

**MID-TERM EVALUATION:  
UNCTAD-UNDP GLOBAL PROGRAM ON GLOBALIZATION,  
LIBERALIZATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT\***

December 2003

Prepared by:  
Fuat Andic and A. Benbouali (Independent Consultants)

*Abstract*

This joint project had two distinct but related conceptual underpinnings; one was at the global level - to promote a clear understanding of the linkages between globalization and the dimensions of sustainable human development, and the second was at the country level - to enhance national capacities for analyzing the impact of globalization on economic and social sectors. The evaluation finds that the programme has suffered resource and managerial upheaval constraints, and the report calls for the programme to be better focused on feasible objectives that show tangible results. The report also recommends that the project maintains its efforts on consensus building rather than be involved in capacity-building activities.

---

\* This report was commissioned by the Government of Belgium. The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not represent the views of the UNCTAD secretariat or of the organizations or institutions with which the author(s) may be connected or organizations or institutions that commissioned this evaluation. The designations and terminology employed and the presentation of the material in these publications do not imply the expressions of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or the authorities or of its frontiers or boundaries. This document has not been formally edited.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ABBREVIATIONS

### *EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

### INTRODUCTION

#### **PART ONE: APPROACH OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAM**

- 1.1 Rationale of the Program
- 1.2 Evolution and Current Status of the Program
- 1.3 Execution Modalities

#### **PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAM**

- 2.1 Management
- 2.2 Achievements Phase I
- 2.3 Achievements Phase II
- 2.4 Review of Selected Country-based Interventions

#### **PART THREE: ASSESSMENT OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAM**

- 3.1 Relevance of the Program
- 3.2 Design/Execution
- 3.3 Synergy/Partnerships
- 3.4 Resources Mobilization
- 3.5 Capacity Building
- 3.6 Ownership

#### **PART FOUR: CONCLUSIONS**

- 4.1 Program Design
- 4.2 Program Management
- 4.3 Quality of Outputs
- 4.4 Linkages
- 4.5 Impacts/Outcomes/Sustainability
- 4.6 Perceptions
- 4.7 Strategy
- 4.8 Recapitulation

#### **PART FIVE: GLIMPSE OF THE FUTURE**

- 5.1 White Paper
- 5.2 Aftermath of Cancún
- 5.3 Recommendations

#### **APPENDICES:**

1. Terms of Reference
2. Persons Interviewed
3. Publications and Documents Reviewed
4. Organization Chart of the Program

## ABBREVIATIONS

AsDB	Asian Development Bank
AFTA	ASEAN Free Trade Area
ATI	Asian Regional Trade Initiative
BDP	Bureau of Development Policy
CACM	Central American Common Market
CAS	Country Assessment Study
CBDB	Capacity Building Data Base
CLIA	Country Level Impact Assessment
CO	Country Office
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DRR	Deputy Resident Representative
DTIS	Diagnostic Trade Integration System
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GCF	Global Cooperation Framework
GP	Global Programme
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICTSD	International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IF	Integrated Framework Technical Assistance Programme
ILO	International Labour Organization
ITC	International Trade Centre
JITAP	Joint Integrated Technical Assistance Programme to Select Least Developed Countries and Other African Countries
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MUTRAP	Multilateral Trade Policy Assistance
MDGD	Management Development and Governance Division
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NHDR	National Human Development Report
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes
RBA	Regional Bureau of Africa
RBAP	Regional Bureau of Asia and Pacific
RBEC	Regional Bureau of Europe and Central Asia
RBLAC	Regional Bureau for Latin America and Caribbean
RR	Resident Representative
SAPAM	Special Assistance for Public Administration and Management
SEPED	Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division
SHD	Sustainable Human Development
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SURF	Sub-regional Resource Facility
TA	Technical Assistance
TCDC	Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
TNC	Transnational Corporation
TRTA/CB	Trade Related Technical Assistance/Capacity Building
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Relevance of the Program**

- *The rationale of the Program is appropriate and reflects the need for assistance in a number of fields and area, so that a host of countries can be in a position to enter into the world economy without undue hardship and without suffering a decline in their human development.*

### **Program Design**

- *The Program Documents are designed rather ambitiously. They cover a wide array of issues, but these are not commensurate neither with financial, nor with human resources allotted to them in both phases.*
- *Difficulties of implementation detected in Phase I are due to the shortage of staff, as well as budgetary limitations.*
- *Phase II did not scale down the expected activities and outputs to render the Program more manageable.*
- *In many instances the language of the Phase II Document is rather imprecise. Statements like “further strengthening,” “better understanding,” “further refinement” cannot be considered operationally tangible concepts; nor are they measurable.*
- *Phase II Document includes certain activities that are virtually impossible to carry out. Neither the financial, nor the human resources available to the Program could have possible allowed certain activities to be carried out, putting the accomplishment of the foreseen output in danger.*
- *Both Documents are prepared with heavy emphasis on the elucidation of conceptual issues, crowding out direct assistance to the countries.*
- *While in Phase I assistance to low-income countries and LDCs are in the forefront, in Phase II the design is essentially omits the emphasis on LDCs without formal explanation or justification.*
- *Benchmarks and indicators of success stated in both Documents leave very much to be desired. In more cases than not indicators are simply rephrasing the outputs.*

### **Program Management**

- *The Steering Committee meets only once a year at best. Given the nature of the Program this is too infrequent to make the Committee a forceful body.*
- *Apart from the yearly reports the Steering Committee Program does not have a periodic independent monitoring system built into it.*
- *The human resources of the Program are much too limited to be effective.*
- *Financial records following the UN accounting system are not kept in the form that would allow any analysis of efficiency.*

### **Quality of Outputs**

- *The quality of the outputs is rather uneven. There are several studies/reports that are of high quality. But some are either repetitions of already published studies, or border on the activist stand.*
- *Some studies are indeed useful and are conducive to be instrumental for the countries to design their social and economic policies incorporating in them sustainable human*

*development concerns, and to take a more advantageous position vis-à-vis globalization. Some others, however, simply repeat already well-known facts in the countries concerned*

### **Linkages**

- *The Program has failed to establish strong linkages with other programs and projects of UNDP that have similar objectives and with those of other international organizations (such as IDB). However, some linkages exist between GP and IF.*
- *Interaction between certain Divisions of UNCTAD and the Program is uneven*

### **Impacts/Outcomes/Sustainability**

- *At the global level GP contributed with other partners to a better understanding of the issues related to globalization and SHD. However, GP was only a partner but not a leader in this achievement. It is rather early to assess the impact of the global activities of GP, since the process is still ongoing. Also, there are too many political forces with different agenda and interests that might understand the issues related to SHD and globalization, but they are not ready to accept their political, economic and social implications.*
- *At the country level, the outcomes are not yet visible. At best CAS will led to policy changes trying to improve the development of SMEs (Romania), promote FDI (Botswana), build consensus on SHD issues (in most partners countries), and link trade to SHD in the national development plan (Indonesia). These are cases in point.*
- *The GP monitoring system is not systematic in following up the decisions and actions that occurred after the GP's interventions, and in reporting initiatives of other partners. Therefore the outcomes/impact that the GP tries to achieve are not traceable at the country level.*
- *It is rather premature to pass any definitive judgment on sustainability at this point of time. However, consensus building, FDI promotion, capacities building in formulating trade policies, establishing linkages between SHD and national development policies have potentialities to be sustainable. Efforts at the global and regional level are by their very nature less inclined to have sustainability, since they are subject to global and political changes.*

### **Perceptions**

- *There are both negative and positive images of GP perceived by those that are outside the Program. The negative perceptions are as follows: The over ambition of the project, its lack of focus, the academic nature of the concept of social efficiency, the "personalized" element in the selection process of countries, GP's privileged treatment of the energy sector, the bureaucracy and the lack of visibility of UNCTAD, the focus on global activities and their academic nature, the disconnect between global and country activities, the lack of follow-up, the incompleteness of the web site, not anchoring activities with UNDP/COs, except in some countries, the absence of linkage with SURF, except in the recent case of Kenya, the focus on trade and the second priority given to SHD, are the negative perceptions collected through the interviews.*

- *On the positive side no one challenges the relevance of the Program, Those, well informed, were aware about the inadequacy of the financial and human resources to achieve the ambitious objectives. The linkage with ILO was recognized as a positive development. The new management of the Program was considered as proactive rather than reactive.*

### **Strategy**

- *Under the present circumstances there are forceful reasons to conclude that the strategy of GP should be modified in the short run. In case there is a new Phase or a new Program, they should be initiated with a new strategy (see Conclusions).*

### **Results**

- *The results of Phase I are rather uneven and mediocre at best. Many of the undertakings during this Phase have not yielded sustainable outputs.*
- *Phase II started rather slowly, but gained momentum throughout 2003. The incumbent Program Director was conscious of the shortcomings of this Phase and took actions conducive to tangible results. Linkages with think tanks and universities are likely to yield appreciable results. Capacity building efforts of GP during 2003 in the areas of trade policy, promotion of women entrepreneurs, fine tuning FDI, technology transfer, enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs are noteworthy.*
- *It is rather difficult at this stage to state unequivocally whether the activities of GP resulted in creating national ownership. There are some good indications to that effect in some countries, but whether the ownership will be lasting cannot be ascertained categorically at this point of time.*

### **Summary**

- *During Phase I Objective 1 has been only very partially achieved. Outputs of Objective 2 are either partially achieved or not achieved at all, putting the attainment of this Objective in question. Finally, Objective 3 has not been achieved at all. Phase II is still in process, and it has only a little over one year for its completion. It is expected that Objective 1 of this Phase may very well be achieved at the completion of the Program. With respect to its Objective 2 only partial achievement is likely.*
- *In short, the Team wishes to assert that the findings are not conducive to state unequivocally that both Phases have been a success. In fact, the Program leaves very much to be desired. The Team notes, however, that the present Project Director, who has been guiding the Program only during the last twelve months or so, has been conscious of the shortcomings of the Program and has taken the initiatives to redirect the Program in order to be able to overcome them and increase its efficiency.*

## **Recommendations**

### **Short-term Strategic Recommendations**

*The Team proposes the following adjustments for Phase II to undertake until it ends:*

- *Consolidate the results already achieved.*
- *Focus the Program on reasonable objectives that will show tangible results.*
- *Create synergies with partners and other programs. There is a strong need to improve the relationships with IF, JITAP and other UNDP programs to stimulate synergies.*
- *Optimize the use of the financial resources that still remain.*
- *Change the perceptions of the Program.*
- *Focus the Program on country-based activities in countries, such as Bolivia, Vietnam, Indonesia and perhaps Kenya and Ecuador. In other countries undertake limited actions.*
- *Avoid being involved directly in capacity building activities, except in trade policy and not in trade development, but maintain efforts on consensus building.*
- *Strengthen the networking with think tanks and universities on the global and regional and country levels in order to facilitate the understanding of globalization and SHD by the development community.*
- *Update the web site and connect to the most relevant sites on globalization, trade and SHD. (The [www.talkdevelopment.info](http://www.talkdevelopment.info) site is certainly useful, but since GP staff is limited, this might not be feasible before the end of Phase II).*
- *Make the language of conceptual papers non-esoteric and jargon free (as did the “White Paper and Social Efficiency study) without lowering its intellectual content, so that they are understood by large audience and enhance the positive image of GP.*
- *Reach an agreement with UNDP to support its high-level policy advice services (“soft interventions”).*
- *Launch innovative projects only if GP is able to secure their concretization through resource mobilization.*
- *Ensure more result-oriented and less narrative monitoring system.*
- *Ensure a wider base of donor contributions for the future through a fund raising campaign based on the concrete results obtained at the end of Phase II and the vision for the next phase.*

### **Long-term Recommendations**

#### **Long-term Recommendations Concerning Management**

- *If UNDP were to decide that there ought to be a new Program that is substantially modified from Phase II, the first issue is to determine how it is to be managed. After weighing several alternatives the Team concludes, therefore recommends, that the new Program should be placed within UNDP, but located in UNDP/Geneva.*
- *The Team also recommends that the Steering Committee should be open to the membership of donors and developing countries; should establish a Coordinating Committee with UNDESA, ILO, ITC, WTO, UNCTAD and UNDP/HQ; and should also a panel of experts with UNDP/HDRO, UNDP/ODS, UNDESA, ICTSD, WTO, UNCTAD and eminent experts.*

### ***Long-term Recommendations Concerning Substance***

- *A new program may be designed to assist the developing countries with the aim of “bringing the key aspects of a country’s foreign trade regime in conformity with the tenets of SHD.” Some forty countries are yet to join WTO; a number of countries are desirous to join regional economic blocs; or others who are members of such schemes may like to enhance their position in them. Yet WTO’s attributes now expand into a number of substantive areas that have clear impacts on domestic policy making, explicitly linking trade with protection of investment and intellectual property rights, strictly enforcing the solution of disputes. This has extended its authority to domestic regulation, legislation, governance and policy making that are central to the development process. In other words, global trade under WTO is now much more closely related to human development than any other agreement ever did, such as GATT in the past.*
- *As to the overall nature of the program, it is recommended that it should be designed with two immediate objectives, if it is going to be instrumental at all in assisting these countries, provided, of course, they demand assistance from such a program. The demand should be articulated through the UNDP Country Offices and preferably worked into the “Country Program” so as to assure the support of the Country Offices and to insure national ownership. These objectives will have to be:*
  - (i) ***To assist the countries who are likely to enter WTO (or any other regional cooperation scheme) in assessing the implications of globalization on SHD.***
- *In this respect the program’s activities should essentially consist of fielding highly competent national/international experts to assess the potential impact of globalization on a country’s economy and its various sectors, should the country wish to pursue to enter into the globalization stream. It is in fact a modified CAS.*
- *The Program should also assist the countries in applying or developing analytical and decision-making tools including economic models to quantify the impact of accession (positive/negative) on the economy.*
  - (ii) ***To provide a catalytic role in providing technical assistance in negotiations with WTO so that most favorable conditions are attained in most effective way possible.***
- *As can be appreciated, the above recommendations are neither a draft project document, nor is it a straight jacket for UNDP to find itself in. It is, however, an action-oriented and a practical way of looking at the substantive content of a new program. It cannot be overemphasized that a new program cannot be viewed as the continuation of Phase II of GP, but a new mind-set and an altogether new approach are strongly recommended.*

## INTRODUCTION

The mid-term evaluation of the “UNCTAD-UNDP Global Program on Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development” was undertaken by F.Andic (Team Leader) and A. Benbouali (Team Member) between September 13 and December 5, 2003.

As clearly stated in the Terms of Reference, the purpose is to provide “an independent, neutral and fact-based perspective ... analyze successes and problems to help future decision making and generate a new vision that can be used to build consensus; and support learning.” The present Report adheres to these basic tenets and is organized in a way that the conclusions it reaches and recommendations it makes, based on the assessment of the Project Documents and their implementation, will be useful to future decision-making. The main body of the Report follows the methodology that is already elaborated in *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* issued by UNDP in 2002.

Both Programs (98/615 and 2001/615) have two components. One is global; it aims at putting in place a number of instruments that are useful to all developing countries in their quest of incorporating into the world economy under more advantageous conditions that would further enhance their sustainable human development. The second component is directed to providing assistance to a number of select countries (as pilot undertaking) in their policy determination to be incorporated into the world economy.

The Report was prepared in three steps. **First**, all Program Documents and all documents produced by the Program were scrutinized. **Second**, interviews were held in New York (UNDP), Brussels (the Government of Belgium was a significant co-financer), and in Geneva (UNCTAD-Project Management). After the conversations and interviews in Geneva the consultants developed a tentative questionnaire/methodology to be used in the field. **Third**, the technical assistance provided to five countries, namely, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Senegal and Vietnam was assessed. Test cases had to be selected, since it was not financially viable within the budget of the evaluation to cover all countries that benefited from the Program. However, the selection was not haphazard. Care was taken to reflect the geographical location of the countries, their level of development as well as the implementation of the two phases of the Program. The results of the fieldwork are incorporated into the main body of the Report.

The Report reflects the unanimous view of both consultants who are grateful for all the assistance they received from UNDP and UNCTAD staff, and especially from the Program personnel as well as from all the persons with whom they interacted in the field.

## **PART ONE: APPROACH OF THE PROGRAM**

### **1.1 Rationale of the Program**

Since the nineties the world has been moving on the road of liberalizing all trade barriers and of globalization, i.e., integrating the countries into the world economy. But liberalization and globalization cannot be attributed to the past few years alone. During the decades of the sixties, seventies and nineties technological innovation brought about a series of radical changes that contributed to movements towards globalization, and both the developing and developed countries have made conscious efforts to integrate their economies, one way or another. Regional cooperation efforts, such as the Central American Common Market, NAFTA, the European Common Market finally ending in the European Union, and the establishment of WTO all show that trade liberalization and globalization are but one path to follow in the foreseeable future.

Since its inception in 1994, WTO significantly changed the framework for international transactions. But one major question is yet to be solved, and that is: Since different countries in the globe have different socio-economic constraints and conditions, can then all of them participate on an equal footing into the world economy without altering a set of conditions? Not all countries show an even picture; asymmetries and disparities exist. If eventually all the countries of the world are to be integrated into the “world economy,” should they all have the same conditions in order to be able to participate? Since obviously they do not, what can be done to assist them so that they can derive the expected benefits from globalization in the form of more trade, more foreign investment, more economic growth in a milieu of democracy and good governance leading to a more and better Sustainable Human Development (SHD)?

A host of policy options and actions exist, but one option immediately suggests itself, and that is assisting those countries that, for a variety of reasons, are not yet in a position to reap the benefits of globalization and liberalization. They need assistance in a number of fields and areas so that they can be in a position to integrate into the world economy without undue hardship and without suffering from a decline in their human development. UNCTAD/UNDP has launched its Program precisely for this purpose. The ultimate goal is as simple as it is appropriate: to enhance the ability of the developing countries, especially of the low income ones, to deal with globalization and trade liberalization for the pursuit of accelerating their growth and SHD.

