.

2.3.3 Findings and Conclusions

- In the nine countries under study, Norway funded 235 agreements for a total of just over NOK 780 million. While Guatemala received NOK 172 million, the Palestinian territories got just over NOK 10 million. The reasons for the very different funding levels are probably case-specific, but may involve whether Norway has direct (bilateral) channels available, the degree to which the UN is receiving funding for other activities (crowding out DemDev funding), perhaps the quality and relevance of the DemDev projects being proposed for funding by the UN. The field work will address these issues.
- When it comes to DemDev dimensions, the funding pattern is different for the nine countries than for the UN as a whole, but not in a systematic way. Since the group of nine largely consists of fragile states, one might have expected some pattern within this group, yet there does not seem to be one. This raises a question of whether Norway or the UN has any strategy for support to DemDev in fragile state contexts. A possibility may be that the UN in fact has such a systematic approach but the Norwegian funding does not reflect this since it only funds a certain share/fragment of the UN DemDev portfolio – an issue to be pursued.

2.4 Support through alternative UN Channels

The Norwegian funding has been provided through a number of different UN agencies, though the UNDP is by far the dominant one, as seen in table 2.3 below. The NOK 630 million through the UNDP represents over 80% of all the funding and nearly three quarters of the agreements. Not surprisingly, the second most important channel is UNICEF, with its particular mandate on children's rights and support for women's rights in a number of fields, though funding of only NOK 36 million and 5.5% of the total is perhaps lower than expected. The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR) got a little over NOK 32 million for eleven agreements, and UNIFEM NOK 25 million for ten projects.

From Annex table A.5 and graph 3.6 it is clear that there is a grouping of agencies around certain themes, which is as expected. Legal and judicial reform support is largely through the UNDP, as is 100% of the support for elections. Support to human rights, gender equity and access to media are more evenly distributed across UN


agencies. Several of the UN agencies are only engaged in one or two areas. The UNHCHR only has activities in the field of human rights and UNFPA in gender, while UNIFEM, ILO and UNESCO are engaged in two. UNDP has managed funding for all dimensions and UNICEF in four of them.

Table 2.3: Norwegian funding for DemDev by UN Agency (NOK '000)

| Agency | Funding | Share | Agreements | Share |
|---------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|
| UNDP | 631,171.6 | 80.6% | 171 | 72.8% |
| UNICEF | 36,215.3 | 4.6% | 13 | 5.5% |
| UNHCHR | 32,400.0 | 4.1% | 11 | 4.7% |
| UNIFEM | 25,700.6 | 3.3% | 10 | 4.3% |
| ILO | 10,739.6 | 1.4% | 8 | 3.4% |
| UNFPA | 12,950.0 | 1.7% | 7 | 3.0% |
| UNESCO | 19,050.0 | 2.4% | 6 | 2.6% |
| Other * | 14,428.0 | 1.8% | 9 | 3.8% |
| Total | 782,655.2 | 100% | 235 | 100% |

*: Includes UN Secretariat, UNOCHA, UN Volunteers, UNOPS and various UN offices.

Graph 2.6: Support to DemDev Dimensions through UN Agencies, 1999-2008 (NOK '000)



Concerning the UNDP, one of the questions posed in the TOR and that will be looked at in the field is to what extent it has implemented activities itself (Direct Execution, DEX) or through national bodies (National Execution, NEX), and if there have been any noticeable changes over time or differences across different country situations.

Another question may be to what extent the more specialized agencies in these various sub-fields deliver different kinds of projects or different kinds of results than UNDP. The UNDP takes on projects across all dimensions of Democratic Development, and one question is if it does so with a sufficient level of quality and expertise, given the complexity of the issues and range of dimensions.

This means that the team will be focusing a lot on the performance of UNDP during the field work. However, for each particular dimension – probably with the exception

of legal and judicial reform, and support to elections – the team member responsible for that dimension will also try to pick up on the performance of the other UN agencies in that dimension, to see if there are any significant differences that can be identified across agencies.

Because of the predominance of UNDP, it is of interest to see in which countries the other UN agencies have been involved. Table 2.4 shows that UNICEF and UNHCHR have both had Norwegian-funded DemDev projects in four countries, while UNIFEM has been engaged in five. UNFPA has only been used in Guatemala, while ILO has largely been used in Pakistan. UNESCO had three projects in Mozambique (the media program), and three in the Palestine – the only one of the nine countries where UNDP has not been a channel.

Table 2.4: Number of Agreements (projects) by UN Agency and Country

| | UNDP | UNICEF | HCHR | UNIFEM | ILO | UNFPA | UNESCO | Other |
|---------|------|--------|------|--------|-----|-------|--------|-------|
| AFG | 23 | 1 | 2 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 3 |
| T-L | 16 | 3 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| GUA | 45 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7 | -- | -- |
| MAL | 33 | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| MOZ | 13 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- |
| NEP | 10 | 3 | 5 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 2 |
| PAK | 23 | -- | -- | 1 | 7 | -- | -- | -- |
| PalTerr | -- | -- | 1 | 2 | -- | -- | 3 | 1 |
| SUD | 8 | -- | 3 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 2 |
| Total | 171 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 9 |

2.4.1 Findings and Conclusions

- UNDP is by far the most important UN agency, representing over 80% of the funding and nearly three-quarters of the agreements with the UN family. The other agencies to note are UNICEF, UNHCHR and UNIFEM.
- UNDP handles all the election support and nearly all the funding for legal and judicial development, and over 80% of the funding for public oversight institutions and parliament, and civil society support. It handles only half the gender funding.
- The other half of the gender funding is largely divided between UNIFEM and UNFPA, while UNICEF most of the remaining funding for civil society, public oversight institutions and legal and judicial development. UNHCHR is the largest actor apart from UNDP when it comes to human rights support.
- Almost all the funding for Guatemala, Malawi and Mozambique has gone through UNDP while Palestine is the one country where UNDP is not engaged at all. In the other five countries there are two to four other UN agencies present.

3. Country Portfolios

While the previous chapter has looked primarily at Norwegian funding based on the allocation data in the database, it is possible to take a first look at the actual project portfolios in the nine countries by looking at the individual agreements in the database. The actual lists of projects are provided in Annex tables B.1 through B.9.

The first thing to note that while this study has so far spoken of 235 agreements in the nine countries, the actual number of **projects** or **programs** is a lot less since a number of projects have multiple agreements. This is noted in the country portfolio discussions below, and which in turn are then used to construct table 3.1, which groups the various country programmes in dimensional portfolios.

When putting together table 3.1 and the country portfolio discussions below, some changes have been made compared to the more “mechanical” quantitative analysis in chapter 3. While for chapter 3 the team accepted the classification of the data as contained in the database, here some modifications have been done based on the description of the activities. This is in order to provide a more realistic foundation for the selection of countries and programmes within countries to look at during the field work. The modifications compared with the quantitative analyses are discussed in each case (see for example Afghanistan).

Table 3.1 has also aggregated a number of dimensions into larger categories, in line with the usage in the TOR, rather than the seven dimensions of the DAC classification. The Free media dimension has not been listed since only Mozambique had such a program.

3.1 Afghanistan

The focus of the UN funded portfolio has clearly been the elections. In addition to the 11 agreements for funding elections, two of the four Legal and judicial development projects were voter registration. The one CSO project was to support the Loya Jirga (constitutional assembly) process. Total funding for elections was thus nearly NOK 97 million and not just the NOK 83 million recorded in table A.4. That means this dimension alone accounts for 70% of Norway’s contribution through the UN to DemDev in Afghanistan.

The other single largest contribution is NOK 10 million to LOTFA, and then a number of projects to support various human rights offices or commissions in the country.

Finally UNIFEM received NOK 12 million for two women’s programs – one is the National Action Plan for Women while the other was a Gender and Justice program.

The most interesting program is thus the one supporting elections, since it covers a series of different elections over the time period 2002-2008, and possibly the gender program.

3.2 Guatemala

The largest program in Guatemala is a comprehensive Justice Reform program that received support from 1998 through 2008. It covered a range of bodies, from the reformed national civilian police, the Supreme Court, and the public defender's office. Most of the NOK 73 million for this sector was thus for this large-scale reform, which in table 3.1 has been represented by the four main parts supported by Norway.

