

## Summary of 2007 MOPAN survey

1.1 The Annual MOPAN Survey 2007 was carried out in 10 countries: Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Mali, Nicaragua, Senegal, Serbia and Zambia. The three MOs covered by the Survey were the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Health Organization, and the African Development Bank (AfDB).

1.2 The Survey is carried out under the MOPAN HQ Group, composed of representatives from the headquarters of each MOPAN member. The MOPAN Secretariat plays an administrative and orchestrating role for the Survey. The UK is heading the Secretariat in 2008.

1.3 All 10 MOPAN members involved their embassies and country offices in the Survey. Austria and Finland participated in 4 MOPAN country teams, Norway in 6, Denmark, France, Switzerland and The United Kingdom in 7, Sweden in 8, The Netherlands in 9, and Canada in 10 country teams. On average, there were 7 MOPAN members per country team.

1.4 All 10 country teams delivered a country report. All country reports cover UNDP and WHO. AfDB is covered by all 6 African countries of the Survey.

1.5 In total, 132 questionnaires were completed: 62 for UNDP, 41 for WHO and 29 for AfDB.

1.6 The present report is a synthesis of the findings reflected in the country reports. It also refers to the responses of the aggregated questionnaires where they corroborate or further illustrate the qualitative findings of the Survey. The Synthesis Report presents verbatim quotes from the country reports, illustrating specific aspects of the reported findings.

1.7 The survey focuses on how MOPAN country teams perceive the quality of the partnership behaviour of the three assessed MOs towards national stakeholders and other development agencies, respectively. Each chapter begins with a summary of the main Survey findings on the partnership performance of the MO in question, see below.

### UNDP partnership performance: main findings

UNDP has country offices in all countries of this year's Survey. The MOPAN country teams are familiar with UNDP. MOPAN member embassies and country offices have frequent contacts and bilateral meetings with UNDP. Most of them also cooperate directly with UNDP.

#### (1) Partnership behaviour towards *national stakeholders*:

**a. Policy dialogue:** The overall assessment of the UNDP contribution to national policy dialogue is positive. At times, UNDP avoids addressing politically sensitive issues or focuses more on its role as coordinator and less on making substantive contributions of its own. MOPAN country teams consider that UNDP supports civil society participation in national policy dialogue, but that it could do better.

**b. Capacity development:** The Survey reveals an inconsistent picture in terms of the UNDP contribution to capacity development of public institutions as well as government ownership. The perception that UNDP often remains directly responsible for project management is considered a major weakness as it limits capacity development and ownership of national partner institutions. The perceptions of the quality of UNDP technical advice are overall positive. Country teams were not

able, for lack of information, to judge the UNDP contribution to capacity development of NGOs and the private sector.

**c. Advocacy:** Overall, the country teams acknowledge the UNDP advocacy work. While it seems to be good at supporting government campaigns, UNDP itself does not seem to play a very visible advocacy role.

**d. Alignment with national poverty reduction strategies, policies and procedures:** UNDP is felt to be very supportive of national poverty reduction strategies. While its own programmes are seen as generally well aligned with national poverty reduction strategies, it appears that UNDP has significant difficulties in aligning its business practice with national procedures. UNDP offices seem generally free to take decisions without referring back to headquarters.

## **(2) Partnership behaviour towards *other international development agencies*:**

**a. Information sharing:** MOPAN country teams in general appreciate UNDP efforts undertaken in this respect. They see room for improvement with regard to briefings on visiting missions.

**b. Inter-agency coordination:** UNDP is seen as a very active and central actor in aid coordination matters, in particular with regard to inter-agency working groups. Yet, it could/should in certain cases play a more proactive role. At the operational level, the UNDP track record with regard to coordination seems to vary quite considerably from country to country. Local UNDP senior management contributions to inter-agency coordination are recognized and appreciated.

**c. Harmonisation:** UNDP appears to be an active contributor to local donor harmonisation initiatives as well as to harmonisation within the UN system. However, its participation in joint activities (joint programming and field missions) remains limited.