### **1.2 Evolution and Current Status of the Program**

The Program was originally designed for three years starting in 1998. It was expected that at the **global level** it would develop a conceptual as well as an operational framework for analyzing the process of integrating the developing countries into the world economy. At the **country level** it was to focus on providing support to a number of low-income developing countries through specific technical assistance for their successful integration into the global economy.

Two sets of events were considered to provide the justification of Phase II of the Program:

- At the global level: i) “the Asian crisis raised questions about the sustainability and equity of a growth model based on unbridled globalization, and ii) the Seattle events followed by the manifestations in Prague, Washington and other cities... They constitute a serious warning about a globalization process that is perceived as too rapid, non-participatory, and a cause of increasing inequalities between and within countries.”
- At the country level: “there is strong demand for assistance from developing countries. In participating countries, the Program has had a positive impact at the highest political level”

The implementation of GLO/98/615 brought to the surface a series of lessons. These are clearly articulated in the Program Document of GLO/2001/615 (Phase II of the Program). It is worth listing here the major lessons learned:

- The speed of integrating into the world economy depends upon the circumstances present in the individual countries.
- Successful integration requires larger investment in human capital.
- Improved national governance is critical for integration. The capacity to negotiate agreements is fundamental to the success of national development strategies.
- Regional integrations seem to be the building blocks for global integration.
- SMEs are important links between economic growth and social development.
- Foreign direct investments (FDI) are not alternatives to national investment, but they play a significant role in technology transfer and market access.
- There is a positive correlation between democracy, rule of law, and savings and investment.
- The UN Regional Commissions were useful in identifying the needs of the countries involved in activities at the regional level. Building upon the experience gained, it may be useful to envisage how to extend these activities to other regional commissions and other UN agencies.

The main character of Phase II is that it is directed not only to fortify the results of Phase I, but also, as comprehensively as the financial resources allow, to enhance the capability of the developing countries to manage their integration into the global economy in a fair and equitable manner that is supportive of sustainable development.

The Program Document of Phase II reflects the several steps that are required for globalization to lead to sustainable development. Capacity constraints at all levels – individual, organizational, societal – must be eliminated, good governance and democracy should be the rule of the land, and poverty reduction should be palpable. It was also clear that the Program would not attempt to create new capacities, but rather to strengthen the existing ones. Then, and only then, would globalization lead to SHD. If not, marginalization, stagnation would set in and competition would work against the country. The Program Document indicates the ways and means to assist the developing

countries. Regional and south-south cooperation and especially technical assistance are vehicles that will assist these countries to enable them to move on the road of globalization and liberalization.

The Program evolved along the following lines:

- Linkage between trade liberalization and SHD issues. In the Phase I liberalization of trade was the main focus and SHD was the second concern, while in Phase II a more balanced approach was adopted.
- Support of global and country-based activities. Here again Phase I concentrated on assessing the integration into the global economy; it was allocated 90% of time, while policy dialogue was allocated 10% of time. Phase II was expected to change the allocation of time as follows: assessment of integration into the global economy (40%), policy dialogue and advice (30%), and follow-up and capacity building (30%). This meant providing greater support to country needs.
- Selection of countries. In Phase I the Program was inclined to provide support to low-income countries, including LDCs; in Phase II LDCs were no longer targeted.

The Program is designed as a partnership drawing on the twin strengths of UNDP and UNCTAD to contribute to a better integration of developing countries into the global economy. The underlying assumption is that UNDP would provide the SHD paradigm on a worldwide basis, and UNCTAD would provide an analytical and systemic understanding of trade and development issues. The Program is designed to operate holistically and interactively on issues of trade and development policies, enhancing investment opportunities and institutional innovations for managing global integration. The following table summarizes the objectives and outputs that were identified in each phase.

**TABLE 1**

	<b>Phase I (1998-2001)</b>	<b>Phase II (2001-2004)</b>
<b>Objective 1 Global level</b>	<p>To develop SHD-centered conceptual and operational framework toward global integration</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> Establishment of a framework for analysis and integration of low income countries into the global economy consistent with SHD and its application through Country Assessment Study (CAS)</p> <p><i>Output 2:</i> Strengthened understanding of participating countries in future multilateral negotiations in issues affecting globalization and SHD through enhanced capacity</p> <p><i>Output 3:</i> Better understanding by the development community of issues related to globalization and SHD</p> <p><i>Output 4:</i> Measurement of the economic performance of countries seeking to integrate into the world economy</p> <p><i>Output 5:</i> Network with capacity to provide advice and network with civil society groups who are engaged in advocacy around issues related to SHD and globalization</p>	<p>To further strengthen the SHD-centered conceptual and operational framework toward global integration and ensure a wide dissemination of the new paradigm</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> further refinement, through CAS, of the conceptual and operational framework for analysis and integration of low income countries into the global economy consistent with SHD and its application</p> <p><i>Output 2:</i> better understanding of participating countries in future multilateral negotiations of issues affecting globalizations and SHD through enhanced capacity</p> <p><i>Output 3:</i> better understanding of the development community of issues related to globalization and SHD</p> <p><i>Output 4:</i> measurement of pro-poor and SHD content of macro-economic and structural policies in the context of integrating into the global economy</p>
<b>Objective 2 Country level</b>	<p>To strengthen national capacities to develop and implement global market integration policies consistent with SHD policies</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> Establishment/support of national consultative mechanism for the project</p> <p><i>Output 2:</i> Assessment of country-specific situation through CAS and preparation of national action plan</p> <p><i>Output 3:</i> Consensus building with in-country donor community on policy coherence to pursue global integration consistent with SHD</p> <p><i>Output 4:</i> National indicators to measure impact of integration on SHD</p>	<p>To strengthen national capacities to develop and implement global market integration policies consistent with SHD policies</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> Assessment of country-specific situation using the refined CAS</p> <p><i>Output 2:</i> Consensus building with in-country donor community on policy coherence to pursue global integration consistent with SHD</p> <p><i>Output 3:</i> Preparation of action plans and support to their implementation</p> <p><i>Output 4:</i> Ad hoc policy advice in specific areas of globalization and SHD</p>
<b>Objective 3 LDCs</b>	<p>Support follow-up of the High-Level Meeting on Integrated Initiatives for LDCs' Trade and Development</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> Improved integration of LDCs into the international economy</p>	
	Benchmarks for Objectives 1 and 2 were identified	Indicators of success were identified for the Program

### **1.3 Execution Modalities**

The Phase I started in late 1998 and ended in 2001. The Phase II started in 2001 and was originally planned to end in 2003, but after several interruptions of about one year due to several changes in the upper management of the Program, it is now expected that Phase II will be completed in October 2004.

The Program is not a traditional project funded by UNDP and executed by a UN executing agency, but claims to be a joint UNDP/UNCTAD Program. Cooperation with other UNDP and UNCTAD units and programs was envisaged as well as secondment of UNDP staff to the Program and part-time assignment of two UNDP staff, one as a focal point and the other as a technical backstopping officer. It was also expected that the out-posted UNDP trade and poverty reduction policy advisors in the Sub-Regional Resource Facility would contribute to the activities of the Program.

The execution modality of the Program is rather simple and straightforward. The Program (Phase II) is overseen by a steering committee comprised of the representatives of UNDP, UNCTAD and of the Belgian Government, by the virtue of the fact that Belgium is an appreciable co-financer. For administrative purposes the Program is attached to the Office of the Deputy Secretary General of UNCTAD, a modality that aims to provide a high profile and visibility in UNCTAD. In UNDP the Program was attached to the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Development Policy. The Program Director is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Program, as well as providing substantive leadership.

Phase I of the Program had more complex arrangements. In addition to the Steering Committee, a technical and scientific Steering Committee was foreseen, as well as, at the country level, a National Steering Committee including the Government, the private sector and the donor community.

## PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAM

### 2.1 Management

#### 2.1.1 Direction

The Global Program, through its two Phases, has seen many changes in its management due to the retirement of the first Director, the sudden resignation of the second and the late recruitment of the current incumbent. The following table illustrates the Program's calendar of events.

	1998	1999	2000	2001		2002		2003
<b>GP</b>	Start in March	Phase I	Phase I	Phase I until Jul.		Phase II	Phase II	Phase II
<b>Manager</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Dir.	1 <sup>st</sup> Dir.	1 <sup>st</sup> Dir.	1 <sup>st</sup> Dir.	OIC	2 <sup>nd</sup> Dir. Nov. to Jan.	OIC	3 <sup>rd</sup> Dir.
<b>Steering Committee</b>		8 Feb.	20 Sept.				26 Nov.	
<b>Periodic report</b>		Work Plan 1999 Newsletter	Intern. Eval. Report Two Newsletters				Progress Rep. Jul. 01- Dec 02; Work Program. 03 Newsletter	Progress Rep. Dec. 02-Mar.03; WP Apr. 03-Dec. 03; Progress Rep. Jan. 03-Dec.03

#### 2.1.2 Staff resources

Phase I was very short in human resources; it had one Director and one associate expert provided by the Italian Government. In Phase II the situation was improved; there was one Director assisted by a Special Advisor on energy, one JPO financed by the Belgian government, two program officers and two general services staff. The Italian Government is no longer providing a JPO. One UNDP staff member was seconded to GP in February 2002 until July 2003. Given the ambitious objectives and the wide coverage of GP, staffing resources were not adequate in both Phases; even in Phase II the number of experienced staff was limited.

#### 2.1.3 Responsiveness

The number of changes in the management of the Program generated a floating period of one year (July 2001-July 2002) in its management. The responsiveness of the Program slowed down during this period, but it improved subsequently as can be seen in the following table. This is not meant to blame the two Officers-in-Charge who tried to manage GP in addition to their normal official duties.

	VIETNAM	INDONESIA	ROMANIA	ECUADOR	BOLIVIA	KENYA	SENEGAL
<b>Official Request</b>	Oct. 2001	Nov. 2001	Dec. 2001	Jun. 2002	Aug. 2002	Nov 2002	No official request
<b>Identification Mission</b>	Sept. 2002	May 2002	3 in Jun. Jul. Oct. 2002	Oct. 2002 and March 2003	Oct. 2002	Feb. 2003	July 2003
<b>Duration</b>	12 months	6 months	6 months	4 months	2 months	4 months	N/A

### **2.1.4 Oversight**

As planned in the Project Documents the Steering Committee oversaw the implementation of the Program, but not frequently: more than one year and a half passed between the Committee's first and second meeting and more than two years between the second and the third. It is interesting to note that the first and the second meetings were attended by high level senior representatives of UNDP and UNCTAD; the third one was attended also by the highest level representatives of the Belgian Government, since it provided financial resources for Phase II. The UNDP Office in Geneva attended the second and third meetings. The purpose of these meetings was to:

- Review the implementation of the Program.
- Discuss the work plan for the next period.
- Provide policy orientation, particularly in terms of selecting the countries and determine the focus.
- Mobilize additional resources.

The minutes of these meetings were useful to understand why some changes took place in the implementation of the Program and to record the efforts made for mobilizing resources. But it is not possible to see how the management of the Program responded to the recommendations made by the earlier meetings of the Steering Committee, for example, on the selection of countries and the follow-up actions in the Central American countries.

### **2.1.5 Reporting system**

In Phase II the Program issued newsletters beginning in July 1999 and ending in January 2002. These newsletters were very informative about the advancement of the Program and its linkages with UNCTAD Divisions and the IF Program (see box below). A work plan for 1999 was prepared for the 1<sup>st</sup> Steering Committee and provided a detailed list of activities envisaged for each objective and output, with an estimated allocation of resources by output. However, the documentation and the newsletters received by the Team do not make it possible to:

- Understand always the criteria used for selecting the countries to be assisted.
- Assess the responsiveness of the Program.
- Find an explanation of why the Global Resources Facility or the External Advisory Committee was not established even though there might be a rationale for this.

An internal evaluation report was prepared in 2000 to review the results achieved output by output. In Phase I no systematic attempt was made to report on the use of financial resources.

In Phase II GP issued three progress reports. One related to the period July 2001-July 2002, the second to the period December 2002 - March 2003, and the third to the

period January 2003 - December 2003, including a work plan for 2003. A work plan was also made for the period April 2003 - December 2003.

These latest reports provide a detailed account of activities at the global, regional, and corporate and country level and provide a financial account of Belgian and UNDP resources used, at least in the last progress report. They are narrative and do not provide a clear picture of the results achieved so far. They ignore the current status of the countries assisted in Phase I; they do not go beyond the last Investment Policy Review or national workshop, even if another donor did take the lead for the follow-up actions, something that GP could have claim some merit for (such as in Nicaragua with IDB). Only Phase I countries are mentioned where GP has some ongoing activities. They do not provide an explanation of what happens when an activity is foreseen in a work plan, but is not carried out subsequently. A good example is Vietnam where the training seminars on banking and insurance industries and on S&DT, related to capacity development in connection with WTO accession, were envisaged in the 2003 work plan. The latest progress reports ignore these seminars and refer to three ongoing studies on capacity development. It is likely that this can be explained but for the evaluation team this is not reflected in the periodic reports. The reporting system does not pay tribute to the “soft” (meaning high level policy advice) interventions led personally by the Director of the Global Program, such as in Bolivia, as well as to his effort to mobilize the energies of UNCTAD for the Program. This has changed subsequent to the discussions of the Team with the Program Director (see the last 2003 progress report).

In its annual report on technical cooperation activities UNCTAD has reported every year the achievements of GP.

It appears from the review of these reports that Phase I had focused primarily on conceptual issues, while in Phase II GP was more action-oriented at the country level. The linkage between global activities and country activities is not obvious in the reporting system except for the use of the CAS framework, some thoughts developed in the White Paper and the social effectiveness concept.

The monitoring system is limited to periodic progress reports and mission reports. In these reports, as well as in the Project Documents for both Phases, concepts of outcome, benchmarks and indicators of success used were not always really clear, measurable or even relevant.

#### **2.1.6 Selection of countries**

The countries selected in Phase I were supposed to be low-income countries, but in reality 8 low-income countries and 6 LDCs were selected, as recommended by the Steering Committee in its first meeting and with strong suggestion from UNDP and UNCTAD. It was not clear whether the countries were selected on the basis of a formal demand from their governments or whether they were chosen because of the Program Manager’s personal relationships with some public officials. The regional dimension criteria suggested by the Steering Committee were also not obvious in the choice of the

countries, except for Central American and some South East African countries, as the Evaluation Team was later informed. As stated earlier, in Phase II LDCs were no longer the main target, but they were still part of the countries selected and no explanation has been provided as to why this change occurred. The Belgian Government requested to have the countries it targeted on the list of selected countries. In few cases, such as Senegal, there was no formal demand from the Government, even it may be argued that GP's intervention was considered as a follow-up of the IF exercise.

### **2.1.7 Coordination within UNCTAD**

GP was able to develop relationships with many UNCTAD Divisions and Programs, such as the Special Program for Least Developed, Landlocked and Island Developing Countries (including the Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to LDCs), the Division of International Trade in Goods and Services and Commodities, and the Division on Investment, Technology and Enterprise Development (including EMPRETEC). In addition GP has attempted to establish some relationship with IF within UNCTAD which was to be developed later.

Some examples selected from Phase I are:

- Fine-tuning FDI: the China Symposium, 1999.
- The Training Program in Commercial Diplomacy: Latin America and Caribbean; Africa; and Asia and the Pacific, 1999.
- Best practices in investment promotion.
- The workshop on integrating LDCs into the global economy.
- The round table on trade in Haiti jointly with IF, 1999.
- Sectoral consultations on trade, investment and private sector development for Gambia, jointly with IF, 1999.

For Phase II the following examples can be mentioned:

- Asian regional meeting on "Enhancing the Competitiveness of SME's through Linkages with TNC's," 2001.
- Investment policy review for Botswana and Nepal, 2003.
- Transfer of technology for successful integration into the global economy: cases of Brazil, India and South Africa and the expert meeting for the presentation of the three studies, 2002.
- Regional seminars on "Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness," 2003.

Two types of relationships have been developed: those where GP was funding some activities managed by other divisions (due to their expertise and the relevance to the Program) and those that were follow-up actions of GP interventions engaged by other Divisions (irrespective of funding).

As mentioned by the UNCTAD Deputy Secretary General, GP has not succeeded to be the pillar of coherence in UNCTAD on globalization and SHD. This can be

illustrated by the lack of relationship between the Division on Globalization and Development Strategies and GP.

The special and dual role of the Director of the Program as Special Advisor to the UNCTAD Secretary General might have facilitated some relationships or created difficulties with some other colleagues.

### **2.1.8 Coordination with UNDP**

Since UNDP is a decentralized and field-oriented organization and UNCTAD a centralized but de-concentrated one as part of the UN Secretariat, it is important to review the coordination between the two at each level. For UNDP, in Phase I GP was a highly regarded flagship Program, since it was initiated by the Administrator of UNDP and the Secretary General of UNCTAD; it was to link the SHD concern of UNDP with the trade and globalization expertise of UNCTAD. Over the years GP became a “standard “ UNDP program executed by an agency; it lost its identity as a joint program, but retained high visibility in UNCTAD. This new perception within UNDP can be witnessed at the Country Office levels where GP is sometimes unknown such as in Senegal. GP’s management argues that many other countries know about the GP such as Zimbabwe, Jamaica, and Kenya. The mainstreaming of GP in the UNDP/CO activities was linked to the chemistry of personal relationships. The former UNDP staff member of BDP, who became the Special Advisor to GP, was able to grease the relationships between the two organizations at the Headquarters and Country Office levels, as well as with the UN Office in Geneva. His departure from UNDP left a vacuum. It has to be recognized that in some cases, such as the ICT program in Vietnam, GP and UNDP/HQ worked very closely to launch the pre-feasibility study of ICT. In Kenya GP is in the process of linking its future activities with the new Country Program 2004-2008.