Table 3.1: Overview of Key Dimension Programmes by Country (NOK) *

| Legal Reform, Justice Sector and Constitution | |
|---|---|
| East Timor | UNDP: Enhancing the Justice System 03-08 (10 mill) |
| Malawi: One integrated programme | UNDP: Malawi Democracy Consolidation (MDCP): civic education, legal reform, admin of justice, parliamentary and pol inst strengthening and program management capacity building 1999-2008 (41,5 mill) |
| Guatemala Four large programmes | UNDP - OJ: Justice (Supreme Court) 98-04 (16 mill) UNDP - Public Ministry: Justice Reform 00-04 (14 mill) UNDP-IDPP: Justice IDPP (juveniles, women, indigenous) 01-08 (17,5 mill) UNDP - PNC: Justice National Police 02-07 (11 mill) |
| Sudan: Several parts - one program? | UNDP-UNDP: Rule of Law, conflict resolution, support to JAU secretariat (?) and training on constitutional and internat law 04-07 (13,5 mill) |
| Elections | |
| Afghanistan | UNDP-UNDP: Various basket funds 02-08 (97 mill) |
| Sudan | UNDP-UNDP: Basket fund for cap bld of election authorities 07-09 (14 mill) |
| Support to Parliaments and public watchdog institutions | |
| East Timor | UNDP-UNDP: Strengthening Parliamentary Democracy. 04-07 (11,630 mill) |
| Malawi | UNDP: MDCP 99-08 UNDP: Malawi Human Rights commissions strategic plan, 03-07 (7 mill) |
| Human Rights commissions, programmes (indigenous, children, women) | |
| East Timor | UNICEF: Child protection and Child Justice 06-08 (7 mill) |
| Malawi | UNICEF: Child Rights Programme 2004-2008 (11,5 mill) |
| Nepal: | UNDP: National Human Rights commission 2001-2004 (300.000 NOK) UNHCHR: Office of High Commissioner for HR Nepal 2005-2008 (13,5 mill) |
| Sudan: Core to OHCHR | UNHCHR - UNHCHR: HR monitors and OHCHR contribution 04-08 (12,4 mill) |

| Legal Reform, Justice Sector and Constitution | |
|---|--|
| Political participation, voice and accountability, women's empowerment | |
| Afghanistan: | UNIFEM: National Action Plan for Women 06-08 (6 mill), Gender and Justice 07-08 (6 mill) |
| East Timor: | UNIFEM: Women in Politics 07-10 (2 mill) |
| Nepal: | UNICEF: Decentralised Action for Women and Children. 07-08 (14 mill) |
| Malawi: | UNDP: MDCP 99-08 Civil Society Frame Agreement, HR awareness and CS competence building. 2005-2008 (12,554.mill) |
| Guatemala: | UNDP-UNDP: Civil Society Participation 00-08 (60,5 mill) |
| Sudan: | UNIFEM-UNIFEM: promoting women's participation 05-06 (7.699 mill) |
| Pakistan | UNDP-several Ministries: Training of Women Union Councillors and Women's political participation 01-03 (26,9 mill) UNDP: Gender Support Programme/ Gender Equality Umbrella. 03-08 (40. mill) UNDP-UNDP: Support to Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment 04-08 (34 mill) |

*: The table lists the UN agency responsible, sometimes also the implementing partner ("UNDP – UNDP" means UNDP also executed – i.e., DEX); the years of the programme, and the total allocation to the closest NOK million.

Most of civil society support was in the form of a large-scale CSO fund where local organizations were encouraged to apply for financing of activities related to the rule of law, reconciliation and the follow up to the national commission that looked into the atrocities during the protracted conflict in the country. The other program under CSO funding was for strengthening local councils at departmental and later on municipal level.

There is a gender program run by UNFPA, where the seven agreements fund three projects: on gender and governance; combating sexual violence, and gender and statistics.

The Guatemala portfolio is thus somewhat richer than Afghanistan's in terms of identifiable core projects/programs.

3.3 Malawi

The Malawi Democracy Consolidation Program, MDCP, received funding through 15 separate agreements with UNDP, for a total of NOK 41.5 million. Most of these agreements were classified as CSO support, though the MDCP has four main areas of focus: (i) civic education on governance, (ii) legal reform and administration of justice, (iii) parliamentary and political institutional strengthening, and (iv) program management capacity building. Only the first can really be classified as CSO support, though three of the agreements were listed under Elections. This points to the dilemmas of the classification system when a project can only be listed under one heading.

Linked to this was support for a child rights programme managed by UNICEF, as well as considerable support for the elections in 2004 and a follow-up program on electoral reform and funding for the elections in 2009. In addition there was a constitutional review process that received Norwegian assistance.

Six agreements funded support to Malawi's Human Rights Commission, for NOK 7.1 million, which was a project co-funded equally with Sweden. Parallel to this were three agreements to support a CSO frame agreement with UNDP, where these three agreements were not classified as CSO support but rather under the Human rights category.

3.4 Mozambique

The major program in Mozambique was the support to media development through three phases and eight agreements from 1999 through 2006 costing just over NOK 30 million. It was to increase human, technical and organisational capacity of independent media and public service radio to enable them to become sustainable and to contribute effectively to the process of governance and democracy in the country. It was also to strengthen human rights by increasing access to media through decentralisation, the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels and empowering especially isolated communities, youth and women to actively participate in the media.

Norway provided a one-time NOK 20 million contribution to the elections in 1999, and a three-agreement program to support the establishment of a legal and judicial centre during 2000-2002 cost nearly NOK 14 million. Support to prepare for the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) was also provided at a cost NOK 5 million.

3.5 Nepal

The program in Nepal is split across a number of fields, but two programs stand out. One is the focus on Human rights, which has received a total of NOK 19 million in two phases: first through UNDP to a national human rights commission (2001-05) and then to the UNHCHR (2005-08). The other major is a gender program administered by UNICEF, with NOK 14 million. The program is quite recent, however, with funding only for the last two years of this evaluation period.

3.6 Pakistan

The most important dimension is gender. In addition to the NOK 45.5 formally classified as such there are also other gender activities: training of women union councillors, and three agreements to support to women's political participation (classified as CSO support), for a combined additional 26.4 million.

The ILO got five agreements for its IPEC program, with NOK 6.6 million, which was to address the problem of child labour (while focused on the use of media, these agreements are classified as CSO support rather than media).

Finally, two agreements for a total of NOK 27 million supported elections – one was classified as such, the other is found under the sub-category of Government administration.

3.7 Palestinian territories

Five of the seven agreements support women's activities and rights through three programs managed by three different UN agencies, with no clear common theme.

3.8 Sudan

The Sudan program can be split in four: (i) electoral support for both North and South, (ii) a rule of law and conflict resolution program, (iii) support to women's participation, and (iv) human rights through several activities and channels. As with the Nepal program, many of the activities are fairly recent while at the same time spread across the two constituent parts of the country.

The two most interesting programs are the human rights and support to elections.

3.9 Timor-Leste

The support in Timor-Leste has focused on enhancing the justice system, with six agreements for a total of NOK 10.5 million (when including a UNICEF project that focused on child justice), and five agreements that provided support to Parliament for a total of NOK 11.6 million.

Three agreements under the Human rights rubric funded Norwegian JPOs in this field. Two women's projects appear quite different in nature: one funding a guest-house (shelter?) while the other is to support women in politics. The 21 agreements thus boil down to two major programs, covering 11 agreements in total, and a sprinkling of stand-alone activities.

3.10 Overall DemDev Portfolio

The country portfolios are thus more structured around certain themes or issues than the team had originally expected. Given the re-classifications of some of the agreements as seen in table 3.1, this thematic focus becomes even more pronounced. To summarize the country portfolios, the key DemDev dimensions in the various countries are the following:

Table 3.2: Country Portfolio Focus, by DemDev Dimensions

| Country | Primary DemDev | Secondary DemDev |
|-------------|--|--|
| Afghanistan | Elections | Gender |
| Guatemala | Justice reform (broad) | Gender – Civil society support |
| Malawi | MDCP: civil society/legal/ Parliament | Elections – Human rights offices |
| Mozambique | Free media | (Legal/judicial reform – Elections) |
| Nepal | Human rights | Gender |
| Pakistan | Gender | Media/child labour – Elections |
| Pal Terr | Gender | |
| Sudan | Human rights | Elections |
| Timor-Leste | Parliament | Justice sector |

The picture in table 3.2 is not all that different from the one that is provided by the budget data in table A.4/graph 2.5, though the suggested re-classifications mean that the legal/ judicial dimension in Afghanistan is reduced in importance, as is CSO

support and human rights in Guatemala. What was classified as major support to civil society in Malawi is linked with the MDCP program.