## **WHO partnership performance: main findings**

WHO has offices in all 10 countries of the Survey. With a few exceptions benefiting from a high level of information, participating MOPAN country team members have little to medium knowledge of WHO. A majority of members regularly attend meetings in which WHO representatives are also present, but less than half have bilateral meetings. The most common forms of collaboration are in the context of policy dialogue with governments and local coordination efforts.

### **(1) Partnership behaviour towards *national stakeholders*:**

**a. Policy dialogue:** Most MOPAN country teams perceive WHO to significantly contribute to national policy dialogue in the health sector. WHO support to NGO involvement in policy dialogue, however, appears to be uneven. No country report mentions examples of private sector involvement.

**b. Capacity development:** Overall, the country reports give the impression that WHO is more effectively engaged in supporting capacity development of public institutions, mostly at the central government level, than of private institutions. Views with regard to promoting government ownership in the design and planning of the projects that WHO supports are on the positive side. MOPAN country teams unanimously appreciate the quality of WHO technical advice (TA).

**c. Advocacy:** In a majority of the Survey countries, WHO appears to play a visible and/or strong role in advocacy, mainly in partnership with governments.

**d. Alignment with national poverty reduction strategies, policies and procedures:** While MOPAN country teams have differing perceptions of WHO support to PRS or equivalent strategies, they consider that WHO country strategies, sector strategies and operational activities are thematically well aligned with national development priorities and strategies. WHO is perceived to align its business practice with national procedures and modalities in one way or another, though not uniformly across the board. Based on brief references in the country reports, it appears that WHO country offices are not systematically granted decision-making authority.

### **(2) Partnership behaviour towards *other international development agencies*:**

**a. Information sharing:** On balance, the WHO contribution to information sharing amongst development agencies is considered to be modest.

**b. Inter-agency coordination:** While WHO appears to be actively involved in local donor coordination groups in the health sector, perceptions regarding coordination at the project/programme level are more critical. The limited information in the country reports gives a fairly positive impression of local senior management contribution to inter-agency coordination.

**c. Harmonisation:** The WHO contribution to local donor harmonisation efforts is judged to be uneven and varying within and between the countries of the Survey. Its contribution to harmonisation within the UN system is considered modest.

## **AfDB partnership performance: main findings**

AfDB has offices in 5 of the 6 African countries of the Survey, some of which were established/strengthened only very recently. Apart from a few exceptions benefiting from a high level of knowledge, participating MOPAN member embassies and country offices have low to medium knowledge of AfDB. A clear majority of MOPAN member embassies and country offices regularly attend meetings at which AfDB is also present. However, barely half have regular bilateral meetings with AfDB. Overall, the level of cooperation seems to be either increasing or at least remains unchanged.

### **(1) Partnership behaviour towards *national stakeholders*:**

**a. Policy dialogue:** On balance, MOPAN country teams consider the AfDB contribution to national policy dialogue as modest. AfDB does not appear to actively support the participation of civil society in national policy dialogue. It also appears to limit dialogue on its own strategies and analytical work mostly to government ministries.

**b. Capacity development:** Perceptions of AfDB support to capacity development of different national stakeholders vary and are partly characterised by limited information. Views on government ownership and technical advice are also limited.

**c. Advocacy:** MOPAN country teams are collectively of the opinion that AfDB is not actively involved in advocacy activities.

**d. Alignment with national poverty reduction strategies, policies and procedures:** It appears from the country reports that AfDB supports the national PRS or equivalent national strategies in one way or another. All 6 MOPAN country teams consider AfDB work as thematically well aligned with government development policies and strategies. On the other hand, MOPAN country teams perceive differing degrees of AfDB business practice alignment with government modalities and procedures. The delegation of decision-making power to the country level appears limited.

### **(2) Partnership behaviour towards *other international development agencies*:**

**a. Information sharing:** Perceptions of AfDB performance in terms of sharing information in general are mixed, whereby fairly positive perceptions prevail.

**b. Inter-agency coordination:** Overall, the assessment of AfDB participation in inter-agency coordination is positive.

**c. Harmonisation:** Overall, AfDB seems to be contributing to donor harmonisation in the countries of the Survey.