Based on the documentation received and the information collected through field visits the Evaluation Team was not able to see any connection, as envisaged in the Project Document of Phase II, between GP and the UNDP/SURF network. The only exception is Kenya where a SURF staff, posted in Addis Ababa, is involved with GP in formulating a new joint project: UNCTAD - UNDP/CO.

The lack of flexibility in administrative and financial matters in UNCTAD is a matter of concern for UNDP that has a less bureaucratic approach in project management.

Some Country Offices complain about GP’s lack of follow-up (Nicaragua) and the lack of anchorage into the Country Office programs (Senegal, Ecuador). From the review of mission reports of consultants and GP staff, it is clear that UNDP Country Offices were not by-passed by GP, since visits to the COs took place and copies of the field reports were always distributed.

One special case, Bolivia, illustrates the conflicting perception by UNDP and UNCTAD of the role of the Program. The advice of the Director of GP to the Government on the impact of energy policy on the poor was challenged by UNDP on two

grounds: the nature of the advice itself and whether GP had the right to provide advice on energy issues. The subsequent political events have shown that the advice was appropriate. This example needs to be analyzed by both organizations. They need to clarify the issue and come to an understanding as to what the future role of GP should be in similar cases.

### **2.1.9 Use of resources**

GP has been using international as well as national consultants to carry out global studies and CAS and to produce research papers. It has also subcontracted some studies to other UNCTAD Divisions or to ICTSD in Geneva. GP has also funded some UNDP initiatives, such as at the country level in Vietnam, three studies launched by the Asia Regional Trade Initiative.

### **2.1.10 Publications/Web site**

GP has issued many documents that are available on its web site free of charge. The latest progress report provides some information on the use of the web site by the public: 70 to 90 hits are recorded every day. Universities, international organizations, “private Internet service providers”?, companies and governments are the main users in descending order. More than 82% of hits come from EU, North America and Asia, but very little from the rest of the developing world.

However, the website is not updated (the latest update is July 2003) and it contains references that cite, month after month, that information will “come soon.” There is nothing in the website that would help the user to be guided by cross-references to know where UNCTAD stands after the Cancún meeting. The statement of the Secretary General at the Trade and Development Board on Post-Doha Development (8 October 2003) could have been useful for interested persons. There is no linkage to WTO, ITC, ILO (the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization) and OECD and no reference to IF and JITAP or to the CAS conceptual framework that was supposed to be widely disseminated. This indicates the limited usefulness of the site. The [www.talkdevelopment.info](http://www.talkdevelopment.info) site is yet to be established.

### **2.1.11 Financial Resources**

The budget of Phase I of the Program was \$4 million; \$2.9 million came from UNDP sources (MDGD, RBA, SEPED and TCDC); \$1.1 million was going to be mobilized from other sources. At the completion of Phase I \$2,885,841 were spent. Phase II was allotted a budget of \$2.8 million. \$1,023,000 was to come from the UNDP sources; \$1.077 million were to be mobilized from other sources. It was also expected that the Italian Government was to make an in-kind contribution (attaching a JPO to the Program). Phase II mobilized \$1 million from the Belgian Government, and the contribution of the Italian Government did not materialize fully, due to the early departure of the JPO. As it did in Phase I, UNCTAD continued to contribute to the budget of Phase II in kind, since the Program management was located in UNCTAD

premises. This contribution was in addition to the other resources. The total expenditure of Phase II, as of October 2003, stands at \$1,271,981. The Belgian Government expects to release presently the third and final installment of its contribution. At the completion of Phase II total outlay is expected to reach \$2 million.

Regretfully, it is almost impossible to carry out a thorough financial analysis of the Program due to the financial information system in use in the UN, and therefore in UNCTAD. The expenditures are shown only as functional line items, but are not linked to the outputs foreseen in the Program documents. Hence, this evaluation cannot link the expenditures to the activities, an impossibility that impedes the evaluation to carry out an analysis of cost effectiveness and financial efficiency. One would assume that the Program management is diligent in allocating the amount of expenditures correctly to the output needs. But this is only a reasonable assumption.

## **2.2 Achievements of Phase I (GLO/98/615)**

The first objective of Phase I was to **expound the underpinnings of global integration with losing the focus of the center role of SHD**. As explained above, globalization is not for globalization sake, but to enhance SHD.

The second objective is more methodology and policy oriented and **aims at having first hand knowledge about the countries and to strengthen their capacities** so that they can pursue the correct policies to enter into the global economy.

The third objective, on the other hand, appears to be an afterthought and **reads more like an output, rather than an objective**. Suffice it to note that in Phase II this objective was in fact incorporated with some variations into the Program Document as an output.

**Objective 1: To develop an SHD-centered Conceptual and Operational Framework toward Global Integration**

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Output 1: Establishment of a conceptual and operational framework for the analysis of integration of LDCs into global economy consistent with SHD	Framework paper is completed; output is partially obtained.	<i>Among the 6 activities foreseen for this output only two have not been completed: validation of the methodology in one country and the discussion with country experts. Conceptual and operational framework and terms of reference for country assessment have been completed..</i>
Output 2: Strengthened understanding of participating countries in multilateral negotiations affecting globalization and SHD through enhanced capacity	Not achieved	<i>Three activities out of four were carried out. Due to lack of financial resources, workshops to define policy objectives did not take place and a series of sectoral meetings to consider how to proceed with integration in particular areas were not concluded satisfactorily.</i>
Output 3: Better understanding in the development community of issues relating to globalization and SHD	Achievement of this output is dubious	<i>Three out of five activities have not been carried out. A conceptual framework methodology and supporting papers were prepared and distributed. Consensus building seminar on framework and methodology was not carried out due to lack of funds.</i>
Output 4: Measurement of economic performance of countries seeking to integrate into the world economy	Not obtained	<i>None of the activities have been carried out.</i>
Output 5: Network of universities, policy think tanks, private consultants with capacity to provide advice on integration to public and private sectors of participating countries	Only partially at hand	<i>Contacts were established, but have never been developed or followed up. Web site is developed.</i>

**Objective 2: To Strengthen National Capacities, to Develop and Implement  
Global Market Integration Policies Consistent with SHD Objectives**

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Output 1: Establishment/support of national consultative mechanism for the Project	This output is not at hand	<i>Only one activity, i.e. work plan, was prepared. Identifying national cooperating institutions to implement the Program was not carried out. Outreach activities were only very partially carried out. Lack of sufficient resources was one of the major reasons why activities were not carried out.</i>
Output 2: Assessment of country-specific situation on the basis of common methodology prepared in Output 1 and preparation of a national action plan	Partially achieved	<i>Ten assessments were carried out. However, the resource mobilization campaign, meeting with development partners and the monitoring of the action plan were not carried out.</i>
Output 3: Consensus building with in-country donor community on policy coherence to pursue integration consistent with SHD	Only very partially at hand	<i>Information was provided to UNDAF, and eleven workshops were held.</i>
Output 4: National indicators to measure impact of integration on SHD	Output not at hand	<i>No activity related to this output was carried out.</i>

**Objective 3: To Support the Follow-up of the High-level Meeting on  
Integrated Initiatives for Least Developed Countries' Trade and Development**

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Output 1: Improved integration of LDCs in the international economy and enhanced supply response	Not achieved	<i>Inter-agency group meeting in Geneva took place. Joint programming was never developed and only in three out of 7-10 countries round table discussions took place.</i>

**Benchmarks of Phase I**

The outputs discussed above and their completions are the first approximation to the success/failure of the Program. This assessment is necessary but not sufficient. It is important to assess the benchmarks established in the Project Document.

<b>Benchmarks</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Related to Objective 1</b>	
Key conceptual studies are prepared	<i>Studies are prepared</i>
A catalogue of best practice experiences is developed	<i>Best practice experiences are developed only with respect to investment</i>
Key experts and institutions to provide expert support to individual countries are identified on needed basis	<i>No follow-up has taken place; only one list is prepared</i>
Global integration SHD impact indicators are identified and used in country studies	<i>Not identified; not used</i>
A web site is developed and used as numbers of hits indicate	<i>Web site developed; average 70 to 90 hits per day</i>
Activity-driven linkages are established with other programs and other institutions	<i>Linkages were established with respect to training; linkages with other divisions of UNCTAD; some linkages with WTO; linkages are made on an ad hoc basis</i>
Existence of a task force in UNCTAD for country exercises	<i>Task force exists</i>
Regional dissemination and training seminars are conducted (numbers of seminars and workshops)	<i>Training seminar was held in Mauritius</i>
<b>Related to Objective 2</b>	
Signature of a memorandum of understanding with the selected countries	<i>Memorandum was signed with some countries</i>
Existing national think tanks and government-private sector advisory mechanisms are identified (preparation and strengthening)	<i>Identification has been carried out, but not strengthening</i>
Country-level stock taking exercise is carried out	<i>Unknown</i>
Country-level program activities based on stock taking activities are carried out	<i>Unknown</i>
Selected policy reform proposals are developed	<i>Very limited development</i>
Selected policy reforms are implemented through national programs	<i>Unknown</i>
National global integration SHD impact indicators are developed to help keep track of the reform efforts	<i>Not developed</i>
<b>Related to Objective 3</b>	
No benchmarks in the Project Document	

### 2.3 Achievements of Phase II (GLO/01/615)

The development objective stated in the Project Document Phase I is also valid for Phase II.

The first objective of Phase II is not dissimilar to Objective 1 of Phase I: **“To further strengthen SHD-centered conceptual and operational framework toward global integration and ensure a wide dissemination of the new paradigm.”** The second objective is an *ad verbatim* repetition of Objective 2 of the first Phase, which is: **“to strengthen national capacities to develop and implement global market integration policies consistent with SHD objectives.”** This objective, in fact, encompasses all country-level activities as will be seen below. The third objective of Phase I is in fact incorporated into outputs.

In terms of objectives, it is difficult to distinguish Phase II from Phase I; however, as will be seen below, Phase II aims to be much more policy oriented, putting greater emphasis on the particular conditions and constraints of the developing countries and paying greater attention to the role of SMEs, capacity development and the role of good governance for the integration of these economies into the world market.

#### **Objective 1: To Further Strengthen the SHD-centered Conceptual and Operational Framework toward Global Integration, and Insure a Wide Dissemination of the New Paradigm**

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Output 1: Further refinement through country assessment studies, of the conceptual and operational framework for the analysis of the integration of low-income developing countries	Achieved, but not in all countries	<i>Not all country studies foreseen have been carried out</i>
Output 2: Better understanding by participating countries of forthcoming multilateral negotiations, enhanced capacity to prepare policy positions and to negotiate	Partially achieved	<i>This output is seen as a process and the role of GP is viewed as a catalyst.</i>
Output 3: Better understanding in the development community of issues relating to globalization	This output is viewed as being in the process	<i>It is ongoing; expected to be completed at the end of the Project</i>
Output 4: Measurement of pro-poor and SHD content of macro-economic and structural policies in the context of integration	This output has not been achieved	<i>This output should have been one of the pillars of the Program; never-theless the list of indicators to measure the impact of integration, updating the data base in core countries and the monitoring of the results to be obtained from the national data were not carried out. It is highly unlikely that it can be done so prior to the completion of the program.</i>

**Objective 2: To Strengthen National Capacities to Develop and Implement  
Global Market Integration Policies Consistent with SHD Objectives**

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Output 1: Assessment of country-specific situation using the common methodology formulated in Phase I, further developed in Phase II	The methodology used in Phase II is no longer the same	
Output 2: Consensus building with in-country donor community on policy coherence to pursue global integration consistent with SHD	Yet to be achieved	<i>If national workshops are held, output is likely to be achieved.</i>
Output 3: Preparation of action plans and support to their implementation	Not likely to be had	<i>Over-ambitious output; partial outputs are visible in Nepal, Botswana and Malawi; Program is withdrawn from Zimbabwe.</i>
Output 4: Ad hoc policy advice in specific areas of globalization and SHD	Likely to be achieved at the end of the program	<i>Ad hoc expertise has been extended/to be extended to Ecuador, Bolivia and Vietnam.</i>

**Indicators of success**

As can be seen from the previous Section, some of the outputs were in fact obtained at the end of the first Phase. However, the question still remains, and these are: to what extent has the Program yielded the expected results? The very first intent, therefore, is to compare indicators before and after the Program. It is somewhat easy, since the Program Document lists the indicators of success objective by objective.

### Indicators of success

Indicators	Comments
<b>Related to Objective 1</b>	
The conceptual and operational framework is used in all the core countries and by other projects	<i>This objective is yet to be achieved; given the life of the Program this appears to be major weakness</i>
Identification of the global integration SHD impact indicators and their use in country studies	<i>Not fully identified; GP aims to strive whether it can be used in "Millennium Development Goals"</i>
Implementation of the list of recommendations to support research and training programs in international trade is under way	<i>In preparation</i>
Best practices in policy management and in technology transfer are well accepted by the international community	<i>A book is published on the subject; the acceptance by the international community is not known</i>
Publication of best practices in investment promotion, benchmarks developed and they are used by investment promotion agencies	<i>Best practices are published; benchmarks are not developed</i>
Development of a web site providing access to publications. Track of use (hits) and updates regularly maintained	<i>Developed during Phase I and updated regularly; hits are mostly from Europe, USA and Asia; very few hits from other regions</i>
<b>Related to Objective 2</b>	
National think tanks and private sector assn's strengthened and their capacity to engage in a policy dialogue with the government increased	<i>There is an impression that think tanks are strengthened; one think tank in Indonesia; some works are carried out with chambers of commerce in Zimbabwe and Nepal; result in Zimbabwe is doubtful</i>
National priority areas for capacity building to maximize the benefits of globalization identified and strengthened	<i>No tangible information with respect to this indicator</i>
Regional network of institutions specialized in research and training in int'l trade organized and influencing the policy dialogue	<i>Some relationships have been developed with universities and think tanks.</i>
Integrated national action plans drawn up and financing mobilized for their implementation	<i>Not yet developed</i>

### 2.4 Review of Selected Country-based Interventions

Five country cases are presented below based on field visits of the Evaluation Team: Nicaragua, Ecuador, Bolivia, Senegal and Vietnam. In addition two additional boxes are presented: One is on Indonesia, a country not visited by the Team but considered as an important country in the GP portfolio. The other is on the concept of social efficiency that has been tested in Senegal and is likely to be used also in Kenya.

### Box 1: Nicaragua

Currently, the most important liberalization issue in Nicaragua is the bilateral negotiations between USA and Central American countries to form a Free Trade Area. The trade between USA and Central America is lopsided. Central America's imports from USA are over 90%, whereas USA's imports from Central America are barely over 1% of its total imports. Both sides are locked in about the issues of subsidies to agriculture at the moment. Nicaragua is in dire need of advisory assistance to conclude negotiations as favorable to her as possible. At present, it is preparing, with the assistance of UNDP/CO, its development plan and a document for PRSP. Certainly, from the point of view of trade and globalization, any assistance from GP would be a welcome addition to these efforts. Moreover, the Central American Common Market, which has started almost half a century ago, has never been fully successful to comply with its mandate. Currently, there are new intents to vitalize it. It stands to reason that Nicaragua has a major stake in this revitalization in the negotiations for which it needs technical assistance.

During Phase I of GP a valuable report entitled *Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges in Central American Countries* elucidated the major issues related to SHD as well as trade expansion in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. Subsequently, 5 national workshops were held on April 12 in Guatemala City, May 4 in San Pedro Sula, May 5 in Tegucigalpa, May 8 in San Salvador and May 11, 2000 in Managua. The meeting in Managua brought together private and public sector representatives. It was organized by UNDP/Nicaragua and raised quite a lot of interest and expectations. But there was no follow-up; the interest and expectations died out, and neither the report nor the proceedings of this workshop is in the memory of decision makers, nor can they be found in the archives. There is one single copy in the office of UNDP.

It is not difficult to guess what happened in Nicaragua. After the last elections all the decision makers in the Government have been changed. And, as one interviewee put it, "global programs are a bit like remote control programs; if there is no active follow-up no tangible results can be expected, unless they are anchored in the Country Programs. Many observations and recommendations made in the report and in the forum found their ways in the Nicaragua Human Development Report, and this is the only legacy of GP's efforts in Nicaragua."

Since the activities in Nicaragua were repeated in Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala, it is not difficult to surmise that the outcome of these efforts was most probably no different than what actually transpired in Nicaragua.

Nicaragua is a member of WTO. It now has turned to IDB for assistance. The Bank is providing technical assistance to the country in the areas of export policy analysis, training of the private sector for foreign trade and for in-depth training of trade negotiators with a loan agreement of about \$5 million. The project is expected to start at the end of 2003.

Was this IDB assistance inspired by GP's activities there? No definite answer can be given. The fact remains that the impact of GP activities in Nicaragua did not go beyond the report and the forum. Yet Nicaragua remains as one of the LDCs who are in dire need of assistance with respect to the gamut of problems of trade liberalization, globalization and problems related to SHD. Regrettably, Phase I, and in fact subsequently Phase II, failed to yield concrete results in bringing the benefits that were foreseen in their Project Documents

## Box 2: Ecuador

At the request of the Government of Ecuador GP fielded an exploratory mission in 2002 during which consultations with the Government, civil society, UNDP and IDB took place. As a result, four possible areas of interest emerged: (i) institutional development in the public sector; (ii) international trade and productivity; (iii) strengthening human capital; and (iv) financing. The mission developed a series of alternatives for GP to select as possible areas of intervention. The elections interrupted the dialogue between GP and the Government, but once the new Government assumed power a second mission was fielded in March 2003 to re-open the dialogues in order to precise the specific field of action. The new Government was sympathetic to the four areas mentioned above. Yet, neither side took any definite action. In May 2003 a third mission was fielded that held potentially fruitful discussions with UNDP/CO and a symposium, with the participation of the private sector, to discuss some central themes, such as human development strategy, international trade and macro-economic policy. But, subsequently GP's activities in Ecuador fell into the trap of "stop-and-go" and no further concrete activity took place. The decision of contracting a local consultant was never realized, and specific interventions within the general areas were never clearly delineated. And yet GP could have been rather instrumental in assisting the new Government that came into power in January 2003 in crystallizing policies related to international trade and SHD.