The Mozambique dimensions are in line with the data in table A.4, while the Nepal portfolio appears even more fragmented than seen in the numbers in table A.4.

In Pakistan, there are several changes as electoral support is greater than the classification in A.4 shows, while civil society support appears largely linked with gender support. The portfolio in the Palestinian territories is heavily gender-focused, though overall very small. In Timor-Leste the focus is on building the state and thus legal and judicial development and support to Parliament. The gender activities are very perfunctory.

3.10.1 Findings and Conclusions

- Looking at the project portfolios, it is clear that while there are 235 agreements, the number of projects is much smaller: several agreements support one project. A number of the projects may in turn be linked in what can be considered a thematic program. The Norwegian funded portfolios thus tend to focus on a few DemDev dimensions in each country, often with one particular theme or program dominant across time.
- The overall portfolio thus contains fewer independent cases than expected. This means on the one hand that the various cases may permit more in-depth results analyses, but also that the limited number means that there will be limited variation for cross-country analyses.

4. The Field Work

The TOR requests the team to identify five countries in which to carry out the field work. A discussion took place with Norad's Evaluation Department on 12 February 2010 where the preliminary findings from the Mapping Study were presented. The key point made was that given the fact that there is in fact considerable grouping of the 235 DemDev agreements with the UN across the nine countries, the number of independent projects that can form the empirical foundation for the study is actually limited. It was furthermore noted that in each country there tends to be a focus on a few dimensions, so the ability to identify comparable cases across countries also is fairly restricted.

Norad's Evaluation Department emphasized that what is important is that the cases selected for study have identifiable results. This generally would imply that they should have taken place over time, so most one-off or small-scale projects would probably not be valid.

This means that the number of countries may not be such a critical variable, but rather that the team is able to maximize the number of interesting cases. This would also be in line with the approach taken by the team in the Tender Document, where it was the DemDev **dimensions** and not the **countries** that were seen as the interesting variable, a view the Evaluation Department agreed with.

However, when the team raised the issue of not taking the number of countries as the key parameter for specifying the field work, the caution provided by Norad was that if the team spread itself across more countries it might lead to insufficient time on the cases selected.

The team has therefore carefully reviewed the various dimensions for this study:

- **Funding levels:** The levels of assistance to DemDev through the UN varies, and clearly the high-volume countries are the more important (Annex table A.3/Graph 3.3). Based on this criterion, field work ought to be carried out in Afghanistan, Guatemala, Malawi and Pakistan.
- **DemDev Dimensions:** The actual content of the program funded in each country varies, and this can lead to two different ways of assessing this criterion:
 - Half of all gender assistance has gone to Pakistan, and more than half the election assistance to Afghanistan. In order to really understand what can be achieved along either of these dimensions, these two cases should be included.

- Nepal and Malawi have agreements across a number of dimensions, so doing field work in these two countries would generate information on a greater number of valid cases, and would thus also allow for understanding how country context might contribute across different dimensions of DemDev.
- Both of these arguments would seem to be valid and thus need to be considered.
- **State Stability/Maturity:** The TOR note that one dimension of particular interest is the degree to which the countries are fragile states – conflict/post conflict states (Afghanistan, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Palestinian territory and now perhaps Pakistan entering into a more conflictual situation). This covers also emerging states such as Sudan (Southern) and Timor-Leste. Guatemala, Malawi, Mozambique and Nepal represent long-term Norwegian cooperation with fairly stable states, though of these all but Malawi have also come out of quite bloody conflicts not too long ago, with some of the underlying conflicts still not fully resolved (Guatemala, Nepal). So the selection of cases needs to bear in mind that as much of context variation should be included as is feasible.
- **UN Channel:** Since there is some diversity regarding which UN agencies have been used to deliver the DemDev results, it is of interest to find cases where it may be possible to compare UNDP delivery with those of other more specialized agencies. From Annex table A.3 one can see that Nepal would then be interesting since both UNICEF and UNHCHR have several projects there, Guatemala is the only country where UNFPA has a Norwegian-funded program while Afghanistan has UNICEF, UNHCHR and UNIFEM activities in addition to UNDP's. Pakistan has almost all of ILO's activities, and Mozambique half of UNESCO's.
- **Field work possibilities:** One of the key concerns is clearly the extent to which field work can be carried out since the team needs to carry out project visits. At the present time, it seems clear that field work will not be possible in Afghanistan.
 - The field situation may become more unstable in Southern Sudan and perhaps in Pakistan or Nepal as well, but the basic assumption the team is basing its planning on is that apart from Afghanistan it will be possible to carry out field work in all foreseen countries.
- **Projects/Programs with Identifiable Results:** These are the project/program/ DemDev areas identified in table 3.1 from Annex tables B.1-B.9, and restructured and summarized in table 3.2.

4.1 Defining the Field Work Case Load

In the Tender Document the team had proposed to carry out a pilot study in **Malawi**. This was partly because Malawi has had a stable political environment for a long time, and the country itself is small and with good infrastructure, so the conditions for doing field work are good. The Mapping Study has further confirmed that Norway has funded a number of different DemDev dimensions through the UN in that country, so the conditions for testing the methodological approach across different dimensions of Democratic Development are present. **Malawi** thus will be maintained as the pilot country.

Afghanistan, Guatemala and Pakistan are the countries that have received more than NOK 100 million in DemDev funding through the UN, and all three ought

therefore to be included. In the cases of Guatemala and Pakistan, they both also have interesting and large-scale programs in the fields of judicial/legal reform and gender equality, respectively, and thus interesting countries to visit. In addition diversity of UN agencies engaged make them important to include.

Afghanistan, on the other hand, will not be possible to visit due to the security constraints. The proposal is therefore that Afghanistan be addressed through a combination of intensive desk study and telephone interviews. This means that the team will largely not be able to interview local stakeholders – national decision makers, local implementing partners and beneficiaries. The consequences of this will have to be considered more carefully in the Inception Report. As suggested in the Tender, Afghanistan may be included as a “half country”, with a focus on election support.

Sudan is an interesting case to include, both because much of the Norwegian support is for state building in the South, but also because of the complex challenges the UN has faced when carrying out DemDev activities in the country. Sudan poses a particular challenge since activities have taken place both in the north and the south, but the team believes this can be addressed through contracting a local consultant for the north and a second one for the south.

Nepal has two programs that are worth looking at, namely human rights, and gender.

Mozambique is an interesting case for the media program, while the rest of the support there is probably not worth looking at. One thing is that free and accessible media is considered an important part of sustainable democratic development, but this is also one of the few DemDev programs that Norway has funded through the UN that has appears to have a long-term history with documentable results, and is thus expected to be one of the most “information rich” cases in the overall DemDev portfolio.

Timor-Leste also has two very interesting programs, namely support to the development of Parliament, and for developing the justice system. However, it is now clear that the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), in collaboration with Norad’s Evaluation Department, will be doing a full-scale Country Assistance Evaluation, where Norway’s assistance will be looked at in-depth. While the questions that are asked may not be fully identical to the ones for this evaluation, the overlap will be so substantial that it does not seem justified to use limited Norwegian evaluation resources twice in the same time period to address largely the same issues. For that reason the team is suggesting that Timor-Leste **not** be included in among the countries/cases to be evaluated by this team.

Given the small size of the program and the limited number of projects that have been implemented, the **Palestinian territories** will not be included in the study.

This, however, leaves the team with “six and a half countries”: Guatemala, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan and Sudan plus Afghanistan as a desk case.

This, however, can be accommodated within the personnel and financial resources at the disposal of the team, with consultants allocated across tasks and countries as shown in table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1: Country and Consultant Distribution, Field Work Proposal


| Countries | Team and Dimensions to Review |
|-----------|---|
| GUA | Manolo (Civil society – gender), Hannes (justice sector) |
| MAL | Liv (civil society – human rights), Arne (parliamentary strengthening) - Pilot Country |
| MOZ | Arne (media) |
| NEP | Endre (human rights - gender) + desk study Afghanistan |
| PAK | Hanne Lotte (gender) |
| SUD | Vegard (human rights – electoral support) |

- **Manolo Sánchez** and **Hannes Berts** will carry out the field work in Guatemala, given that the program is quite complex and rich;
- **Liv Moberg** will spend the three weeks foreseen for the pilot study in Malawi.
- **Arne Disch** will join Liv for the second week of the field work in Malawi, focusing on the Parliamentary support and methodology issues, and then spend his second week of field time in Mozambique reviewing the media program there;
- **Endre Vigeland** will carry out the field work in Nepal, but will also be given some additional resources to do the desk study on Afghanistan, since the Nepal case study/ write-up is expected to be fairly straight-forward;
- **Hanne Lotte Moen** will review the support to gender equality/women’s organizations in Pakistan;
- **Vegard Bye** will carry out the field work in Sudan.