Ecuador was then, and still is interested to work with GP, for currently it is negotiating a bilateral agreement with USA. In 2005 further negotiations will be re-opened with the Andean Community and the Latin American Free Trade Association. In addition, a policy decision has already been taken to negotiate with EU regarding certain agricultural products. As was stated by various decision makers, the in-house capacity to negotiate, as well as to assess realistically the impacts on the economy, is not in its optimum level and assistance is a dire need. It seems, however, that in this area GP has already lost the initiative. IDB now is in the process to conclude with the Government a loan agreement of about \$ 3.7 million to assist the foreign trade sector. A rather hefty portion of this loan will be used in training and capacity building of the selected trade negotiators.

Several explanations are given as to why GP's preliminary activities did not result in concrete actions. According to some, GP is neither sufficiently agile, nor does it have sufficient financial resources to carry out the required assistance. Others argue that it was the complete change in the Government team after the elections that wiped out the fruits of the earlier attempts. Yet according to others, GP changed its focus of attention from Ecuador to Bolivia (at the request of the Bolivian Government). It is also argued that GP never firmly anchored its activities into the UNDP/CO programs. Hence, it became an orphan of the support of the Country Office. Finally, not linking its activities with IDB's initiative, it lost a window of opportunity for cooperation.

To insist on the past is obviously rather unproductive; it would be more fruitful to explore if some spheres of action for GP exist in Ecuador. Many decision makers pointed out that the IDB intervention is very likely to yield good results. It would not only reshape the Ministry of Trade and build capacity among the trade negotiators in the technical sense. However, the contribution of GP would also complement and supplement the enhancement of capacity, if in addition to IDB's technical training the negotiators could be given a global view within the context of SHD. This can easily be accomplished by GP. IDB/Quito also sees this view positively.

Ecuador has been liberalizing and expanding its foreign trade since the 1990s. In 2002 its foreign trade was 47% of GDP, since its exports have been increasing by about 10% a year during the last decade. A member of WTO, Ecuador is also heavily involved in regional trade agreements. It has a dynamic private sector with about 1,700 firms engaged in foreign trade with 130 different countries as trade partners. Ecuador is a fertile ground for GP as a country of activities. The question is: Can the Program move rapidly and efficiently from the stop-and-go mode just to the "go" mode during the next twelve months?

### Box 3: Bolivia

One of the poorest and the least developed nation of the Western Hemisphere, Bolivia has 6.8 million ethnically diverse inhabitants (white – 15%; mestizo – 30%; Quechua and Aymara – 55%), endemic unemployment and underemployment. The income distribution is highly skewed; lowest 10% of the families receive 1.3% of the income and the highest 10% receive 32%. Seventy percent of the population lives below the poverty line. Yet, Bolivia is very rich in mineral resources, such as natural gas, oil, tin, zinc, silver, and timber. Its economic and human development (SHD) is closely linked to the exploitation and exportation of these resources, among which natural gas is gaining an increasingly predominant role. The country's development depends highly on the diversification of its export markets. For this purpose it needs technical assistance not only in technological terms, but also in designing and formulating a rational resource exploitation policy that would be conducive to SHD.

It should be noted that the emergence of natural gas as a new energy source is gaining preponderance with far-reaching impact on world trade, bringing about new opportunities and risks, new interdependencies and geo-political alignments. While coal was the driving force in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and oil in the 20<sup>th</sup>, the 21<sup>st</sup> century is highly likely to be the century of natural gas, since the demand for it is growing in leaps and bounds. This development obviously will have far-reaching impacts on Bolivia.

To be able to enter the era of natural gas as advantageously as possible under the changing circumstances and to have better access into the global market, the Government of Bolivia requested from GP technical assistance to develop a rational energy policy. Responding to the petition of the Government, GP fielded two exploratory missions (October 2002 and February 2003) and established an agenda in cooperation with the Government as well as with the representatives of the private sector. The agenda's aim was to hold a series of forums with three interrelated goals: productive development; entry into the international markets; and good governance through development of public institutions. The first activity was to organize a forum in collaboration with a national organization called FUNDAPPAC (Foundation for Supporting the Parliament and Participation of Citizens). This was a welcome step to prepare the parliamentarians, in particular, and civil society, in general, to discuss rationally the parameters of a nationally accepted energy policy. The result was two widely distributed publications entitled "Noche Parlamentaria" with substantial financial contribution from the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

However, the decision of the Government to export natural gas via Chile gave rise to political unrest. Old political wounds re-opened, since in 1884 Bolivia had lost the Altamaca corridor to Chile and become a land-locked country, a trauma that is very much alive in the mind of the Bolivians. Also, a large sector of the Bolivian poor wanted to have the gas for their own use, rather than being exported, irrespective of the fact that only less than 2% of the gas production can be consumed internally. In October 2003 civil and political unrest ensued; finally the President resigned and the new Government promised to come up with new natural resource policies within two months or so.

The new Government still needs assistance in formulating the new rational energy policy. GP's assistance is very much needed and sought in finding a rational and nationally accepted energy policy solution compatible with the Government's SHD efforts, on the one hand, and the country's penetration into the global markets, on the other. Two separate but interrelated initiatives are in the making. One is to hold several forums in early 2004 in the capital and in the regions with full participation of parliamentarians and civil society to dispel misinformation, to present reliable data and to offer alternatives for a national energy policy to the decision makers for them to select one on which there will be a national consensus. The proposed forums are of particular importance at this point of time, since a referendum will be held in early 2004 to determine as to what the Government's gas policy should be. Given the importance of these forums it is more than likely that UNDP/CO will support this initiative in a way yet to be determined.

The second initiative is to secure technical assistance from the Government of Mexico to provide training in the technology of oil and gas production, create cluster enterprises in the country, and build capacity within the responsible authorities so that they can negotiate, define and monitor policies in the realm of gas exportation. GP is a catalytic force in bringing together pertinent Bolivian and Mexican authorities for a bilateral agreement on this technical assistance. Should this bilateral agreement be concluded successfully – there are indicators that it is likely to be so – GP will be able to realize some resource mobilization to assist Bolivia, since the Government of Mexico will underwrite the cost of its part of this technical assistance.

Both initiatives are yet to be concluded. But they are certainly in the full purview of GP. If both are concluded with success, GP will be completing its program's mandate and will be responding fully to the petition of the Government of Bolivia.

#### Box 4: Senegal

Senegal is an interesting case. It is a Round Table country, a LDC, a country where IF was developed in August 2002. It is now at the stage now of implementing the Action Matrix (see the box presenting the three joint programs: GP; IF and JITAP). It is a member of WTO. It has 75 donors and is a country where many UN agencies are represented.

The linkage between PRSP developed in May 2002 and IF is ensured through the existing mechanisms of aid coordination.

GP's intervention in Senegal was not based on an official request by the Government. It was decided upon an but on the analysis by the Program. GP, through the review of the Diagnostic Trade Integration Study and the Action Matrix, decided in June 2003 to complement IF to cover non-traditional sectors with high trade potential and future social impact. Two pilot projects were identified.

The first was a group of projects in order to test the concept of competitiveness and social efficiency. This group consisted of:

- Apparel/fashion design.
- Eco-tourism.
- Higher education in Casamance.

The second was Creative Industries and Music Sector, a joint project with ILO and managed by UNCTAD's Special Program for least developed, landlocked and island developing countries. This is conceived as an input for the Program of LDC 2004. It is expected to provide a report on the situational analysis of Senegal that will serve to develop a multi-agency project (ILO, UNCTAD and UNESCO) on poverty reduction through employment creation and trade expansion in creative industries.

For the first pilot project the IF study shows that Senegal has already seen an increase of non-traditional exports in the field of cosmetics, perfumery and soap mainly in the regional market. IF considers the textile and apparel sector to have a good potential. The GP study argues that the apparel industry is more promising than textiles, since Senegal has significant comparative advantage in well-recognized creativity of Senegalese designers and will have wider access to regional and international (EU and USA) markets when the Multi-Fiber Agreement ends. The GP consultant argues that this niche has a tremendous potential in terms of employment and poverty reduction. It is also expected that the development of the apparel industry will benefit other sectors (cluster approach), such as handicraft, fashion, and jewelry. However, some issues need to be addressed, such as the low level of skills, use of obsolete equipment, and the lack of coordination between public and private sectors on the one hand and with the international market on the other.

IF underlined tourism as a sector with a growth potential due to the advantages of the country. GP, in line with this analysis, recommends developing eco-tourism as a high quality sector of services that is not seasonal. This niche will have a great impact on employment; will lead to better utilization of existing human, natural and cultural resources; and its impact will be more sustainable. This may very well be a fruitful approach in Casamance that has a high tourist potential once the civil war ends.

The third sub-project is conceived as part of a post conflict strategy.

The joint ILO/UNCTAD study on the creative industries reflects the recommendation of the first ACP (Africa-Caribbean-Pacific) Inter-Ministerial Meeting calling ILO and UNCTAD to "evaluate the impact of the current trade regime on domestic cultural policies."

## Box 5: Vietnam

Vietnam is strongly committed to address SHD issues and to become a member of WTO. Its commitment toward SHD can be witnessed by the impressive impact of its domestic policies reducing by 40% the level of poverty since the mid-1980s. Vietnam is now the second largest exporter of rice in the world and the second producer of coffee. However, according to the last National Human Development Report (NHDR) social inequalities between urban and rural areas were found. They need to be addressed. 15% of its population consists of ethnic minorities and requires special attention.

An Inter-Ministerial Committee for Integration in the global economy was established to support and coordinate efforts toward the country's accession to WTO. This Committee is in charge of coordinating WTO negotiations as well as other issues related to the country's integration into the regional and global economy. Vietnam is well regarded by the donor community. ODA plays an important role and proper attention is given to aid coordination. Vietnam has a close relationship with UNDP and the UN system, which was the sole partner of the country during the post-war period. Vietnam and its development partners established a Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy linked to the MDGs through the Vietnam Development Goals. The 2004 NHDR is expected to focus on trade and liberalization.

In October 2001 the Government requested GP's support. In September 2002 a needs identification mission was fielded. The following areas were selected:

- Support to the accession process into WTO in a way compatible with SHD through a seminar on special and preferential treatment and studies on banking and insurance industries.
- Capacity development in the area of ex-ante and ex-post policy analysis of impact of trade liberalization on poverty reduction.
- Pilot project on IT for development in four provinces. GP will finance the pre-feasibility study and will seek financial support from EU and other partners.

The Global Program was able to adapt its interventions and provided up to now the following support:

- The UNDP Asian Regional Trade Initiative Program (ATI) carried out two studies funded by GP on the accession process. One was on trade and investment and the other on movement of natural persons. A study on energy services is envisaged but not yet launched. It is expected that these studies will be discussed in a seminar jointly organized by UNDP/CO, ATI and GP. It was agreed that UNDP would support the accession process, while ATI will integrate the S&D treatment in its regular work program. The subjects of the studies were selected from the list of topics mentioned in the Doha agenda.
- A pre-feasibility study was carried out on the pilot project of ICT (on trade, education and health needs) and presented to the provincial governments and the Central Government in November 2003. The full fledged feasibility study will be carried out in June 2004 after securing the required financial resources. GP recently discovered a similar initiative from UNDP; and it was decided that, using the same consultant both projects could be coordinated through a similar approach, but with different geographic and sectoral coverage. ICT in rural areas to reduce poverty is a priority for UNDP Country Program. Many other partners, such as EU, are assisting Vietnam in information technology. A national development ICT strategy is being developed.
- Study of impact of liberalization of trade on coffee and footwear is awaiting the development of a model by the National Institute for Science and Technology and the Millennium Institute. These institutions are trying to secure the funding of the model by the US National Science Foundation.
- Support to the development of SMEs, in connection with EU, in the areas where UNCTAD has a comparative advantage. These are policy dialogue between SMEs and the Government and cluster approach for fostering competitiveness.

Vietnam is receiving some assistance from EU through the Multilateral Trade Policy Assistance Program (MUTRAP) on liberalization and integration into regional AFTA and global WTO economic and trade framework. This program does not duplicate GP's efforts since they complement each other. MUTRAP is directed to provide training courses in major trade policies and WTO frameworks, research studies and ad hoc policy advice. Vietnam is receiving TA from UNCTAD on commercial diplomacy.

Vietnam is an interesting case, for in the field of trade and SHD, UNDP provides support at the global, regional and country-based levels. The coordination between the three levels seems to work, but there is still a room for improvement. It is also a country where a number of donor initiatives co-exist. It needs to prepare itself to be able to negotiate with WTO on global and Asian-Pacific perspectives; build the national consensus on globalization; and prepare and implement a new national policy framework consistent with the liberalization process and SHD. GP has developed linkages with many other interventions in line with its objectives, but sometimes with low profile, such as with ATI studies.

Vietnam, like Indonesia and Bolivia, can be considered a flagship country program for GP in its second phase of implementation. GP is highly visible in this country, thanks to the personality of Mr. Paul Trần Van-Thinh, former EU Ambassador to WTO who provides high-level policy advice to the Government on negotiations with WTO and building consensus and backstops the ICT project.

GP is active in mobilizing resources by seeking funds from donors, such as Spain, and from private sector for follow-up actions of its intervention.

### **Box 6: Indonesia**

Indonesia is the world's largest archipelago with 235 million inhabitants. It is a semi-industrialized country and exports petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, textiles, rubber, mining products, and timber and wood products. Its export market is rather concentrated with Japan, United States and Singapore representing 50%.

After gaining its independence from Holland, Indonesia set up an administrative system that was highly decentralized. However, especially as of 2000, the country entered into a reform process where decentralization was predominant.

In November 2001 the Government of Indonesia requested assistance from GP and an identification mission was fielded in May 2002. The concern of the Government was how to integrate human development goals into the new liberalization program, what impact decentralization would have on SMEs, and the possible role of Indonesia within the global economy, bearing in mind that it is a member of WTO and of ASEAN.

The May 2002 mission identified consultants for the preparation of three interrelated papers; namely, assessment of the country's current situation; the role, the importance and the future of SMEs; and assessment of human resources. Also, a committee was set up within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to coordinate the work to be undertaken by GP. The work of the local consultants progressed very slowly, mainly due to bureaucratic obstacles and entanglements encountered in UNCTAD. Finally the papers were completed in April 2003 and an international consultant wrote a single report unifying them. At present local consultants are holding seminars in three provinces whose participants are local government officials, private sector representatives and NGOs. It is expected that in early 2004 a national seminar will be held to discuss the policy implications of the papers prepared and commented upon in the provincial seminars. The result of the national seminar is expected to be a policy paper, which will be discussed at the cabinet level and will be submitted to the Parliament. In short, the activities of GP moved rather slowly and only in three specific areas. The usefulness of the contribution of GP will only be decided upon if and when the policy paper is thoroughly discussed at the cabinet level and endorsed.

### **Box 7: Social Efficiency**

The concepts of collective action, competitiveness and social efficiency were linked by the Prof. François Xavier Merriem and applied in Senegal. These linkages are based on many researches and particularly on the GP document prepared by Manuel R. Agosin, David E. Bloom and Eduardo Gitli entitled "Globalization, Liberalization and SHD; Analyses and Perspectives." The three spheres of integration into the global economy and liberalization of markets; promotion of economic growth; and SHD have a common area where optimal results can be obtained.

Social efficiency is seen as the increase in the welfare result of each individual with no decrease in that of any other (Pareto optimum). Competitiveness is the result of capacity of enterprises and the state to generate innovation and to produce profitable outputs.

The linkage between economic competitiveness and social efficiency is what GP attempts to establish in Senegal. Competitiveness without social efficiency or social efficiency without competitiveness is not sustainable, as argued in the above mentioned research paper.

GP is also testing the mix of the two approaches cluster theory and value chain theory in the three sub-projects identified in Senegal.

## **PART THREE: ASSESSMENT OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAM**

### **3.1 Relevance of the Program**

As the overall international trade, liberalization and globalization gained momentum during the past several years, the concern related to developing countries' participation into world trade, and especially those of least developed ones, has raised a number of challenges for them. These can be best summarized as implementing development strategies that would assist them to integrate into the world economy, as well as assessing the impact of globalization onto their economy, and in the final analysis on the endeavors of creating an enabling environment for sustainable human development. It stands to reason that economic liberalization and integration may not by itself be conducive to ensuring relevant gains to meet the SHD goals. Unless these countries are assisted in designing policies that would lead to their internal development and to their integration into the global economy, unless they are endowed with appropriate capacities not only to design the relevant policies, but enable them to negotiate the conditions of participation into the world economy, they may not be able to obtain the benefits that are usually associated with globalization and liberalization. Otherwise, sustainable human development, which is the ultimate goal of any country, may be impacted negatively.

Within this overall briefly described frame of reference, the Program is relevant not only to elucidate the conceptual and operational underpinnings of the relationship between globalization, liberalization and sustainable human development, but also to assist the developing countries, especially the least developed ones, to formulate appropriate policies, build capacities for policy design, and enhance their capacity to arrive at advantageous solutions in multinational or regional trade negotiations.

In short, overall the Program has great deal of relevance for the developing countries. However, what is needed is the transformation of this relevance into operational schemes. It is indeed the Program that will convert the relevance into specific operations and assistance.

The objectives of the Program are consistent with the thoughts expressed in the Human Development Report of 1997 and the Trade Development Report 1997. The Program is also in line with the development dimensions of the UNDP Global Cooperation Framework (GCF) 2001-2003, which has a specific goal on globalization with the following intended results:

- Innovative approaches to managing the impacts of globalization on SHD.
- Broad support in the international community for formulating global regimes in ways that protects and promotes the interests of developing countries and poor people.
- Tools to enhance the knowledge and negotiating capacities of developing countries to enable more effective participation in the framing and implementation of global regimes.

GP reflects also the concerns expressed in the Regional Cooperation Frameworks for Asia and the Pacific regarding globalization and economic governance, as well as the promotion of ICT for development.

### **3.2 Design/Execution**

The Program has two distinct but related conceptual underpinnings. One is at the global level, the other at the country level. At the global level the Program aims to promote a clear understanding of the linkages between globalization and the dimensions of sustainable human development. The aim is to boost the conceptual frame of reference and enhance the capacity of the developing countries to participate effectively in multilateral and regional or bilateral negotiations through studies and research that elucidate this relationship and through seminars, forums and regional meetings that disseminate the conceptual framework to be used by decision makers and stakeholders for policy design.

At the country level the Program's underpinning is to enhance national capacities for analyzing in specific national contexts the impact of globalization on economic and social sectors, and ultimately on sustainable human development.

As was pointed out earlier (see 2.2) the execution of the Program during Phase I was rather slow and incomplete. At the global level certain conceptual studies were prepared, a web site was developed and several regional policy dialogs were held in various countries. Following the emphasis of the Program Document, country-level activities focused on LDCs. Central America and Jamaica were studied with respect to essentially globalization and SHD. However, the execution was slow and incomplete. Lack of financial and human resources available to GP did not permit an efficient execution or the required follow-up. Disproportionate relationship between the foreseen activities and required resources resulted in a rather mediocre execution at best.

The execution of Phase II (see 2.3) started rather slowly due to a number of administrative difficulties and in fact gathered force essentially as of 2003. At the global level the Program succeeded in executing activities related to the improvement of competitiveness in specific sectors, undertook activities in defining the concept of social efficiency and explored the ways to improve the WTO regulatory framework to enlarge the spaces for development policies.

Phase II also started to execute a series of country-level activities, though shifting the emphasis that Phase I had given to countries. Different interventions were executed or are in the process of execution in Vietnam, Indonesia, Romania, Ecuador, Bolivia and Senegal. In Ecuador the execution was only partial, since there has been no follow-up after the exploratory missions. The execution in Bolivia was interrupted for unforeseen reasons. Although Bolivia had made an official request in August 2002, it is only now that the execution of a series of forums is being planned to disseminate information and policy options about energy. These are expected to take place early next year. In

Indonesia the execution of the Program is again slow due to interruptions. The official request of the Government dates back to November 2001 and the identification mission was fielded in May 2002. Following this mission several activities were planned focusing on SMEs, decentralization and SHD. The studies by the national consultants in these areas took much longer than expected. One explanation is that bureaucratic entanglements originating from the UNCTAD administration delayed the work of the consultants. Tangible results are expected not much before mid-2004. The case of Vietnam is perhaps the best example of GP's program execution. Here the slow responsiveness to execute must be pointed out (see 2.1.3). The official request backs to October 2001, but the first identification mission's date is September 2002. However, in all fairness program execution has gathered speed and Vietnam can easily be considered a flagship execution by GP. Although there was no request from the Government of Senegal, an identification mission was fielded in July 2003 that focused its attention on the concept of social efficiency and competitiveness in such sectors as textiles, tourism and higher education. At this point of time it is difficult to assert the efficiency of the execution, since the activities are at the starting point.

In short, the Team observes that the execution in general, both in Phase I and Phase II, has been rather slow and uneven. Several factors may have contributed to this. Ambitious Program Documents, disproportion between resources and contemplated activities, and also possibly the rigidity of the rules and regulations of UNCTAD. It is impossible to attach specific weights to each of these factors. However, it is clear that the Program Management, being conscious of the shortcomings and the need to change the direction and speed of the Program, has already prepared a "White Paper" to redirect the Program. This Report examines the White Paper in Part Five.

### **3.3 Synergy/Partnerships**

There are many levels to be considered to consider in this heading:

- Partnerships with governments through development of cooperation.
- Partnerships with institutions at the global, regional and country levels.
- Synergy with close global programs.
- Synergy with regional programs.
- Partnerships with networks, think tanks and universities.
- Partnerships with private enterprises.

#### **3.3.1 Partnerships with governments through development of cooperation**

There are some noteworthy relationships developed through fund raising that will be analyzed later. The Report will examine only the reported activities initiated by GP that generated or will generate cooperation between countries. In the case of Bolivia, for example, GP was able to attract the interest of Spain, France, and the Netherlands to support the establishment of an Economic and Social Council or of Mexico and the Netherlands to support the development of the gas industry with social considerations.

Jointly with the Government of Sweden GP was able to launch a project in five LDCs to promote good governance, macro-economic performance and to attract FDI.

### **3.3.2 Partnerships with institutions at the global, regional and country levels**

GP developed relationships with UNDP, ITC, WTO, UNDESA and ILO. Its relationship with ITC and WTO is through the Steering Committee of IF and JITAP. The relationships with UNDP have already been treated in this report.

The interviews conducted by the Evaluation Team indicate that GP developed strong linkages with ILO at the highest level. The comparative advantages of ILO in poverty alleviation, employment, development of SMEs and its tripartite system seem to have been decisive in establishing these linkages. It was agreed to test this “convergent approach” in Senegal and Vietnam.

In Senegal, as already mentioned, there is a joint ILO/GP initiative to develop creative industries and the music sector. In Vietnam the linkage of the ICP program and ILO’s rural development training modules is envisaged to provide business information to rural people.

It is also expected that ILO and GP will contribute in substantive and not financial way to the functioning of the Phillipson Chair. It is unfortunate that there is no mutual relationship between the work of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization established by ILO and the work of GP.

With UNDESA professional contacts as well as cooperation are taking place in Bolivia for the establishment of an Economic and Social Council.

From Phase I to Phase II GP was able to develop relationships with many other organizations, such as the World Bank, Inter-American Bank, Asian Development Bank, African Development Bank, OECD, EU, OPEC, WHO, ITO, UNIDO, UNIFEM, Regional Economic Commissions, and Regional and Sub-Regional organizations. This list is incomplete, but illustrates the number of contacts established, some at the global level such as with OECD, others at regional and country levels. EU is an example of linkage at the global and country level. Except for ILO they were developed on an ad hoc basis.

### **3.3.3 Synergy with close global programs**

Three important global programs are providing TA in the field of globalization, namely GP, the Integrated Framework for Trade Related Technical Assistance to the LDCs (IF) and the Joint Integrated Technical Assistance Program (JITAP). The following tables present the main features of these programs as well as the processes for GP and IF.

	<b>GLOBAL PROGRAM (GP)</b>	<b>INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK (IF)</b>	<b>JOINT INTEGRATED TA PROGRAM (JITAP)</b>
<b>Starting date</b>	First phase; 1998-2001 Second phase: 2001-2004	October 1997	First phase: 1998-2002 Second phase: 2003
<b>Objectives</b>	Strengthen the SHD-centered conceptual and operational framework toward global integration and ensure a wide dissemination of the new paradigm. Strengthen national capacities to develop and implement global market integration policies consistent with SHD objectives	Trade capacity building and integrating trade issues into overall national development strategies including components aimed at reducing poverty in the country. Assistance to the coordination and delivery of trade-related assistance as provided by the core agencies and by other development partners	Capacity building and strengthening national knowledge on MTS. More effective participation in trade negotiations, implementation of WTO agreement and formulation of trade policies. Improved supply capacity and market knowledge of exporting and export-ready enterprises
<b>Budget</b>	First phase: US \$ 2,900,000 Second phase: US\$ 2,000,000	US\$ 11,800,000	US\$ 12,600,000
<b>Lead agency</b>	UNCTAD with UNDP involvement	WTO as Secretariat of the Steering Committee	ITC as Secretariat of the Steering Committee
<b>Associate agencies</b>	UNDP	IMF, ITC, UNCTAD, UNDP, WTO and World Bank	UNCTAD, WTO
<b>Selection criteria</b>	Low-income countries in all regions in the first phase, but LDCs and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) were also targeted. In the second phase LDCs were no longer the focus	LDCs (demand side) meeting four criteria: government commitment, country at the preparatory stage in the development of a poverty reduction strategy, positive environment for mainstreaming trade in national development and sufficient agency donor activity to ensure a good DTIS and its follow up	Countries in Africa only, including 10 LDCs and 6 non-LDCs. Three criteria: allocation of counterpart resources to support program activities; setting up a Nat'l Steering Comm. & creation of an Inter-Insti. Comm. On MTS and mainstream of trade as an engine for poverty reduction
<b>Countries selected</b>	Phase I: Botswana, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Nepal, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Jamaica Phase II: Bolivia, Romania, Ecuador, Vietnam, Indonesia, Senegal, Tunisia, Mali, Morocco, Kenya	Cambodia, Mauritania, Madagascar, Malawi, Yemen, Lesotho, Senegal, Nepal, Bangladesh, Haiti, Uganda, Gambia, Tanzania, Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Burundi, Guinea and Mali	Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Senegal, Tunisia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia
<b>Donors</b>	Phase 1; UNDP Phase 2: Belgium and UNDP	Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA, EU, WB and UNDP	Phase II: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and UK
<b>Oversight arrangements</b>	A Steering Committee including Belgian representatives, UNDP and UNCTAD review annually the progress of the GP. It provides policy guidance to the program management. The supervision of the program is achieved by UNDP and UNCTAD under arrangements already described in this report.	IF secretariat is located at WTO. An IF Working Group (IFWG), responsible for the overall management, includes the 6 core agencies, 2 LDCs and 2 donors on a rotational basis and OECD as observer. An IF Steering Committee (IFSC) oversees the work of IFWG and provides policy guidance. Members of IFSC are from agencies, donors and LDCs.	
<b>Working Modalities</b>	As described in this Report	See the detailed process in the following pages.	See the detailed process in the following pages.
<b>Evaluation</b>	Ongoing (October to December 2003)	First: in the first half 2000 Second: September 2003	First: September 2000 Second: May 2002

**PROCESS OF T.A. COUNTRY-BASED NEEDS IN TRADE THROUGH GP**

1. Country Assessment Study (CAS)



2. Validation through Country Workshop



3. Finalization of CAS



4. Special studies



5. Preparation of an Action Plan



6. Funds raising meeting



7. Implementation of the action plan

Steps 1 to 6 are funded through GP

For low-income countries  
Provision of ad hoc policy advice in specific  
area of globalization and SHD at country's  
request.  
The process indicated above was applicable  
in Phase I for LDCs. In Phase II, a needs  
identification mission replaced the CAS.

**PROCESS OF T.A. COUNTRY-BASED NEEDS IN TRADE THROUGH IF**

1. Identification of national expertise and stakeholders and development partners; selection of a lead donor (facilitator)



2. Collection of all available studies and identification all Trade TA programs



3. Diagnostic Trade Integration System (DTIS) and an action plan (Action Matrix)



4. National Workshop to define priorities and gain consensus



5. Optional meeting with donors on DTIS



6. Action Plan to be included in the national development plan such as PRSP



7. Round table or CG meeting to fund national development plan



8. Formulation and implementation

Steps 1 to 3 are funded through Windows I

Steps 4 to 6 are funded through Windows II

Other steps are not funded through IF

While the three programs want to mainstream trade into development, GP is trying also to mainstream development in trade by being more critical about the new MTS.

It is important to underline some specific features of GP with regard to IF:

- GP deals with national and regional projects, while IF focuses on national projects.
- GP encompasses trade, investment and financial flows, while IF is restricted to trade.
- IF deals only with LDCs.

The Evaluation Team wants to clarify the possible risks of duplication in the field of capacity building between GP and IF in the LDCs.

TA on capacity building under IF is limited to consensus building around the IF process. IF is mostly interested in internal trade and its mainstreaming in PRSP. Therefore, the overlap between IF and GP is not by design. It is quite possible that PRSP and CAS may present different views and there is nothing right to reconcile them except the Government machinery, which would decide the final direction.

The existence of an IF focal point in UNCTAD allows a coordination and exchange of information between the two Programs. GP is also invited to participate into the national workshops on DTIS where it brings its expertise on SHD. In addition, GP participates into the IF Steering Committee and makes its documentation and reports available to IF members. The Team considers that the real risk of overlap between IF and GP is minimal and whatever risks may exist can be minimized through UNCTAD's mechanism of coordination between IF and GP.

To verify this, the Evaluation Team reviewed (on the basis of documents and a visit to Senegal) the cases of the five countries where GP and IF were involved: Malawi, Mali, Nepal, Kenya and Senegal. There was no overlap in Senegal since GP was looking into the downstream issues identified by IF. In Malawi and Nepal (countries of Phase I) GP's involvement concerned the production of CAS and their presentation to national workshops. In Malawi DTIS was published in March 2003 and the national workshop organized in September 2003. According to the IF Evaluation Report, the Government of Malawi is divided on the issue of the contribution of trade to poverty reduction and has doubts about integrating the country into the global economy. There is neither overlap nor coordination between IF and GP. In Nepal an Investment Policy Review was published and no duplication was observed with IF, which is at the stage of preparing the Action Matrix. In Mali IF started its work in 2003 and GP (after 4 years of involvement) is now focusing on investment (recognized by IF as one of the national bottlenecks for development) and building the capacities of National Center for Investment Promotion. Here again no overlap was found.

In theory, there is no risk of duplication in the mandates of JITAP and GP, but the risks exist between JITAP and IF, since they have similar criteria for selecting countries, a common capacity-building orientation and a wide joint geographical coverage. Six countries benefit both from GP and JITAP: Tunisia, Kenya, Botswana, Malawi, Mali and Senegal. In the case of Kenya there is clear indication from the documentation received that JITAP “covers a large array of priority activities germane to those of the Country Programs and GP”. GP was approached by the RR to provide a large contribution for the next Country Program of 2004-2008 on the trade sector with substantial core funds. However, coordination with JITAP seems to be ensured. In the case of Senegal it is important to coordinate the results of the ongoing studies with JITAP’s intervention, since this Program is trying to improve supply capacity and market knowledge of exporting and export-ready enterprises. These are the two cases that the Evaluation Team was able to review, for information lacked on JITAP activities in its second phase. Information received by the Team seems to indicate that the relationships between JITAP and GP are minimal, except in Kenya.

There are only two countries where JITAP, IF and GP are all involved: Mali and Senegal. Senegal was already reviewed through JITAP/GP and IF/GP relationships as explained above. The information on JITAP intervention in Mali is not available; hence no judgment can be passed on this issue.

At this stage the Evaluation Team can make only two remarks:

- GP will have to exercise great deal of discussion in providing TA to African countries. It should know what is already envisaged by other programs, or at least by JITAP, and coordinate with them. Coordination can avoid potential duplication and conflict and might promote synergy.
- The scope of this evaluation does not include the investigation of the relationships between JITAP and IF

The Doha Declaration in its paragraphs 38 to 41 addresses the issue of TA for capacity building and insists in its paragraph 39 on the coordination between the development partners on this issue

UNDP manages one other Global Program (see Box 7). This is a good example of the complexity of coordination in the field of trade and SHD between ITC, WTO, UNCTAD and UNDP and within UNDP itself, particularly when its regional programs are taken into account (see next section).

### **Box 7: Trade and SHD of UNDP**

The principle function of this global project (GLO/00/516) is human development assessment of trade governance and capacity strengthening. It has three inter-related objectives. These are to assist developing country governments and their civil societies in ensuring that the countries can strategically seize the opportunities of global economic and trade integration for advancing human development and poverty eradication; to strengthen the participation and substantive negotiating and advocacy positions of developing countries in both the debates and negotiations on the emerging global trading regime; and to present the UNDP position on the current development outcomes of the global trading regime and the positive agenda of reforms needed in the global governance of trade to make it more inclusive and fair so that trade can serve as an instrument for enhancing human development and poverty eradication goals. The Project started in 2000 with a modest budget of \$250,000 for 18 months, but was extended until 2004 with an expanded budget of over \$1.5 million.

### **3.3.4 Synergy with regional programs**

There are many regional programs that provide assistance to developing countries. Some are clearly trade-related, such as the IDB initiative in Latin America and the Caribbean region, or the Central America Program of Canada on Trade Readiness Technical Assistance Project. Others are trade and SHD oriented such as the Asian Pacific Regional Initiative on Trade, Economic Governance and Human Development (ATI) or the New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD) and the Trade Capacity Building in Africa (new project). These are summarized in Boxes 8, 9, 10 and 11.

### **Box 8: Asia-Pacific Regional Initiative on Trade, Economic Governance and Human Development (UNDP)**

The Program is intended to support Asia and Pacific countries in the following areas:

- Facilitation of the cross-fertilisation experiences and lessons learnt on trade, investment and economic governance in order to develop appropriate policy responses through a lens of sustainable human development and poverty eradication.
- Strengthening their ability, through provision of policy support, training and building capacity; and support to defend their viewpoints, negotiations and advocacy positions on selected common issues emerging from regional and global debates.
- Facilitation of consensus between governments of developed and developing countries and non-government groups in regional and global trade discussions and economic governance debates.
- Advocacy for pro-human development policies, based on accumulated learning, which reflect and advance the interests and priorities of the poor and marginalized.

### **Box 9: NEPAD (UNDP)**

NEPAD (Assistance to the New Partnership for Africa's Development RAF/02/017) is an initiative of the Regional Bureau of Africa. It has a budget of \$ 3 million. The Project is of a preparatory assistance nature. It aims at doing the groundwork for a long-term, multi-partner support program for the NEPAD Secretariat and governance organs. It will support the development of a five-year strategic plan. It focuses on six areas that the Secretariat and the Steering Committee have identified as urgent priorities. These are setting up of a technical support facility; launching an advisory panel; developing joint AU/NEPAD communication and popularization strategy; strengthening democracy and good governance; operationalizing the new partnership with external partners; and country level promotion of NEPAD/MDG goals.