4.2 Findings and Conclusions

- Using a set of criteria – size and complexity of country program funded, coverage of DemDev dimensions in the overall portfolio being looked at, covering different framework conditions (in particular fragile states), and ensuring that the cases being looked at are the most “information rich” in the portfolio – the team is proposing that a more flexible program than one necessarily limited to five countries is considered.
- Given the resources available, the team is thus proposing to visit Guatemala, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan and Sudan, and add in whatever information is possible through a desk study of the support to Afghanistan.

Annexes



Annexes

Annex A Tables: Total Disbursements to DemDev through the UN:

- A.1: Resources for Democratic Development, UN System in General, by Year and Dimension (NOK '000);
- A.2: Resources for Democratic Development, UN System in Nine Study Countries totals, by Year and Dimension (NOK '000);
- A.3: Resources for Democratic Development, by Nine Study Countries and Year (NOK '000);
- A.4: Resources for Democratic Development, by Nine Study Countries and Dimension (NOK '000).

Annex B Tables: Overview of all DemDev Agreements in Nine Study Countries

- B.1: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Afghanistan
- B.2: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Guatemala
- B.3: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Malawi
- B.4: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Mozambique
- B.5: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Nepal
- B.6: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Pakistan
- B.7: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Palestinian territories
- B.8: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Sudan
- B.9: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Timor-Leste

Annex Table A.1: Resources for Democratic Development, UN system in general, by year and dimension (NOK '000)

| Dimension | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Sub-total | Share | Agree-ments | Share |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | 9,287.4 | 12,328.3 | 28,933.0 | 25,847.4 | 28,962.7 | 22,728.0 | 30,223.0 | 20,480.7 | 16,505.2 | 33,007.2 | 228,302.9 | 10.5% | 91 | 11.6% |
| Govt admin | 2,073.6 | 548.3 | 3,829.0 | 8,850.0 | 5,771.0 | 16,095.0 | 30,045.6 | 21,603.4 | 38,637.1 | 32,050.0 | 159,503.0 | 7.3% | 46 | 5.9% |
| Civil society support | 11,321.0 | 42,541.5 | 50,005.0 | 49,523.2 | 51,155.2 | 47,653.7 | 39,997.5 | 41,455.4 | 30,778.2 | 44,244.6 | 408,675.5 | 18.7% | 135 | 17.3% |
| Electoral support | 32,200.7 | 8,000.0 | 13,345.8 | 22,877.6 | 11,350.0 | 56,475.4 | 60,188.6 | 13,035.6 | 24,598.6 | 113,030.0 | 355,102.3 | 16.3% | 78 | 10.0% |
| Human rights | 11,767.6 | 133,682.4 | 74,837.1 | 58,561.4 | 57,417.9 | 26,390.4 | 60,038.8 | 49,962.5 | 81,210.9 | 90,564.3 | 644,433.3 | 29.5% | 271 | 34.7% |
| Free media | 3,955.0 | 6,092.0 | 5,000.0 | 6,500.0 | 6,500.0 | 0.0 | 5,220.2 | 5,430.6 | 0.0 | 1,600.0 | 40,297.8 | 1.8% | 17 | 2.2% |
| Gender equality | 14,941.9 | 12,106.1 | 9,212.2 | 14,340.9 | 22,318.1 | 12,445.3 | 15,765.2 | 34,635.2 | 137,139.0 | 73,062.2 | 345,966.1 | 15.9% | 144 | 18.4% |
| Sub-total | 85,547.2 | 215,298.8 | 185,162.1 | 186,500.5 | 183,474.9 | 181,787.8 | 241,478.9 | 186,891.8 | 328,869.0 | 387,558.3 | 2,182,280.9 | 100% | 782 | 100% |
| Two-year ave | 150,423.0 | 200,230.5 | 185,831.3 | 182,631.4 | 184,987.7 | 182,631.4 | 211,633.4 | 214,041.2 | 257,736.2 | 358,213.7 | | | | |

Annex Table A.2: Resources for Democratic Development, UN system in nine study countries, by year and dimension (NOK '000)

| Dimension | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Sub-total | Share |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | 7,766.4 | 9,133.0 | 20,825.0 | 20,077.0 | 25,582.0 | 6,194.2 | 13,542.2 | 10,365.8 | 6,660.3 | 9,125.0 | 129,270.9 | 16.5% |
| Govt admin | 2,073.6 | 435.0 | 2,300.0 | 2,350.0 | 1,300.0 | 95.0 | 185.0 | 10,200.0 | 22,180.0 | 1,000.0 | 42,118.6 | 5.4% |
| Civil society support | 2,200.0 | 7,647.6 | 3,125.0 | 24,000.0 | 29,800.0 | 35,978.0 | 22,930.7 | 29,358.0 | 21,178.2 | 34,219.2 | 210,436.7 | 26.9% |
| Electoral support | 27,677.5 | 6,500.0 | 5,919.8 | 15,107.6 | 5,250.0 | 15,250.0 | 18,700.0 | -464.4 | 3,522.1 | 80,430.0 | 177,892.6 | 22.7% |
| Human rights | 2,163.5 | 5,530.7 | 14,450.0 | 10,644.5 | 7,187.8 | 6,909.0 | 16,818.0 | 7,975.0 | 15,525.0 | 17,582.4 | 104,785.9 | 13.4% |
| Free media | 3,955.0 | 6,000.0 | 5,000.0 | 5,000.0 | 4,000.0 | 0.0 | 4,000.0 | 2,200.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30,155.0 | 3.9% |
| Gender equality | 0.0 | 545.0 | 2,050.0 | 0.0 | 4,000.0 | 8,000.0 | 7,699.7 | 16,000.0 | 34,002.0 | 15,698.9 | 87,995.6 | 11.2% |
| Sub-total | 45,836 | 35,791.3 | 53,669.8 | 77,179.1 | 77,119.8 | 72,426.2 | 83,875.6 | 75,634.4 | 103,067.6 | 158,055.5 | 782,655.2 | 100% |
| Two-year ave | 40,813.7 | 44,730.6 | 65,424.5 | 77,149.5 | 74,773.0 | 78,150.9 | 89,351.0 | 130,561.6 | | | | |

Annex Table A.3: Resources for Democratic Development, by nine study countries and year (NOK '000)

| Country | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Sub-total | Share | Agree-ments | Share |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Afghanistan | 800.0 | 0.0 | 1,950.0 | 6,733.0 | 22,900.0 | 15,014.2 | 22,838.0 | 2,000.0 | 11,700.0 | 54,595.9 | 138,531.5 | 17.7% | 33 | 14.0% |
| Timor-Leste | 0.0 | 4,000.0 | 7,069.8 | 4,881.5 | 3,237.8 | 2,773.6 | 1,000.0 | 12,000.0 | 9,180.0 | 3,000.0 | 46,819.1 | 6.0% | 21 | 8.9% |
| Guatemala | 9,840.0 | 10,268.0 | 25,575.0 | 20,721.0 | 12,932.0 | 18,528.0 | 22,024.2 | 17,615.8 | 14,890.5 | 19,825.0 | 172,219.5 | 22.0% | 52 | 22.1% |
| Malawi | 9,800.0 | 6,725.0 | 2,000.0 | 4,500.0 | 7,750.0 | 10,250.0 | 12,530.0 | 11,260.6 | 9,972.9 | 23,706.1 | 98,494.6 | 12.6% | 39 | 16.6% |
| Mozambique | 23,955.0 | 9,000.0 | 11,750.0 | 9,750.0 | 4,000.0 | 0.0 | 4,000.0 | 4,200.0 | 2,000.0 | 1,317.1 | 69,972.1 | 8.9% | 16 | 6.8% |
| Nepal | 77.0 | 2,930.0 | 1,000.0 | 293.1 | 11,000.0 | 259.0 | 7,000.0 | 4,000.0 | 7,300.0 | 17,162.5 | 51,021.6 | 6.5% | 20 | 8.5% |
| Pakistan | 864.0 | 2,150.6 | 4,325.0 | 28,300.0 | 15,300.0 | 17,125.0 | 9,483.7 | 19,358.0 | 31,377.0 | 13,723.9 | 142,007.2 | 18.1% | 31 | 13.2% |
| Palestinian territories | 500.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3,925.0 | 5,725.0 | 10,150.0 | 1.3% | 7 | 3.0% |
| Sudan | 0.0 | 717.7 | 0.0 | 2,000.0 | 0.0 | 8,800.0 | 4,999.7 | 5,200.0 | 12,722.1 | 19,000.0 | 53,439.5 | 6.8% | 16 | 6.8% |
| Sub-total | 45,836.0 | 35,791.3 | 53,669.8 | 77,179.0 | 77,119.8 | 72,749.8 | 83,875.6 | 75,634.4 | 103,067.5 | 158,055.5 | 782,655.2 | 100% | 235 | 100% |