Though standing on their own rights, three separate projects are closely related and complementary to the NEPAD initiative. These are briefly strengthening Africa's regional capacities and strategies for conflict prevention (RAF/01/002); support to the southern African development community of the regional strategic plan for integrated water resources (RAF/02/008); and re-launching sub-regional economic integration of the Central African states (RAF/02/015). The latter is most germane to regional integration and trade liberalization efforts. It seeks to assist Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) in re-launching sub-regional economic integration of these states through lowering the national barriers that impede the movement of persons, goods, services, capital and ideas within the sub-region. It focuses on activities that not only support the development of institutional capacity in the Secretariat of ECCAS, but also requires that the Secretariat work closely with national governments, the sub-regional business community, and civil society in a manner that promotes partnership among all three, which is a requirement for successful integration. The Project at present has a modest budget of about \$300,000 and is executed by ITC with the support of UNCTAD and WTO. The estimated date of completion is December 2005.

### **Box 10: Trade Capacity Building in Africa**

The development objective of the Program is to support the beneficial integration of Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries into the international trading system so as to utilize international trade as an engine of growth for achieving national development objectives for poverty reduction, income growth, expansion of employment opportunities and sustainable development. This is in line with NEPAD's vision of creating conditions conducive for growth and reduction of poverty. Poverty reduction through international trade is an important aspect of the Millennium Development Goals. The immediate objective of the Program is to build and strengthen human, institutional and policy capacity in SSA countries for effective participation in multilateral and other international trade negotiations, and for formulating and implementing trade and related policies to achieve their developmental objectives and reduce poverty. In respect of trade negotiations, emphasis will be given to SSA countries' participation in the negotiations under the Doha Work Program of the WTO, and the interface with ACP-EU negotiations on economic partnership agreements and intra-African economic integration processes under the aegis of the African Union. In respect of policy formulation, emphasis will be placed on integrating poverty reduction objectives. The capacity building activities are targeted at policy makers and trade negotiators, and also at facilitating increased and systematic involvement of key stakeholders including researchers and academicians, business communities, civil society associations, and parliamentarians. The Program will benefit from an integrated and coordinated assistance from several international and African organizations, namely, African Union (AU), UNCTAD, UN-ECA, African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Southern African Trade Research Network (SATRN) and Third World Network-Africa (TWN).

### **Box 11: Initiative of Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)**

IDB initiated recently a country-directed program to provide assistance on loan basis (depending upon the countries' needs the loans will be around \$5 million) with the general objective of contributing to the improvement of public sector's management of foreign trade. The specific objectives are to improve the institutional structure for the management of the foreign trade sector; to consolidate the techno-analytical capacity for the formulation, coordination, execution and evaluation of the commercial policies; to build the capacity of the trade negotiators; and to establish a comprehensive information system to promulgate and support foreign trade activities. TA is based on the demand of the countries in Central and South America. The Bank first prepares a "Profile of Sectoral Facility," and thereafter the appropriate TA activities start upon the agreement signed between the Bank and the borrower. The Program is offered to all countries in the region and Guyana, Peru, Trinidad & Tobago, Dominican Republic, Ecuador and Nicaragua are now in the execution stage either in the preparation of the profiles or in the reception of TA.

The developments in Vietnam, as observed during the field visit, show that the ATI project is working closely with GP and with other UNDP country-based initiatives, such as the preparation of the NHDR on trade and liberalization. The NEPAD Program is too new and its focus is on regional integration. It does not seem that there is a risk of overlap with GP, but there is a need for coordination between both programs in the future.

#### **3.3.5 Partnerships with networks, think tanks and universities**

GP has started to be more active in developing linkages with universities, such as the universities of Rennes, Geneva and Lausanne, the Institut Français des Relations Internationales and others and in the developing world, such as the universities of Bolivia and Mexico. The Program developed a network of eminent professors that support GP through advice and consultancy.

GP, together with ILO and Université Libre de Bruxelles, is supporting (at no cost) the establishment of the Philippon Chair in the Solvay Institute as a center of excellence to promote the concept of managing sustainable development.

In addition, GP has used the services of the International Center for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), which is an NGO think tank, to organize a series of three regional policy dialogues on globalization, trade liberalization and SHD. ICTSD contributed financially and substantially to the organization of a retreat in 2002 and a meeting on "Dialogue on S&DT Provisions" held in Geneva this year.

#### **3.3.6 Partnerships with private enterprises**

GP has tried to attract the business leaders to its seminars and tries to raise funds from private sources in its activities, such as the ICT project in Vietnam, and from Microsoft for a pilot project in computerization in Bolivia and Ecuador. It was able to get a financial contribution from ICTSD (see above) and it initiated and now supports UNCTAD in its participation into the World Economic Forum.

### **3.4 Resource Mobilization**

In its Phase I was able to attract funds from other UNDP global resources (SAPAM, SEPED and MDGD), as well as from the TCDC program and the UNDP Regional Program in Africa. It also expected to mobilize additional resources, particularly to establish the Global Resources Facility. However, these mobilization efforts did not succeed for unknown reasons. In its Phase II it lost the complementary UNDP resources; they were replaced by the contribution from the Belgian Government.

Despite the efforts it made to raise funds, GP was not really successful to mobilize additional financial resources; it could not even replace the associate expert financed by the Italian Government. According to the last progress report some initiatives have been launched to approach new donors to contribute to global activities (France, Luxemburg, the EU) or to country specific interventions as in Bolivia and Vietnam. This is an important element for GP's strategy, particularly with regard to the following four issues:

- The innovative interventions, such as the ICT project in Vietnam and the eco-tourism development activities in Senegal, will not be viable if there is no sponsor to finance and lead the follow-up stage of these interventions.
- The allocation of GP's resources to ATI studies in Vietnam or to special activities of the UNCTAD Divisions should not be seen as a de-mobilization of the GP resources, but as a way of finding the right expertise to achieve GP's goals.
- The ownership by recipient countries would be certainly improved if a financial cost sharing contribution to GP's country-based interventions were secured.
- The partnerships with the establishment of joint activities (such as with ICTSD) or activities managed by GP, but funded by others (such as Sweden in LDCs or UNDP in the case of Kenya) should be developed.

### **3.5 Capacity building**

The Program has launched many activities in terms of "capacity building" at the global, regional and country levels. WTO tries to record the Trade-Related Technical Assistance (TRTA) on capacity building provided by donors along two headings: trade policy and regulations and trade development. Examples of GP interventions are presented along the following lines:

#### **3.5.1 Trade policy:**

*Global level:*

- Follow up of the High-level Meeting on Integrated Initiatives for LDCs in trade and development.
- Strengthening capacities for training in commercial diplomacy in Latin America, Asia-Pacific and Africa.
- Expert meeting in governance.
- Special and preferential treatment.

*Regional level:*

- Seminars on “Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness.”

*Country level:*

- Country Assessment Studies including national workshops.

### **3.5.2 Trade development**

*Global Level:*

- Fine-tuning the meetings on FDI.
- Meetings on best practices in investment promotion.
- Meetings on best practices in technology transfer.
- Meetings on women entrepreneurs in LDCs.

*Regional level:*

- Meetings with TNCs to enhance the competitiveness of SMEs.

*Country level:*

- Investment policy reviews

GP’s notion of capacity building is very limited, since it relates mainly to training, seminars and workshops. It is, however, clear that GP has rightly focused on strengthening existing capacities rather than developing new ones. There is one aspect of capacity building where GP was very effective: the consensus building between the different partners through national workshops following the CAS and in some global or regional seminars where the participants came from public and private sectors with civil society representatives.

The concept of capacity building is rather wide. It concerns the development of human resources, institutions and an enabling environment. It also relates to the dynamic development of these factors; it is not a one-shot exercise, but a continuous process.

Review of the documentations and interviews conducted the Evaluation Team led to the conclusion that GP did not try to analyze the capacity building needs with respect to human, institution or local context or strategize its point of entry into these issues. The Team also takes note that the IF evaluation report also stresses the need to assess the specific capacity requirements in each country

In the field of TRTA for capacity building, it is now recognized that there are many initiatives from donor countries (see the Doha Development Agenda Trade Capacity Building Database (TCBDB) maintained by WTO and OECD Secretariats). If GP cannot be directly involved at the country level on TRTA/CB because of lack of resources, it may be the right partner for analyzing the countries’ TA needs in a comprehensive manner by offering a coherent and coordinated approach to donors. At the minimum it can come to an agreement with JITAP and IF on this division of work, since JITAP and IF have substantial resources for TA in specific LDCs and countries in Africa. It is worth noting the paragraphs 129 and 130 of the document TD XI/PC/1 “Preparations for UNCTAD XI”, 6 August 2003 on capacity building that invites such a cooperation.

As already mentioned in the Section on synergy (see 3.3.) between the three global programs, the Doha Declaration invited all development partners to coordinate their TA on capacity building.

The statement “Ideas and knowledge can be as important as money in promoting change” as emphasized in “Assessment of Development Results in Vietnam.” a document published by the Evaluation Office of UNDP, articulates well that the issue of capacity building is a key entry point for the partners who want to help developing countries in the field of globalization.

The Evaluation Team refers to the DAC Guidelines on Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development into which the philosophy of GP should fit very well.

**Box 12: DAC Guidelines on Strengthening  
Trade Capacity for Development**

Trade capacity building enhances the ability of partner country policy-makers, enterprises and civil society actors to:

- Collaborate in formulating and implementing a trade development strategy that is embedded in a broader national development strategy;
- Strengthen trade policy and institutions – as the basis for reforming import regimes, increasing the volume and value added of exports and increasing foreign investment to generate jobs and exports;
- Participate in -- and benefit from—the institutions, negotiations and processes that shape national trade policy and the rules and practices of international commerce.

Five premises were defined as summarized below:

- Trade and its liberalization can contribute to development, but they are not sufficient to generate dynamic and sustainable development on their own. However, but they can enhance a country’s access to a wider range of goods, services, technologies and knowledge that can stimulate development and generate resources for SHD and poverty alleviation.
- Developing countries want to integrate with the global economy. However, a beneficial integration requires comprehensive governance reforms, which should reflect the concern of SHD.
- The new global economic context offers promising opportunities but poses daunting challenges for developing countries in terms of complexity of the issues, the introduction of MTS, the competing demands -- at different levels -- of trade agreements and the need for competitiveness. Frequently they lack the institutional and human resource capacity to meet these challenges.
- OECD countries as well as developing countries need to address these challenges through trade-related capacity building initiatives.
- Donor support can strengthen MTS by addressing the trade challenges facing developing countries. Governments have pledged to strengthen the Integrated Framework.

### **3.6 Ownership**

Based on field visits it seems that GP undertook initiatives that are well anchored in the national development plan or responded to national or special group concerns in the countries assisted. This is true for example for:

- The ICT project in Vietnam where provinces were deeply involved in the development of the concept and the pre-feasibility study.
- The projects identified in Senegal where the target groups were associated in the project development phases, even if these projects are not yet mainstreamed; though their financing is doubtful.
- TA provided in Nicaragua (despite the lack of follow-up by GP). The recommendations of GP were included in the National Human Development Report.

It is also clear that ownership is sometimes volatile due to political changes in a country, such as Ecuador and Nicaragua, or due to political unrest in some countries, such as Zimbabwe and Bolivia.

Since GP in Phase II was involved in countries where the governments formally requested its support, it is assumed that the ownership is not at risk.

## **PART FOUR: CONCLUSIONS**

### **4.1 Program Design**

- The Program Documents are designed rather ambitiously. They cover a wide array of issues, but these are not commensurate neither with financial, nor with human resources allotted to them.
- Difficulties of implementation detected in Phase I are due to the shortage of staff, as well as budgetary limitations. But these did not deter the formulation of Phase II in very much the same way, as Phase I. Phase II did not scale down the expected activities and outputs to render the Program more manageable.
- In many instances the language of the Phase II Document is rather imprecise. Statements like “further strengthening,” “better understanding,” “further refinement” cannot be considered operationally tangible concepts; nor are they measurable.
- The Phase II Document includes certain activities that are virtually impossible to carry out. “Preparation of the list of indicators to measure the socio-economic impact of integration” (see Activity 4.1) is a case in point. Such indicators are extremely difficult to construct; they require in-depth knowledge of statistical/economic information and a wealth of country-specific data. Neither the financial, nor the human resources available to the Program could have possibly allowed such activities to be carried out, putting the accomplishment of the foreseen outputs in danger.
- Both Documents are prepared with heavy emphasis on the elucidation of conceptual issues, crowding out direct assistance to the countries.
- While in Phase I assistance to low-income countries and LDCs are in the forefront, in Phase II the design is essentially omits the emphasis on LDCs without formal explanation or justification.
- Benchmarks and success indicators stated in both Documents leave very much to be desired. In more cases than not indicators are simply rephrasing the outputs.

### **4.2 Program Management**

- A Program of this nature needs an active and forceful Steering Committee. Yet the design is such that the Steering Committee meets only once a year at best. Although the Program Director submits yearly a thorough report to the Committee including the achievements and difficulties encountered during the year, many of the minutes of the Committee reviewed by the evaluators do not provide enough guidance.
- Apart from the yearly reports the Program does not have a periodic independent monitoring system built into it.

- Financial record keeping, which follows the UN rules, is outmoded. The records do not allow carrying out efficiency analysis, since expenditures are not related to outputs at all.

### **4.3 Quality of Outputs**

- The quality of the outputs is rather uneven. There are several studies/reports that are of high quality. But some are either repetition of already published studies (compare, for example, Agosin, Bloom, and Gitli, “*Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development: Analytical Perspectives*, 2000” with UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 1997, pp. 82 ff.), or border on the activist stand.
- Some country studies are indeed useful and are conducive to be instrumental for the countries to design their social and economic policies incorporating in them sustainable human development concerns, and to take a more advantageous position vis-à-vis globalization. Some others, however, simply repeat already well-known facts in the countries concerned. One country report (for example Jamaica), suggests that the Government should follow “intelligent macro-economic policies” (!).

### **4.4 Linkages**

- The Program has failed to develop strong synergies with other Programs and Projects of UNDP that have similar objectives. UNDP’s Bureaux also carry out similar initiatives at the regional level. Other international organizations (such as Inter-American Development Bank) have also similar programs and initiatives (See: box 11). The opportunity of a good synergy between GP and them seems to be lost. However, as expressed by the persons interviewed at the Inter-American Bank, the access of the GP Director to high-level decision makers in Latin American countries sometimes facilitates the work of technical nature of the Bank. In this particular case an informal synergy seems to exist.
- Within UNCTAD interaction between these Divisions and the Program is variable. This may be due to the fact that the organizational structure of UNCTAD is not conducive to horizontal interaction. Nonetheless, the absence of such collaboration is found to be disconcerting.

### **4.5 Impacts/Outcomes/Sustainability**

At this stage of GP implementation it is possible to assess the outcome of the Program but not the impact. Outcome is a powerful concept but sometimes misunderstood. Therefore, it is important to clarify the meaning of outcome as a concept: *outcomes are the changes in development conditions that incorporate the production of outputs of a specific intervention and the contribution of partners*. Outcomes are the changes required, as necessary factors, to lead to the desired impact but they are not always sufficient.

At the global level GP contributed with other partners to a better understanding of the issues related to globalization and SHD. However, GP was only a partner but not a leader in this achievement. It can be said, however, that no one can claim a leadership role in this field and no one was de facto coordinating the contributions coming from anywhere. There are two reasons that explain why there is no impact right now. One is that it is too early to see any impact. The other is that there are too many political forces with different agenda and interests that might understand the issues related to SHD and globalization but they are not ready to accept their political, economical and social implications.

At the country level, the outcomes are not yet visible: at best CAS may lead to policy changes aiming at:

- Improving the development of SMEs (Romania).
- Promoting FDI (Botswana).
- Building consensus on SHD issues (in most partners countries).
- Linking trade to SHD in the national development plan (Indonesia).

The current monitoring system is not systematic in following up the decisions and actions that occurred after the interventions of GP and in reporting initiatives of other partners (IDB in Nicaragua and Ecuador). Therefore the outcomes/impact that GP tries to achieve are not traceable at the country level.

So far as sustainability is concerned, the Team is of the opinion that it is rather premature to pass any definite judgment on this issue at this point of time. However, efforts such as consensus building, FDI promotion, capacity building in formulating trade policies, establishing linkages between SHD and national development policies has the potentialities to be sustainable. Efforts at the global and regional level are by their very nature less inclined to have sustainability, since they are subject to global and political changes.

#### **4.6 Perceptions**

The concept of perception was introduced recently in evaluation. UNDP through its Country-Level Impact Assessment (CLIA) methodology developed in 1999 underlined the benefit of this approach to record the differences of views and opinions of partners on a specific program or institution. It is important to know the image perceived by outsiders of the Program to improve it by providing the missing or correct explanation if it is a wrong image, or modifying the elements that create this image. The evaluation team would like to be clear that these perceptions are of those who were interviewed by the Team and not necessarily reflect the views already expressed by the Team in this Report.

Based on series of interviews conducted by the Team, the image of GP is the result of GP's interventions and not its management or its managers.

The over ambitiousness of the Program, its lack of focus, the ICT project in Vietnam, the academic nature of the concept of social efficiency, the series of projects identified in Senegal, the “personalized” element in the selection process of countries, GP giving privilege to the energy sector, the bureaucracy and the lack of visibility of UNCTAD, the focus on global activities and their academic nature, the disconnect between global and country activities, the lack of follow up, the quality of the web site, the duplication with IF, the mixed relations of the Program with UNDP, the absence of linkage with SURF, the focus on trade and the second priority left to SHD, are the negative perceptions collected through the interviews.

On the positive side no one has challenged the relevance of the Program. Those who are well informed were aware about the inadequacy of the financial and human resources to achieve the ambitious objectives. The linkage with ILO was recognized as a positive development. The new management of the Program was considered as proactive rather than reactive. It will serve the Program well if such perceptions were to be taken into consideration.

#### **4.7 Strategy**

GP needs a modified operational strategy until the end of Phase II. And should in the final analysis UNDP and possibly bilateral donors wish to continue the Program, its strategy will have to be designed in a substantially different vein than the present one. Part V of this Report will put forward short-term recommendations for a new strategy to be followed until the end of Phase II. It will also make strategy recommendations concerning a possible new Program related to its substance and administration. This will be done after reviewing the “White Paper,” a strategy paper prepared by GP in November of the present year. The strategy that will be recommended will also reflect the possible outcomes of the Cancún meeting of WTO.

#### **4.8 Recapitulation**

In summary, the Team wishes to assert that the findings are not conducive to state unequivocally that both Phases have been a success. In fact, the Program leaves very much to be desired. The Team notes, however, that the present Project Director, who has been guiding the Program only during the last twelve months or so, has been conscious of the shortcomings of the Program and has taken the initiatives to redirect the Program in order to be able to overcome them and increase its efficiency. To this end a “White Paper” has been prepared with the aim of reshaping the Program. The Evaluation Team proposes to review this White Paper before it puts forward its recommendations.

## PART FIVE: GLIMPSE OF THE FUTURE

### 5.1 White Paper

Having assumed his duties about a year ago, the Program Director thoroughly reviewed the objectives and the implementation strategies of the Program and concluded that a new vision was needed to bring it to its successful completion. To this end a Paper, known as the “White Paper,” was prepared internally. It reviewed the implementation of Phases I and II and put forward a new strategy for the remaining period of Phase II. Since the Program will be completed at the end of 2004, the new strategy will be applied during this period. However, it is not impossible to discern that what the White Paper also implies is that it may be valid for a subsequent phase should there be one.

The essence of the White Paper can be summarized as follows: the Program’s activities will improve the negotiating capabilities of the developing countries and preserve spaces for development policy in international trade rules. These will support the work done by UNCTAD and other concerned institutions on trade negotiations, placing a special emphasis on the relationship between trade rules and competitiveness for sustainable human development. Expressed differently, the Program will engage in stimulating forums that will discuss, deliberate and build consensus on the integrated treatment of development policy making and trade negotiations.

In order to assure these intentions, the Paper proposes that the Program should have the main objective, which “is to assist the developing countries in their understanding of the interactions taking place between globalization and trade liberalization on the one hand, and the social, economic and environmental expression of the development process on the other.” In order to reach this objective the Paper proposes three activity clusters that will take place at global, regional and national levels. These are policy advice activities, knowledge and awareness activities and capacity development activities.

The Paper also proposes a sample of activities and projects, which will be undertaken during the present Phase. These will be *inter alia*:

- Promoting an integrated approach to development policy and trade rules negotiations.
- Promoting competitiveness policies for SHD.
- Promoting participatory and transparent economic governance.
- Providing policy advice in solving dilemmas in strategic issues.
- Knowledge, innovation and access to technology.
- Social efficiency of economic policy.
- Energy access, stability and sustainability.
- Water resources management.

The Paper also points out that these levels of activity are in fact those that enforce the millennium goals of UNDP.

No doubt, these areas are perhaps the most important ones for sustainable human development and indeed totally compatible with the “millennium goal of UNDP.” But one important question lingers in the minds of the evaluators, namely, how to connect these intervention areas with globalization and liberalization of international trade. No one can negate that these intervention areas have important bearings on international trade, but how to operationalize them and how to link them to globalization and liberalization of international trade within the remaining life of the Program is a colossal task. The human and especially financial resources of the Program are rather limited to tackle all these interventions within the time frame of about 12 months or so. Moreover, in the opinion of the evaluators, these interventions divert the Program from its primary objectives, i.e., assisting the developing countries to design their policies in such a way that they benefit optimally from the liberalization and globalization of international trade so that they can join to the mainstream of international or regional trade under the most possible advantageous conditions. The Program cannot be viewed, as the White Paper seems to imply, only as interventions with the aim assuring sustainable human development.

## **5.2 Aftermath of Cancún**

It is perhaps axiomatic to say that when exogenous conditions surrounding them change, projects or programs will also have to change with them. Irrespective of their success or failure, as perceived by different countries, the meetings in Seattle and Cancún ushered in a new set of conditions, as well as new mind sets with respect to globalization and liberalization, not only in the developing countries alone, but also in the so-called developed countries. As a result, the developing countries now are taking globalization, which was crystallized by membership in WTO, by a grain of salt. In the developed countries the pervasive opinion is that the Cancún collapse questions the future of WTO. The failure of the Seattle meeting in 1999 and the collapse of the Cancún meeting in 2003 raised important questions that will linger for some time in the minds of decision makers of the developing countries who are not as yet members of WTO: “Is it desirable to be a member of it and will it really yield the benefits that are expected from the membership?” If these countries decide not to join WTO and seek other alternatives, such as joining regional cooperation schemes, the “Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development Program” would acquire a very different, but also a very important underpinning. If there is no demand to join WTO, there would be no justification to maintain the supply of technical assistance to developing countries in aiding them in participation negotiations for globalization.

It is not within the purview of this evaluation to predict the future. If there is no demand for globalization emanating from the developing world, it will be presumptuous for any international organization to design a technical assistance for such a purpose. This is one of those cases where supply does not create its own demand.

However, if the developing countries were to express a well-defined and well-articulated demand for technical assistance in joining some regional economic

cooperation schemes, a program – much more modest in its aspirations – may very well be desirable in order to assist them in such an endeavor. It must be added in this context that several regional cooperation schemes already exist. UNDP, through its regional bureaus and through its other divisions, has already designed and is in the process of implementing such technical assistance programs.

It is not also inconceivable that both the developing and the developed world may see advantages to revitalize WTO and try to repair the fractured global trading system by doing away certain subsidies paid in developed countries and reducing the trade barriers of the developing countries. Should this be the case, a program will have to acquire a new dimension. In the Section that follows this Report will suggest a program of technical assistance that is essentially anchored in the countries where specifically the recipients of this assistance express the need.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

#### **5.3.1 Introductory Remarks**

As can be surmised from the analyses in previous pages of this Report it is very difficult to state categorically that the Global Program has been an unconditional success. This, however, does not negate that the Program, as originally conceived, was indeed useful for the developing countries that were desirous to enter into the main stream of the global economy without tarnishing their aspirations to maintain a sustainable human development. The Program's overall goal was valid then, and it is valid now. To maintain this validity a similar program indeed should be continued, but with a substantial overhaul of both its management and scope. The organizational structure of GP and its administrative modus operandi will have to be revised to increase the managerial agility and capacity to respond as quickly as possible to the needs of the developing countries. The Program's overall scope should focus on deeper and narrower issues that would lead to concrete results; its administrative organization should be enriched with technical staff to provide better management, and finally, given the preponderance of the concern of SHD, which is one of the essential mandates of UNDP, the Program must be much more closely linked to the activities of UNDP/HQ as well as to the Country Offices.

For this purpose the Report puts forth specific recommendations related both to management as well as substantive content of the Program.

#### **5.3.2 Short-term Strategic Recommendations**

The Team proposes the following adjustments for Phase II to undertake until it ends:

- Consolidate the results already achieved.
- Focus the Program on reasonable objectives that will show tangible results.
- Create synergies with partners and other programs. There is a strong need to improve the relationships with IF, JITAP and other UNDP programs.

- Optimize the use of the financial resources that still remain.
- Change the perceptions of the Program.
- Focus the Program on country-based activities in countries, such as Bolivia, Vietnam, Indonesia and perhaps Kenya and Ecuador. In other countries undertake limited actions.
- Avoid being involved directly in capacity building activities, except on trade policy and not in trade development, but maintain efforts on consensus building.
- Strengthen the networking with think tanks and universities on the global and regional and country levels in order to facilitate the understanding of globalization and SHD by the development community.
- Update the web site and connect to the most relevant sites on globalization, trade and SHD. (The [www.talkdevelopment.info](http://www.talkdevelopment.info) site is certainly useful, but since GP staff is limited, this might not be feasible before the end of Phase II).
- Make the language of conceptual papers non-esoteric and jargon free (as did the “White Paper and Social Efficiency study) without lowering its intellectual content, so that they are understood by large audience and enhance the positive image of GP.
- Reach an agreement with UNDP to support its high-level policy advice services (“soft interventions”).
- Launch innovative projects only if GP is able to secure their concretization through resource mobilization.
- Ensure more result-oriented and less narrative monitoring system.
- Ensure a wider base of donor contributions for the future through a fund raising campaign based on the concrete results obtained at the end of Phase II and the vision for the next phase.

### **5.3.3 Long-term Recommendations**

#### **5.3.3.1 Management issues**

If UNDP were to decide that there ought to be a new Program that is substantially modified from Phase II, the first issue is to determine how it is to be managed. Several alternatives present themselves in this respect:

- To set up a new Special Trust Fund for its management and resource mobilization.
- To locate GP in an existing Special Trust Fund, such as UNDP Trust Fund of Poverty Reduction.
- To locate the new Program in UNDESA, ILO, UNCTAD or in UNDP.

The Report will review with some detail the implications of locating the Program only in UNCTAD versus UNDP, since they are the most likely organizations that are operationally feasible. The table below contrasts the attributes of each.

### Comparative advantages of UNDP and UNCTAD for the location of a new project

	UNDP	UNCTAD
Mandate	Wide	Trade
Structure	Decentralized	Centralized
Geographical Locations	Many options: NY, Geneva, regional sites and other options	Geneva
Connection	UN, OECD, MDBs, EU, UN Economic Commissions	UN, ILO, ITC, WTO, EU, UN Economic Commissions
Visibility	High	Average
Connection with donors and developing countries	High	Average
Connection with think tanks	High	High
Experience in SHD	HDR and Poverty alleviation focus	Limited
Experience in globalization	HDR and NHDRs	Average
Experience in trade	Low at the global level, high on TRTA	High
Outreach, advocacy, Soft interventions	High	Average
Management	Flexible; results oriented organization	Traditional
Aid coordination role and experience	High through UNDAF, RT and projects	Limited
Resources mobilization capacity	High	Low
Linkages with related programs	IF, JITAP, Global Regional and Country Programs	IF, JITAP
Visibility of the GP within the organization	Low since it will be one among many others programs	Highly visible

The Report cannot enter at this point into great details of all the alternatives. Based on the comparison provided in the table above, it recommends strongly an UNDP-administered Global Program, but located in Geneva. There are several advantages of locating it in Geneva, where the Program can take advantage of the proximity of close partners, such as UNCTAD, ILO, ITC, WTO, ICTSD, EU, OECD.

In addition, the Team also recommends that the Steering Committee should be open to the membership of donors and developing countries; it should establish a Coordinating Committee with UNDESA, ILO, ITC, WTO, UNCTAD and UNDP/HQ; and it should also have a panel of eminent experts from UNDP/HDRO, UNDP/ODS, UNDESA, ICTSD, WTO, and UNCTAD.

### 5.3.3.2 Substantive Issues

A new program may be designed to assist the developing countries with the aim of “bringing the key aspects of a country’s foreign trade regime in conformity with the tenets of SHD.” Some forty countries are yet to join WTO; a number of countries are desirous to join regional economic blocs; or others who are members of such schemes may like to enhance their position in them. Yet WTO’s attributes now expand into a number of substantive areas that have clear impacts on domestic policy making, explicitly linking trade with protection of investment and intellectual property rights, strictly enforcing the solution of disputes. This has extended its authority to domestic regulation, legislation, governance and policy making that are central to the development process. In other words, in contrast to GATT in the past, global trade under WTO is now much more closely related to human development than any other agreement ever did.

The Report makes various recommendations of general and specific nature. Underlying these recommendations is the thought to respond effectively to the challenges of globalization and trade liberalization and to take advantage of its opportunities and benefits. These will vary from country to country. Also the lack of information regarding the impact of required policies and organizational and institutional options, and therefore the anticipation of the impacts of alternative policy measures acquire paramount importance vis-à-vis the well being of the country and its SHD, and require a thorough quantitative and qualitative analysis.

- As to the overall nature of the program, it is recommended that it should be designed with two immediate *objectives*, if it is going to be instrumental at all in assisting these countries, provided, of course, they demand assistance from such a program. The demand should be articulated through the UNDP Country Offices and preferably worked into the “Country Program” so as to assure the support of the Country Offices and to insure national ownership. These *objectives* will have to be:
  - (i) *To assist the countries who are likely to enter WTO (or any other regional cooperation scheme) in assessing the implications of globalization on SHD.*
- In this respect the program’s activities should essentially consist of fielding highly competent national/international experts to assess the potential impact of globalization on a country’s economy and its various sectors, should the country wish to pursue to enter into the globalization stream. It is in fact a modified CAS.
- The program should also assist the countries in developing analytical and decision-making tools including economic models to quantify the impact of accession (positive/negative) on the economy.

- (ii) *To provide a catalytic role in providing technical assistance in negotiations with WTO so that most favorable conditions are attained in most effective way possible.*

This second objective entails a number of activities:

- Assistance in preparations of negotiations with respect to the key aspects of the country's foreign trade regime to bring them in conformity with the agreements of WTO (the suggestions here refer only to dealings with WTO ) in such issues as import licensing, technical barriers to trade, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, customs valuations, rules of origin, agricultural products, intellectual property rights, anti-dumping countervailing and safeguard measures.
- Legal assistance to prepare draft laws based on the model laws in compliance with WTO agreements and drafting legal reforms deemed necessary by the country for WTO accession.
- Assistance in identifying all the enterprises that fall under the understanding on the GATT 1994 articles (especially Article XVII) and advice on the necessary measures required.
- Assistance to the appropriate ministries (such as Economy and/or Trade) in the evaluation of a country's trade agreements with third parties and identification of all agreements under which preferences cannot be justified according to WTO.
- Assistance in analyzing all current trade customs-related fees for conformity with WTO rules.
- Assistance in preparing and finalizing required accession documents.
- Assistance to train negotiators to become effective in negotiations with members of the multilateral trading system, such as WTO. This specific activity is of paramount importance, since most developing countries lack the capacity to set the agenda and the pace of negotiations in this system to negotiate effectively on issues of greatest concern to them or to fulfill their commitments to the trading regime.

These and similar activities will allow the countries to have at hand a set of rules and regulations and revised laws in conformity with respect to WTO rules and agreements.

These activities will give the basic tools for the country to enter into the global trade stream. However, the program may also help to prepare the countries' various stakeholders (such as the private sector, labor unions, etc.) to have a positive attitude towards globalization. If need be, the program may also provide experienced international negotiators to accompany the national teams as advisors during the actual process of negotiations.

As can be appreciated, the above is neither a draft project document, nor is it a straight jacket for UNDP to find itself in. It is, however, an action-oriented and a practical

way of looking at the substantive content of a new program. It cannot be overemphasized that a new program cannot be viewed as the continuation of Phase II of GP, but a new mind-set and an altogether new approach.

## APPENDIX I

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### Mid-term evaluation of the UNCTAD-UNDP Global Program on Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development

##### 1. Background

Policy advice about successful integration into the global economy has rarely paid attention to the causal relationships between sustainable human development (SHD) and globalization. The usual assumption has been that integration into the global economy will lead to growth, whose benefits will eventually trickle down to the poor and result in sustainable human development. However, actual experiences of many countries and peoples have run counter to this expectation. In responding to this situation, the flagship **Program on Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development** (the Program) was launched in 1998 to develop an SHD-centred conceptual and operational framework for global integration.

The Program presents an important initiative in combining the competencies and comparative advantages of two UN institutions: UNCTAD's expertise in trade and investment and UNDP's development paradigm of SHD and network of country offices. By pooling together the technical, financial and institutional resources of these two organizations, the Program seeks to enable developing countries, especially low-income countries, to participate in the global economy as a means to pursue their sustainable human development objectives. [For more on the Program's concept, objectives and activities, refer to UNDP approved documents GLO/98/615/A/11/40<sup>1</sup> of 30 December, 1997 (Phase 1) and GLO/01/615/A/11/40 of 6 August, 2001 (Phase 2).]

##### 2. Purpose of the evaluation

A key objective of the proposed evaluation of the Program is to provide an independent, neutral and fact-based perspective; ensure accountability through credibility of results and validation of reporting; analyze in-depth successes and problems to help future decision-making; generate a "new" vision that can be used to build consensus; and support learning.

In this perspective, the findings of the evaluation and its recommendations will be an essential piece of information to be used by the forthcoming Steering Committee of the Program. The Steering Committee, which is composed of representatives of UNDP, UNCTAD and the Belgian Government of the Program, will meet during the second part of November and will discuss inter alia medium term perspectives for the Program.

##### The scope of evaluation

This mid-term evaluation will cover the Program since its inception up to now. Two phases will be distinguished, Phase 1 from 1998 to mid 2002, and Phase 2 from August 2002 when the new management took over to 2003 and onwards. For both the first and second phases of the Program, the evaluation will follow a result-oriented approach with greater emphasis being placed on the strategic and forward looking issues that are of importance to the latter phase.

---

<sup>1</sup> Co-funded with contributions from GLO/98/B02/58/40; INT/89/901/14/40; AND RAF/98/001

The evaluation will comprehensively review the Program and its activities, as stated in the UNDP approved documents for Phases 1 and 2. Accordingly, the evaluation will:

- assess the Program's success in terms of achieving the overall developmental changes anticipated by the funding partners, as well as, those of importance to the participating developing countries;
- determine the usefulness of the Program in the current global context and assess its adaptability to changing global circumstances;
- examine the relevance of the Program concept, analyze identified activities and corresponding outputs as outlined in project documents, and assess medium-term outcomes and long-term impacts in achieving the stated objectives;
- appraise capacity building activities supported by the Program and their long-term sustainability;
- investigate the complementarities of the Program to other related technical cooperation activities;
- assess the partnership strategy between the two organizations and review the extent to which the management at both organizations is conscious of the Program; and
- determine the appropriateness of the execution and the management arrangements applied under the Program.