Annex Table A.4: Resources for Democratic Development, by nine study countries and dimension (NOK '000)

| Dimension | AFG | TIM-L | GUA | MAL | MOZ | NEP | PAK | PAL | SUD | Sub-total | Share |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | 18,614.2 | 19,906.0 | 73,000.7 | 750.0 | 14,500.0 | 2,500.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 129,270.9 | 16.5% |
| Govt admin | 1,300.0 | 10,780.0 | 4,538.6 | 0.0 | 5,000.0 | 5,000.0 | 14,300.0 | 0.0 | 1,200.0 | 42,118.6 | 5.4% |
| Civil society support | 4,200.0 | 4,000.0 | 54,480.2 | 38,700.0 | 317.1 | 21,929.9 | 64,691.7 | 0.0 | 22,117.7 | 210,436.6 | 26.9% |
| Electoral support | 82,830.0 | 5,919.8 | 0.0 | 39,135.6 | 20,000.0 | 984.6 | 15,000.5 | 0.0 | 14,022.1 | 177,892.6 | 22.7% |
| Human rights | 18,587.3 | 3,063.3 | 27,250.0 | 19,909.1 | 0.0 | 20,607.1 | 2,469.1 | 500.0 | 12,400.0 | 104,785.9 | 13.4% |
| Free media | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30,155.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30,155.0 | 3.9% |
| Gender equality | 13,000.0 | 3,150.0 | 12,950.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45,545.7 | 9,650.0 | 3,699.7 | 87,995.4 | 11.2% |
| Sub-total | 138,531.1 | 46,819.1 | 172,219.5 | 98,494.7 | 69,972.1 | 51,021.6 | 142,007.0 | 10,150.0 | 53,439.5 | 782,655.2 | 100% |

Table A.5: Resources for Democratic Development, by UN channel and dimension (NOK '000)

| Dimension | UNDP | UNICEF | UNHCHR | UNIFEM | UNESCO | UNFPA | ILO | Other | Sub-total | UNDP share |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Legal, judicial devt | 122,270.9 | 7,000.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 129,270.9 | 94.6% |
| Govt admin | 35,918.6 | 5,000.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1,200.0 | 42,118.6 | 85.3% |
| Civil society support | 171,428.6 | 22,400.0 | 0.0 | 4,000.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6,608.0 | 6,000.0 | 210,436.6 | 81.5% |
| Electoral support | 177,892.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 177,892.6 | 100% |
| Human rights | 62,511.0 | 1,815.3 | 32,400.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4,131.6 | 3,928.0 | 104,785.9 | 59.7% |
| Free media | 16,155.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14,000.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30,155.0 | 53.6% |
| Gender equality | 44,995.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21,700.6 | 5,050.0 | 12,950.0 | 0.0 | 3,300.0 | 87,995.6 | 51.1% |
| Sub-total | 631,171.6 | 36,215.3 | 32,400.0 | 25,700.6 | 19,050.0 | 12,950.0 | 10,739.6 | 14,428.0 | 782,655.2 | 80.6% |

Annex Table B.1: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Afghanistan

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| The Constitution-Making process | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 3 000,00 |
| Voter Registration | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 5 600,00 |
| Law and Order TF Afghanistan | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 10 000,00 |
| Voter Registration | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2004 | 14,22 |
| Støtte til M&E rådgiver | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 40 - Govt admin | 2003 | 1 300,00 |
| Loya Jirga Process | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 50 - CSO Support | 2002 | 4 200,00 |
| Voter Registration Afghanistan | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 61 - Elections | 2003 | 3 000,00 |
| Afghan Elections Project 2004 | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 61 - Elections | 2004 | 7 000,00 |
| Election process | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 61 - Elections | 2004 | 5 000,00 |
| Afghan Elections 2005 (REG-bev) | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 61 - Elections | 2005 | 6 700,00 |
| Afghan Elections 2005 | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 61 - Elections | 2005 | 7 000,00 |
| AFG/2005 National Assembly Elections | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 61 - Elections | 2005 | 5 000,00 |
| AFG/UNDP Election Deficit | UNDP | 2007-2007 | 61 - Elections | 2007 | 1 700,00 |
| Basket funding - election funds 2008 | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 22 830,00 |
| Basket funding - election funds 2008 | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 3 000,00 |
| Voter Registration | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 15 000,00 |
| Basket funding - election funds 2008 | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 6 600,00 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Human Rights projects | UNDP | 1999-1999 | 62 - Human rights | 1999 | 800,00 |
| HR advisers office | UNOCHA | 2001-2001 | 62 - Human rights | 2001 | 1 950,00 |
| Human Rights Commission | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 1 000,00 |
| Children's conference | UN Trust Fund | 2002-2002 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 1 533,44 |
| Human Rights Commission | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2004 | 3 000,00 |
| AFG/Support to Afghan HR-Commission | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 3 000,00 |
| Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 138,00 |
| Norwegian contribution to OHCHR 2007 | UNHCHR | 2007-2007 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| UNDP Human rights support unit in MOJ | UNDP | 2008-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 1 350,60 |
| Norway's voluntary contribution OHCHR | UNHCHR | 2008-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 2 000,00 |
| MFA-Human rights treaty reporting | UNICEF | 2008-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 1 815,27 |
| Tech. coop. for th Advancement of CEDAW . | UN Organisation | 2005-2005 | 64 - Women's equality | 2005 | 1 000,00 |
| National Action Plan for Women of Afghanistan | UNIFEM | 2006-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2006 | 2 000,00 |
| National Action Plan for Women of Afghanistan | UNIFEM | 2006-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| Gender and Justice Programs | UNIFEM | 2007-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 6 000,00 |
| National Action Plan for Woment of Afghanistan | UNIFEM | 2006-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 2 000,00 |

Annex Table B.2: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Guatemala

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Agr. UNDP Justisreform I | UNDP | 1998-2000 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 1999 | 7 766,39 |
| Justice OJ 2000 - 2004 | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2000 | 1 000,00 |
| Justice Reform | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2000 | 1 472,00 |
| Agr. UNDP Justisreform I | UNDP | 1998-2000 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2000 | 3 661,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2002 - 2004 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2001 | 2 613,00 |
| Justice OJ 2000 - 2004 | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2001 | 4 888,00 |
| Justice Reform | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2001 | 6 574,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2002 - 2004 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 2 387,00 |
| Justice Reform | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 5 034,00 |
| Justice OJ 2000 - 2004 | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 5 800,00 |
| Justice PNC 2002 | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 1 500,00 |
| Justice OJ 2000 - 2004 | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 632,00 |
| Justice Reform | UNDP | 2000-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 1 000,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2002 - 2004 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 2 500,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2002 - 2004 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2004 | 730,00 |
| PNC 2004 - 2007 | UNDP | 2004-2007 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2004 | 3 000,00 |
| PNC 2004 - 2007 | UNDP | 2004-2007 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2005 | 3 000,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2005 - 2008 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2005 | 4 000,00 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Informal Sector Diagnostic | UNDP | 2005-2006 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2005 | 5 542,20 |
| Informal Sector Diagnostic | UNDP | 2005-2006 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2006 | 615,80 |
| PNC 2004 - 2007 | UNDP | 2004-2007 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2006 | 3 000,00 |
| PNC 2004 - 2007 | UNDP | 2004-2007 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2007 | 1 045,30 |
| Justice IDPP 2005 - 2008 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2007 | 1 615,00 |
| Justice IDPP 2005 - 2008 | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 30 - Legal, Judicial | 2008 | 3 625,00 |

Annex Table B.2: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Guatemala (cont'd)

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Agreement III Q'anil B | UNDP | 1997-2000 | 40 - Govt admin | 1999 | 2 073,60 |
| Agreement III Q'anil B | UNDP | 1997-2000 | 40 - Govt admin | 2000 | 435,00 |
| Anti Corr/Nat. forum for trans | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 40 - Govt admin | 2002 | 750,00 |
| UNDP/SAAS Add. II | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 40 - Govt admin | 2004 | 95,00 |
| UNDP/SAAS Add. III | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 40 - Govt admin | 2005 | 185,03 |
| Vicepresidency/COPRE Transparency in public admin | UNDP | 2006-2006 | 40 - Govt admin | 2006 | 1 000,00 |
| UNDP Local Democracy | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 50 - CSO Support | 2003 | 4 000,00 |
| UNDP Local Democracy | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 4 000,00 |
| UNDP Civil Society 2004-2006 | UNDP | 2004-2006 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 10 703,00 |
| UNDP Civil Society 2004-2006 | UNDP | 2004-2006 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 9 297,00 |
| Addendum UNDP Local Democracy | UNDP | 2006-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 1 000,00 |
| UNDP Civil Society 2004-2006 | UNDP | 2004-2006 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 10 000,00 |
| UNDP Local Democracy | UNDP | 2006-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | -488,17 |
| IDPP GTM-0041 Travel expenses | UNDP | 2007-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 18,40 |
| UNDP Civil Society Participation 2007-2009 | UNDP | 2007-2009 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 3 000,00 |
| UNDP Civil Society Participation 2007-2009 | UNDP | 2007-2009 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 12 950,00 |
| Civil Society Funds | UNDP | 2000-2003 | 62 - Human rights | 2000 | 3 700,00 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Civil Society Funds | UNDP | 2000-2003 | 62 - Human rights | 2001 | 11 500,00 |
| Civil Society Funds | UNDP | 2000-2003 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 5 250,00 |
| Civil Society Funds | UNDP | 2000-2003 | 62 - Human rights | 2003 | 4 800,00 |
| GTM/Guatemala CICIG | UNDP | 2007-2007 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| Governance -UNFPA | UNFPA | 2006-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2006 | 2 000,00 |
| Sexual violence prevention | UNFPA | 2007-2011 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 305,00 |
| Governance -UNFPA | UNFPA | 2006-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 3 395,00 |
| Women and gender issues -statistical development | UNFPA | 2007-2011 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| Sexual violence prevention | UNFPA | 2007-2011 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 1 000,00 |
| Governance -UNFPA | UNFPA | 2006-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 1 050,00 |
| Women and gender issues -statistical development | UNFPA | 2007-2011 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 1 200,00 |

Annex Table B.3: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Malawi

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| 2nd Constitutional review process in Malawi | UNDP | 2006-2006 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2006 | 500,00 |
| 2nd Constitutional review process in Malawi | UNDP | 2006-2006 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2006 | 250,00 |
| Agreement no 1 on MDCP | UNDP | 1998-1999 | 50 - CSO Support | 1999 | 2 200,00 |
| Add. 4 to 1st. Agre. on MDCP | UNDP | 2001-2001 | 50 - CSO Support | 2001 | -2 000,00 |
| Add. 4 to 1st. Agre. on MDCP | UNDP | 2001-2001 | 50 - CSO Support | 2001 | 4 000,00 |
| Add. 4 to 1st. Agre. on MDCP | UNDP | 2001-2001 | 50 - CSO Support | 2002 | 1 000,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2002-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2002 | 3 500,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2003-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2003 | 4 500,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2003-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 4 500,00 |
| Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 1 250,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2003-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 4 000,00 |
| Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 0,00 |
| Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 1 850,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2003-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 2 500,00 |
| Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 4 500,00 |
| Agr. no 2 to MDCP | UNDP | 2003-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 1 000,00 |
| Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 2 947,92 |
| Democracy Consolidation program Phase III | UNDP | 2008-2011 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 2 000,00 |
| (S)Child rights programme | UNICEF | 2004-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 952,08 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Add. 1 to 1st Agr. on MDGP | UNDP | 1999-1999 | 61 - Elections | 1999 | 7 600,00 |
| Democracy Consolidation Program | UNDP | 2000-0 | 61 - Elections | 2000 | 2 500,00 |
| Democracy Consolidation Program | UNDP | 2000-0 | 61 - Elections | 2000 | 4 000,00 |
| Elections 2004 | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 61 - Elections | 2003 | 2 250,00 |
| Elections 2004 | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 61 - Elections | 2004 | 3 250,00 |
| Elections 2004 | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 61 - Elections | 2006 | -464,42 |
| Electoral reform and elections | UNDP | 2007-2010 | 61 - Elections | 2007 | 1 500,00 |
| Electoral reform and elections | UNDP | 2007-2010 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 3 500,00 |
| Election support fund | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 15 000,00 |
| Democracy Consolidation Program | UNDP | 2000-2000 | 62 - Human rights | 2000 | 225,08 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2003 | 500,00 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2003 | 500,00 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2004 | 1 250,00 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 2 480,00 |
| UNDP CSO frame agreement | UNDP | 2005-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 4 200,00 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2006 | 1 875,00 |
| UNDP CSO frame agreement | UNDP | 2005-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2006 | 2 100,00 |
| Program Support MHRC | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 525,00 |
| UNDP CSO frame agreement | UNDP | 2005-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 4 000,00 |
| UNDP CSO frame agreement | UNDP | 2005-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 2 254,00 |

Annex Table B.4: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Mozambique

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Legal and Judicial Centre | UNDP | 2000-2002 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2000 | 3 000,00 |
| Legal and Judicial Centre | UNDP | 2000-2002 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2001 | 6 750,00 |
| Legal and Judicial Centre | UNDP | 2000-2002 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 4 750,00 |
| APRM - African Peer Review Mechanism | UNDP | 2006-2007 | 40 - Govt admin | 2006 | 2 000,00 |
| APRM - African Peer Review Mechanism | UNDP | 2006-2007 | 40 - Govt admin | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| APRM - African Peer Review Mechanism | UNDP | 2006-2007 | 40 - Govt admin | 2008 | 1 000,00 |
| Nat. consultations on aid eff. | UNDP | 2008-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 317,07 |
| preparation national elections | UNDP | 1999-2001 | 61 - Elections | 1999 | 20 000,00 |
| Development of Media | UNDP | 1998-2001 | 63 - Media support | 1999 | 3 954,99 |
| Development of Media | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 63 - Media support | 2000 | 2 500,00 |
| Development of Media | UNDP | 1998-2001 | 63 - Media support | 2000 | 3 500,00 |
| Development of Media | UNESCO | 2001-2004 | 63 - Media support | 2001 | 5 000,00 |
| Development of Media | UNESCO | 2001-2004 | 63 - Media support | 2002 | 5 000,00 |
| Development of Media | UNESCO | 2001-2004 | 63 - Media support | 2003 | 4 000,00 |
| Develop. of Media -Phase III | UNDP | 2004-2006 | 63 - Media support | 2005 | 4 000,00 |
| Develop. of Media -Phase III | UNDP | 2004-2006 | 63 - Media support | 2006 | 2 200,00 |

Annex Table B.5: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Nepal

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| UNDP: Support to participatory constitution building in Nepal | UNDP | 2008-2010 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2008 | 2 500,00 |
| DACAW - Addendum nr. 2 - 2007 | UNICEF | 2007-2008 | 40 - Govt admin | 2007 | 5 000,00 |
| Social Mobilisation | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 50 - CSO Support | 2000 | 2 929,90 |
| LGP/PDDP Bridging Phase | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2003 | 10 000,00 |
| Decentralised Action for Women and Children (DACAW) 2008-2010 | UNICEF | 2008-2010 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 9 000,00 |
| Election observers | UNDP | 1999-1999 | 61 - Elections | 1999 | 77,00 |
| UN Electoral Asst Secretariate | UNDP | 2002-0 | 61 - Elections | 2002 | 107,55 |
| Selection of system for Constitution Assembly Election | UNDP | 2007-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2007 | 300,00 |
| Support to the Constitution Assembly Election , addendum | UNDP | 2008-2008 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 500,00 |
| Nat. Human Rights Com. | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2001 | 1 000,00 |
| Junior Professional Officer | UNV | 2002-2002 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 185,56 |
| Nat. Human Rights Com. | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2003 | 1 000,00 |
| JPO Covarrubias | UNV | 2004-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2004 | 259,00 |
| Nat. Human Rights Com. | UNDP | 2001-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 1 000,00 |
| Establishing Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, Nepal | UNHCHR | 2005-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 4 000,00 |
| UNHCHR Nepal Monitoring Office | UNHCHR | 2005-2005 | 62 - Human rights | 2005 | 2 000,00 |
| Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, Nepal | UNHCHR | 2006-2007 | 62 - Human rights | 2006 | 4 000,00 |
| NPL/Norwegian Contribution to OHCHR 2007 | UNHCHR | 2007-2007 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 2 000,00 |
| Promotion of indigenous peoples rights - ILO 169 | ILO | 2008-2009 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 1 662,50 |
| NPL/Norway's voluntary contribution OHCHR | UNHCHR | 2008-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 3 500,00 |

Annex Table B.6: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Pakistan

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Training of Women Union Councillors | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 40 - Govt admin | 2001 | 2 300,00 |
| Support to Election 2007 | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 40 - Govt admin | 2007 | 12 000,00 |
| IPEC:Activating Media:Child Labour | ILO | 2001-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2001 | 1 125,00 |
| Women's Political Participation | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2002 | 13 300,00 |
| Women's Political Participation | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2003 | 11 300,00 |
| IPEC:Child Labour | ILO | 2001-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 1 125,00 |
| NRB Trust Fund | UNDP | 2004-2005 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 8 000,00 |
| Women's Political Participation | UNDP | 2002-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | -516,31 |
| NRB Trust Fund | UNDP | 2004-2005 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 7 000,00 |
| IPEC: Child Labour | ILO | 2001-2003 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | -102,03 |
| IPEC: Child Labour | ILO | 2005-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 2 460,00 |
| DTCE Phase II | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 5 000,00 |
| DTCE Phase II | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 7 000,00 |
| IPEC: :Child Labour | ILO | 2005-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 2 000,00 |
| DTCE Phase II | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 50 - CSO Support | 2008 | 7 000,00 |
| Democratic electoral process | UNDP | 1999-1999 | 61 - Elections | 1999 | 0,50 |
| Supporting National Elections | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 61 - Elections | 2002 | 15 000,00 |
| Human Rights Institutional Cap Build | ILO | 1999-2001 | 62 - Human rights | 1999 | 863,50 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Human Rights Institutional Cap Build | ILO | 1999-2001 | 62 - Human rights | 2000 | 1 605,64 |
| Women in Local Government | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 64 - Women's equality | 2000 | 230,00 |
| National Plan of Action for Women | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 64 - Women's equality | 2000 | 100,00 |
| Women in Local Government | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 64 - Women's equality | 2000 | 215,00 |
| Women in Local Government | UNDP | 2000-2001 | 64 - Women's equality | 2001 | 900,00 |
| Gender Support Programme | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 64 - Women's equality | 2003 | 4 000,00 |
| Gender Support Programme | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 64 - Women's equality | 2004 | 8 000,00 |
| Gender Support Programme | UNDP | 2003-2005 | 64 - Women's equality | 2005 | 3 000,00 |
| Gender Support Programme Phase II | UNDP | 2005-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2006 | 12 000,00 |
| Gender Support Programme Phase II | UNDP | 2005-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 9 977,00 |
| UNDP- Baseline studies | UNDP | 2007-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 400,00 |
| Gender Support Programme Phase II | UNDP | 2005-2007 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 3 023,00 |
| UNIFEM-Women's Economic Empowerment | UNIFEM | 2008-2010 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 1 700,93 |

Annex Table B.7: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Palestinian territories

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Human rights activities | UNHCHR | 1999-1999 | 62 - Human rights | 1999 | 500,00 |
| The Crypt Museum | UNESCO | 2007-2008 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 1 800,00 |
| Palestinian Women Research and Documentation Center | UNESCO | 2007-2009 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 125,00 |
| Healthy Food through Women-run School Canteens, | UNIFEM | 2008-2009 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 300,00 |
| Healthy Food through Women-run School Canteens | UNIFEM | 2008-2009 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 2 000,00 |
| Palestinian Women Research and Documentation Center | UNESCO | 2007-2009 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 1 125,00 |
| UNRWA Gaza Women's Programme 2008 | UNRWA | 2008-2009 | 64 - Women's equality | 2008 | 2 300,00 |

Annex Table B.8: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Sudan

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Infrastructure support Parliament Southern Sudan | UNOPS | 2006-2007 | 40 - Govt admin | 2006 | 1 200,00 |
| Work Group Rehab Recov | UNDP | 2000-2000 | 50 - CSO Support | 2000 | 100,00 |
| Intergov Panel on Forests Plan for P | UNDP | 2000-2000 | 50 - CSO Support | 2000 | 617,73 |
| CAP Sudan OCHA | UNOCHA | 2002-2002 | 50 - CSO Support | 2002 | 2 000,00 |
| Support for JAU Secretariats | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 4 500,00 |
| CAP 2004 - CBTF Capacity Building T | UNICEF | 2004-2004 | 50 - CSO Support | 2004 | 1 900,00 |
| SDN/Rule of law/Conflict resolution | UNDP | 2005-2005 | 50 - CSO Support | 2005 | 1 300,00 |
| SDN/Protecting/Promoting Women's Role in Peace | UNIFEM | 2006-2006 | 50 - CSO Support | 2006 | 4 000,00 |
| SDN/Rule of law/Conflict resolution | UNDP | 2007-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 3 000,00 |
| SDN/training on constitutional and internat. law | UNDP | 2007-2007 | 50 - CSO Support | 2007 | 4 700,00 |
| UNDP. Election law preparation | UNDP | 2007-2007 | 61 - Elections | 2007 | 22,05 |
| UNDP.Basket Fund | UNDP | 2008-2009 | 61 - Elections | 2008 | 14 000,00 |
| Human Rights monitors - Darfur | UNHCHR | 2004-2004 | 62 - Human rights | 2004 | 2 400,00 |
| SDN/Norwegian contribution to OHCHR 2007 | UNHCHR | 2007-2007 | 62 - Human rights | 2007 | 5 000,00 |
| SDN/Norway's voluntary contribution OHCHR | UNHCHR | 2008-2008 | 62 - Human rights | 2008 | 5 000,00 |
| Promoting women's participation, Sudan | UNIFEM | 2005-2005 | 64 - Women's equality | 2005 | 3 699,68 |

Annex Table B.9: UN DemDev Projects funded by Norway in Timor-Leste

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Serious Crimes Unit - capacity build | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2002 | 606,00 |
| Enhancing the justice system | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2003 | 2 850,00 |
| Enhancing the justice system | UNDP | 2003-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2004 | 1 000,00 |
| Strengthening Parliamentary Democrac | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2004 | 1 450,00 |
| Strengthening Parliamentary Democrac | UNDP | 2004-2004 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2005 | 1 000,00 |
| Enhancing the justice system 2. phase | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2006 | 4 500,00 |
| Child Protection Programme | UNICEF | 2006-2007 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2006 | 1 500,00 |
| Enhancing the justice system 2. phase | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2007 | 1 500,00 |
| Child Protection Programme | UNICEF | 2006-2007 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2007 | 2 500,00 |
| Building Child Justice and Welfare Systems for Children | UNICEF | 2008-2010 | 30 - Legal, judicial | 2008 | 3 000,00 |
| Advisors for Gusmao and Horta | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 40 - Govt admin | 2002 | 1 600,00 |
| Strengthening Parliamentary Democracy | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 40 - Govt admin | 2006 | 6 000,00 |
| Strengthening Parliamentary Democracy | UNDP | 2006-2008 | 40 - Govt admin | 2007 | 1 000,00 |
| Continued support/Parliament | UNDP | 2007-2008 | 40 - Govt admin | 2007 | 2 180,00 |
| Trust Fund for UN Transitional Adm | X-UN Secretariat | 2000-2000 | 50 - CSO Support | 2000 | 4 000,00 |
| Election on TIM- support | UNDP | 2001-2001 | 61 - Elections | 2001 | 5 919,82 |
| Junior Professional Officer | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 1 231,74 |

| Agreement title | Agreement partner | Agreement Period | DAC Sub sector (code+name) | Year | Disbursed (1000 NOK) |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|----------------------|
| Junior Professional Officer | UNDP | 2002-2002 | 62 - Human rights | 2002 | 1 443,73 |
| Junior Professional Officers | UNDP | 2003-2003 | 62 - Human rights | 2003 | 387,80 |
| Maliana Guesthouse project | UNDP | 2001-2002 | 64 - Women's equality | 2001 | 1 150,00 |
| Women in Politics and in Decision making | UNIFEM | 2007-2010 | 64 - Women's equality | 2007 | 2 000,00 |

EVALUATION REPORTS

| | | | |
|-------|---|------|---|
| 1.98 | "Twinning for Development". Institutional Cooperation between Public Institutions in Norway and the South | 5.04 | Eksemplifisert ved støtte til Norsk Misjons Bistandsnemda og Atlas-alliansen |
| 2.98 | Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities | 6.04 | Study of the impact of the work of FORUT in Sri Lanka: Building Civil Society |
| 3.98 | Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Private Companies and Consulting Firms | 6.04 | Study of the impact of the work of Save the Children Norway in Ethiopia: Building Civil Society |
| 4.98 | Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations | 1.05 | -Study: Study of the impact of the work of FORUT in Sri Lanka and Save the Children Norway in Ethiopia: Building Civil Society |
| 5.98 | Development through Institutions? Institutional Development in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Synthesis Report | 1.05 | -Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norad Fellowship Programme |
| 6.98 | Managing Good Fortune - Macroeconomic Management and the Role of Aid in Botswana | 2.05 | -Evaluation: Women Can Do It - an evaluation of the WCDI programme in the Western Balkans |
| 7.98 | The World Bank and Poverty in Africa | 3.05 | Gender and Development - a review of evaluation report 1997-2004 |
| 8.98 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples | 4.05 | Evaluation of the Framework Agreement between the Government of Norway and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) |
| 9.98 | Evaluering av Informasjons støtten til RORGene | 5.05 | Evaluation of the "Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005)" |
| 10.98 | Strategy for Assistance to Children in Norwegian Development Cooperation | 1.06 | Inter-Ministerial Cooperation. An Effective Model for Capacity Development? |
| 11.98 | Norwegian Assistance to Countries in Conflict | 2.06 | Evaluation of Fredskorpset |
| 12.98 | Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Norway and Nicaragua | 1.06 | - Synthesis Report: Lessons from Evaluations of Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation |
| 13.98 | UNICEF-komiteen i Norge | | |
| 14.98 | Relief Work in Complex Emergencies | | |
| 1.99 | WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations | 1.07 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Petroleum-Related Assistance |
| 2.99 | International Planned Parenthood Federation - Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels | 1.07 | - Synteserapport: Humanitær innsats ved naturkatastrofer: En syntese av evalueringsfunn |
| 3.99 | Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus | 1.07 | - Study: The Norwegian International Effort against Female Genital Mutilation |
| 4.99 | Evaluation of the Tanzania-Norway Development Cooperation 1994-1997 | 2.07 | Evaluation of Norwegian Power-related Assistance |
| 5.99 | Building African Consulting Capacity | 2.07 | - Study Development Cooperation through Norwegian NGOs in South America |
| 6.99 | Aid and Conditionality | 3.07 | Evaluation of the Effects of the using M-621 Cargo Trucks in Humanitarian Transport Operations |
| 7.99 | Policies and Strategies for Poverty Reduction in Norwegian Development Aid | 4.07 | Evaluation of Norwegian Development Support to Zambia (1991 - 2005) |
| 8.99 | Aid Coordination and Aid Effectiveness | 5.07 | Evaluation of the Development Cooperation to Norwegian NGOs in Guatemala |
| 9.99 | Evaluation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) | | |
| 10.99 | Evaluation of AWEPA, The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa, and AEI, The African European Institute | 1.08 | Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norwegian Emergency Preparedness System (NOREPS) |
| 1.00 | Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988-1997 | 1.08 | Study: The challenge of Assessing Aid Impact: A review of Norwegian Evaluation Practise |
| 2.00 | Norwegian Support to the Education Sector. Overview of Policies and Trends 1988-1998 | 1.08 | Synthesis Study: On Best Practise and Innovative Approaches to Capacity Development in Low Income African Countries |
| 3.00 | The Project "Training for Peace in Southern Africa" | 2.08 | Evaluation: Joint Evaluation of the Trust Fund for Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (TFESSD) |
| 4.00 | En kartlegging av erfaringer med norsk bistand gjennom frivillige organisasjoner 1987-1999 | 2.08 | Synthesis Study: Cash Transfers Contributing to Social Protection: A Synthesis of Evaluation Findings |
| 5.00 | Evaluation of the NUFU programme | 2.08 | Study: Anti-Corruption Approaches. A Literature Review |
| 6.00 | Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case | 3.08 | Evaluation: Mid-term Evaluation the EEA Grants |
| 7.00 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety Priorities, Organisation, Implementation | 4.08 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian HIV/AIDS Responses |
| 8.00 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Mixed Credits Programme | 5.08 | Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norwegian Research and Development Activities in Conflict Prevention and Peace-building |
| 9.00 | "Norwegians? Who needs Norwegians?" Explaining the Oslo Back Channel: Norway's Political Past in the Middle East | 6.08 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian Development Cooperation in the Fisheries Sector |
| 10.00 | Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway's Special Grant for the Environment | | |
| 1.01 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund | 1.09 | Evaluation: Joint Evaluation of Nepal's Education for All 2004-2009 Sector Programme |
| 2.01 | Economic Impacts on the Least Developed Countries of the Elimination of Import Tariffs on their Products | 1.09 | Study Report: Global Aid Architecture and the Health Millennium Development Goals |
| 3.01 | Evaluation of the Public Support to the Norwegian NGOs Working in Nicaragua 1994-1999 | 2.09 | Evaluation: Mid-Term Evaluation of the Joint Donor Team in Juba, Sudan |
| 3A.01 | Evaluación del Apoyo Público a las ONGs Noruegas que Trabajan en Nicaragua 1994-1999 | 2.09 | Study Report: A synthesis of Evaluations of Environment Assistance by Multilateral Organisations |
| 4.01 | The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Cooperation on Poverty Reduction | 3.09 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian Development Cooperation through Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations in Northern Uganda (2003-2007) |
| 5.01 | Evaluation of Development Co-operation between Bangladesh and Norway, 1995-2000 | 3.09 | Study Report: Evaluation of Norwegian Business-related Assistance Sri Lanka Case Study |
| 6.01 | Can democratisation prevent conflicts? Lessons from sub-Saharan Africa | 4.09 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian Support to the Protection of Cultural Heritage |
| 7.01 | Reconciliation Among Young People in the Balkans An Evaluation of the Post Pessimist Network | 4.09 | Study Report: Norwegian Environmental Action Plan |
| 1.02 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Resource Bank for Democracy and Human Rights (NORDEM) | 5.09 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Peacebuilding in Haiti 1998-2008 |
| 2.02 | Evaluation of the International Humanitarian Assistance of the Norwegian Red Cross | 6.09 | Evaluation: Evaluation of the Humanitarian Mine Action Activities of Norwegian People's Aid |
| 3.02 | Evaluation of ACOPAM An ILO program for "Cooperative and Organisational Support to Grassroots Initiatives" in Western Africa 1978 - 1999 | 7.09 | Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU) and of Norad's Programme for Master Studies (NOMA) |
| 3A.02 | Évaluation du programme ACOPAM Un programme du BIT sur l'« Appui associatif et coopératif aux Initiatives de Développement à la Base » en Afrique de l'Ouest de 1978 à 1999 | | |
| 4.02 | Legal Aid Against the Odds Evaluation of the Civil Rights Project (CRP) of the Norwegian Refugee Council in former Yugoslavia | 1.10 | Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norwegian Centre for Democracy Support 2002-2009 |
| 1.03 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund) | 2.10 | Synthesis Study: Support to Legislatures |
| 2.03 | Evaluation of the Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank | 3.10 | Synthesis Main Report: Evaluation of Norwegian Business-related Assistance |
| 3.03 | Evaluering av Bistandstorgets Evalueringnettverk | 4.10 | Study: Evaluation of Norwegian Business-related Assistance South Africa Case Study |
| 1.04 | Towards Strategic Framework for Peace-building: Getting Their Act Together. Overview Report of the Joint Utstein Study of the Peace-building. | 5.10 | Study: Evaluation of Norwegian Business-related Assistance Bangladesh Case Study |
| 2.04 | Norwegian Peace-building policies: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead | 6.10 | Study: Evaluation of Norwegian Business-related Assistance Uganda Case Study |
| 3.04 | Evaluation of CESAR's activities in the Middle East Funded by Norway | 7.10 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Norwegian Development Cooperation with the Western Balkans |
| 4.04 | Evaluering av ordningen med støtte gjennom paraplyorganisasjoner. | 8.10 | Evaluation: Evaluation of Transparency International |
| | | 9.10 | Study: Evaluability Study of Partnership Initiatives |

Norad

Norwegian Agency for
Development Cooperation

Postal address

P.O. Box 8034 Dep. NO-0030 OSLO

Visiting address

Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 22 24 20 30

Fax: +47 22 24 20 31

No. of Copies: 300

postmottak@norad.no

www.norad.no