### 3. *The elements of evaluation*

#### (i) Program focus and concept

On a broad level, the evaluation will examine the relevance of the Program and the distinctive implementation activities at the global and country levels with a view to appraise the impact of policy approaches examined, as well, as the capacity building provided. More specifically, the evaluation will examine the significance of the Program concept, analyze identified activities and corresponding outputs, and assess medium-term outcomes and long-term impacts in achieving the stated objectives. In this respect, the evaluation will focus on: (1) implementation and delivery issues, (2) results achieved so far, and (3) an estimate of the extent to which the Program has contributed to the achievement of expected results as outlined in the program documents.

In practice, the Program is focused largely, although not exclusively, on trade. However, globalization has many more elements including non-economic and financial aspects. The evaluation will therefore assess how these other elements of globalization have been addressed in the Program activities. Based on this assessment, the evaluation will determine whether the focus in the second phase of the Program should be revised and made broader to include other dimensions of globalization. In particular, the evaluation will examine the emerging opinions and modalities being adopted during the second phase of the Program, taking into account the evolving needs of developing countries and the existing development assistance framework.

#### (ii) Outputs and activities

The evaluation will assess Program results, i.e. progress towards outputs and outcomes as outlined in the program documents for Phases 1 and 2. The evaluation will identify what works and does not and why. It will also assess the appropriateness of the choice of activities undertaken to achieve the Program goals/objectives. In this regards, it might also be useful for the evaluation

to assess how the contributions of each partner have helped to achieve the outcomes and thereby recommend appropriate measures to enhance future interventions and activities.

(iii) Partnership and linkages with other stakeholders

The evaluation will appraise the partnership strategy between UNDP/BDP and UNCTAD, its design, functioning, and more importantly ensure that partners have a common appreciation of problems, needs and intended objectives of the Program. The evaluation will examine how the Program interacts with other UNCTAD and UNDP programs and takes advantage of the existing expertise in the two organizations, ascertaining whether the Program is exploiting the maximum benefits from its being a joint program with a broad coverage.

The evaluation will also review the progress made on cooperating with other development partners on the various dimensions of globalization from a global, regional and national perspectives (for e.g., ILO on the social dimensions of globalization, UNDP RBx, and bilateral agencies on country and inter-sectoral analysis). Particular focus will be on measures introduced to facilitate and increase dialogue between the key cooperating partners.

Finally, the evaluation will consider whether the Program overlaps with the Integrated Framework for Trade Related Technical Assistance for LDCs (IF) as well as other related technical assistance programs (e.g. JITAP, UNDP Regional programs, etc.) and will assess the added value that the Program offers as well as its complementarities to these programs.

(iv) Management and cost effectiveness

The management and the governance of the Program will be reviewed in order to ascertain the appropriateness of mechanisms put in place by the executing agency to ensure accountability, transparency and the direction of activities. Special attention will be given to evaluating the usefulness of measures, i.e. management and administration, supervision and oversight, technical coordination, accountability, etc, adopted during the two phases of the Program.

#### **4. Methodology**

The evaluation will be subject to the principles of evaluation as outlined in the guide manual.<sup>2</sup> It will compose of (a) desk review of existing materials and program reports, (b) individual interviews, (c) focus groups' meetings in Belgium (Government), Geneva (UNCTAD) and New York (UNDP/HQ), and (d) virtual meetings through e-mail and video-conference with beneficiary countries (policymakers and practitioners), UNDP country offices (activity implementers), partner cooperating agencies involved, and consultants/experts hired. Visits to select beneficiary countries will be a pivotal part of the evaluation. List of countries to be visited will be jointly determined by the key partners, in close consultation with the executing agency.

The evaluation will be participatory and will include inputs from the lead agencies, donors, the relevant stakeholders within beneficiary countries, partner cooperating agencies, and consultants/experts hired. In this framework, the evaluators will serve as facilitators with the purpose of arriving at a coherent and well-integrated approach that can further strengthen the Program, taking into account the evolving needs of developing countries and the existing development assistance framework.

---

<sup>2</sup> UNDP Evaluation Office, November 2001, "Managing for Results: Monitoring and Evaluation in UNDP", New York.

#### **5. Output of the evaluation**

The output of the evaluation will be a report of approximately 30-50 pages, to be submitted as early as possible, but no later than 31st October 2003 through UNCTAD to the UNDP and the Government of Belgium. In the future, this report could be provided to other potential funding agencies.

The report will compose of three parts: (a) a brief description of the concept, evolution and current status of the Program; (b) assessments of the Program in line with the elements of evaluation described above; and (c) recommendations that emanate from the assessments.

#### **6. Requirements and Funding**

The evaluation will be over a period of two months. The Evaluation Team will comprise of two independent evaluators proposed by UNDP and the Belgium Government, as the two funding organizations. As the lead sponsor of the Program, the UNDP proposed candidate will be the lead evaluator.

The evaluation will be financed on a cost-sharing basis with contributions (in cash or kind) from UNDP and the Government of Belgium.

## APPENDIX II

### PERSONS INTERVIEWED (in alphabetical order in each cluster)

#### GENEVA

N. Bennabes-Taarji	Policy and Capacity Building Branch, UNCTAD
Georges Chapelier	Advisor to GP, UNCTAD
Werner Corrales	Special Advisor to GP, UNCTAD
Antoon Delie	Belgian Gen. Direction for Development Cooperation
Véronique Dethier	Executive assistant to the Director of Global Program, UNCTAD
Assane Diop	Executive Director on Social Protection, ILO
Florence Duvieusart	Belgian Development Cooperation in Geneva
Bijan Eslanloo	Technical Cooperation Unit, UNCTAD
Reinaldo Figueredo	Director Global Program, UNCTAD
Robert Foort	Budget and Project Finance Unit, UNCTAD <sup>1</sup>
Carlos Fortin	Deputy Secretary General, UNCTAD
Khalil Hamdani	Head of Policy and Capacity Building Branch, UNCTAD
Z. Kozul-Wright	LDC Division, UNCTAD
Jean Maninat	Office of the Cabinet of the General Director, ILO
R. Melendez-Ortiz	Executive Director, ICTSD
Marcel Namfua	Interregional adviser, LDC Division, UNCTAD
Ngo Quang Xuan	Ambassador of Vietnam, UNCTAD
Florence Renier	Assistant Advisor Belgian Direction for Development Cooperation
Lorraine Ruffing	Chief, Enterprise Development Branch, UNCTAD
Jagdish Saigal	Former Director of the GP, UNCTAD
O. Sorgho-Moulinier	Director, Office in Geneva, UNDP
Maria-Sabina Yeterian-Parisi	Technical Cooperation Unit, UNCTAD

#### NEW YORK CITY<sup>1</sup>

Jean Barut	Senior Economist, RBA/UNDP
Nikhil Chadavarkar	Interregional Advisor, Dep't for Economic and Social Affairs, UN
Shabbir Cheema	Principal Advisor, UNDESA
Patrice Chiwota	Policy Specialist, BDP/UNDP
P. Civili	Assistant Secretary General, UN
Walter Franco	Deputy Director, BDP/UNDP
Luis Gallegos	Ambassador of Ecuador to UN
Radhika Lal	ITC specialist, BDP/UNDP
Kamal Malhotra	Globalization Advisor, BDP/UNDP
Marta Ruedas	Deputy Director, ARBEC/UNDP
Arusha Stanislaus	Program Specialist, RBAP
Jan Vandemoortele	Poverty Group, BDP/UNDP

## WASHINGTON D.C.<sup>1</sup>

Raimundo Arroio	Program Coordinator, IDB
Ramon Espinaza	Consultant, Regional Integration Department, IDB
Edmundo Jarquin	Chief, Division of Sustainable Development, IDB
John Shilling	GP Consultant, Indonesia Project

## DAKAR<sup>2</sup>

Jean Luc Gregoire	Senior Economist UNDP
Diene Keita	DRR/UNDP
Francois Xavier Merriem	Professeur University of Lausanne Consultant
Ahmed Rhazaoui	RR/UNDP
Sonia Van Loo	First Secretary Belgian Embassy

## BRUSSELS<sup>2</sup>

Paul Avontroot	Head Service Multilateral and UN of Belgian Cooperation
Jozef DeWint	Evaluation Advisor Belgian Direction for Develop. Cooperation
Mrs. Freudenthal	In charge of JPOs in Belgian Direction for Develop. Cooperation
Anne Henricot	Research Assistant working for the Chaire Philippson
Florence Renier	Assistant Advisor Belgian Direction for Development Cooperation
Baron Alain Philippson	Président du Conseil d' Administration de la Banque Degroof Fondateur de la Chaire Marie et Alain Philippson

## HANOI<sup>2</sup>

Lars Bestle	Program Officer UNDP
Markus Cornaro	Ambassador, Head of EU Delegation
Francisco Fontan	Second Secretary EU
Murray Gibbs	Director of the Asian Regional Trade Project ATI
Rose Marie Greve	ILO Director
Vo Hong Nam	Director Hong Nam Computer Communication
Vu Dinh Lâp	UNDP/UNCTAD consultant
Markus J.M. Leroy	Minister Counsellor Belgian Development Cooperation
Ian Richards	Program Expert UNDP/UNCTAD Program
Nguyen Son	Deputy Director National Committee for Int. Econ. Coop.
Pham Tat Thang	General Director Vietnam Trade Information Center
Phan Thê Ruê	Vice Minister of Trade (met but not interviewed)
Paul Tran Van Thinh	Former EU Ambassador to WTO, UNCTAD consultant for the GP
Bui Viêt Cong	UNDP/UNCTAD consultant
Khuong Viet Thang	Program Officer, UNDP
Vo Tông Xuân	Rector University of An Giang
Christoph Wiesner	First Secretary EU
Kanni Wignaraja	DRR/UNDP

Other people were met but not interviewed during the presentation of the pre-feasibility study in the meeting of November 11 and during the briefing of Mr. Paul Tran Van Thinh to the Economic Commission of the Party on WTO issues.

## MANAGUA<sup>1</sup>

Lorena Aleman	Director, Department of Investment and Export
Eduardo Bolaños	Director, Enterprise Development
Jorge Chediek	RR/UNDP
Jafet Enriquez	DRR/UNDP
Mauricio Gomez	Vice-Minister, Min. of Foreign Affairs (Aid Coordination)
Maria Rosa Renzi	Program Officer, UNDP
Melia Rosales	Director, Intl. Organizations, Min. of Industry & Trade
Ana Cecilia Tijerino	Advisor, Ministry of Industry and Trade

## QUITO<sup>1</sup>

Guillermo Arreviaga	Sector Specialist/IDB
Jorge Babua	Executive Director, National Council of Competitiveness
Eduardo Egas	Vice-President, CORPEI
Omero Larrea	Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Division of Intl. Trade
Andreas Montalvo	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Division of Bilateral Agreements
Luis Palau	Corporación Andina de Fomento
José Piedrahita	Vice-Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Diego Ramirez	Chief of Staff, Min. of Trade, Industry, Fishing & Competitiveness
Diego Recalde	Manager, Poverty Reduction, UNDP
Paulo Rodriguez	Technical Director, National Council of Competitiveness
Francisco Rumba	Coordinator of Projects, CORPEI
Carlos Stark	UNCTAD/DP Consultant
Ilona Szemzo	DRR/UNDP

## LA PAZ<sup>1</sup>

Ricardo Alba	Ex-Ambassador of Bolivia to UNCTAD
Geraldo Ávila	Ex-Director, Secretariat of Competitiveness
Victor H. Carvajal	Advisor, National Congress
Lucas De Conninck	International Cooperation, Embassy of Belgium
Alfonso Ferrufino	Minister, Ministerio de Gobierno
Alfredo Marty	DRR/UNDP
Luis Ossio	President, FUNDOPPAC
José Rivera	Inter-regional Advisor, GP
Carlos Stark	Consultant, GP

<sup>1</sup> Fuat Andic only

<sup>2</sup> Abdenour. Benbouali only

## APPENDIX III

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

#### **Project Documents**

- Letter of Agreement between R. Ricupero, UNCTAD SG and J.G. Speth, UNDP Administrator
- Project Document Phase I - 1998
- Project Document Phase II – 2001

#### **White Paper**

- Draft White Paper of the GP and the revised versions Oct. and Nov. 2003
- List of participants to the Brainstorming session on the White Paper
- Conclusions of the Brainstorming session on the White Paper (February 2003)
- Letter to Mr. Ricupero after the Brainstorming session on the White Paper

#### **Reports**

- Work Plan 1999
- Internal Evaluation report 1999-2000
- Update on activities to be carried out from April to December 2003(submitted to donors in March 2003)
- Progress report Phase II: July 2001 - December 2002 and Work Program 2003
- Small progress report Phase II: December 2002 - March 2003 (submitted to donors in March 2003)
- (Draft report Phase II: January – December 2003 (to be submitted to donors when ready in November 2003)).

#### **Minutes Steering Committees**

- First SC – UNDP - 08.02.99: Minutes + agenda
- Second SC – UNDP – 20.09.00: Minutes
- In 2001: there was no SC
- Third SC – UNDP & Belgium – 26.11.02: Minutes, agenda & overview on report
- Meeting of 27 March 2003 – Review of UNCTAD and Belgium Cooperation

#### **Review of Technical Cooperation Activities of UNCTAD**

- Report 1999 (activities 1998) – TD/B/46/3/Add. 1 (p 96-97)
- Report 2000 (activities 1999) – TD/B/47/2/Add. 1 (p 117-118)
- Report 2001 (activities 2000) – TD/B/48/5/Add. 1 (p 113-114)
- Report 2002 (activities 2001) – TD/B/49/4/Add. 1 (p 94-95)
- Report 2003 (activities 2002) – TD/B/50/2/Add. 1 (p 100-102)

#### **New Challenges Newsletter (biannual)**

- Issue 1, July 1999 (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.75)
- Issue 2, January 2000 (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.86)
- Issue 3, July 2000 (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.113)
- Issue 4, January 2002 (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.193)

### **Conceptual Paper**

**PUBLICATION:** Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development: Analytical perspectives. Manuel R. Agosin, David E. Bloom and Eduardo Gitli. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.125). Available in English, French and Spanish

### **Occasional Papers**

- **PUBLICATION:** Promoting Competitiveness and Managing Financial Integration in the Global Economy. A contribution by UN-ECLAC. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.73)
- **PUBLICATION:** Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and the Promotion of Sustainable Human Development. A contribution by UN-ECLAC. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.74)
- **PUBLICATION:** The Sequencing of Structural Adjustment Programs: What are the Issues? John Toye.
- **PUBLICATION:** Trade and Finance: An SHD Centred Conceptual and Operational Framework. Manuel R. Agosin.
- **PUBLICATION:** Globalization, Investment and Sustainable Human Development: A Learning and Innovation Approach. Lynn K. Mytelka
- **PUBLICATION:** Globalization and Developing Countries: Foreign Direct Investment and Growth and Sustainable Human Development. Daniel Chudnovsky and Andres Lopez.
- **PUBLICATION:** Sequencing Trade and Capital Account Liberalization: The Experience of Brazil in the 1990s. Ricardo Gottschalk. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.132).
- **PUBLICATION:** Gendered Labour Markets and Globalization in Asia. Gita Sen (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.133).
- **PUBLICATION:** Globalization and Development Revisited in the Light of Asian Experience. Azizul Islam. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.135).
- **PUBLICATION:** Trade Policy and Sustainable Human Development in Africa. T. Ademola Oyejide. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.136).
- **PUBLICATION:** Closing the Loop: Latin America – Globalization and Human Development. David E. Bloom. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.168).

### **Regional Policy Dialogues with ICTSD**

- Memorandum of Understanding with ICTSD
- Report of "Latin American Policy Dialogue on Globalization, Trade Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development", Santiago, Chile, 8-10 November 1999 + Participant list
- Report of "Asian Policy Dialogue on Globalization, Trade Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development", Bangkok, Thailand, 24-26 November 1999 + Participant list
- Report of "African Policy Dialogue on Globalization, Trade Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development", Windhoek, Namibia, 10-12 May 2000 + Participant list

### **Activities sponsored by the GP**

- Press release, April 1998
- Report on meeting of experts, February 1999
- Report "Integrating LDCs into the Global economy", July 1999
- Resource Mobilization Mission Report, December 1999
- Mission Report on Regional Meeting on Training and Research needs in International Trade, February 2000
- Mission Report on Regional Meeting on Training and Research needs in International Trade for Asia-Pacific countries, November 2000

- Conclusions on Regional Meeting on Training and Research needs in International Trade for Asia-Pacific countries, November 2000
- Mission Report on Regional Meeting on Training and Research needs in International Trade in Africa, October 2001
- Official Meeting Report on Regional Meeting on Training and Research needs in International Trade in Africa, October 2001
- Mission Report to China, December 2001
- Report "Asian Regional Seminar on Export Competitiveness and the role of FDI enhancing local firms competitiveness through linkages with TNC's", December 2001 + list of participants
- WSSD Roundtable Report, Abuja, Nigeria, July 2002 + Annex 1

#### **High-level Seminar on governance and globalization in the Asia Region, Bangkok, 2-3 October 2003**

- E-Brief, October 2003
- Aide-Memoir
- Program, as of 2 October 2003
- Background Paper for the High Level Seminar from Professor David Bloom, Harvard University "Governance matters – The role of governance in Asian development"

#### **Social Efficiency**

- Compétitivité économique et efficacité sociale- Note préliminaire 1 (8 Avril 2003)-FX Merrien, consultant
- Compétitivité économique et efficacité sociale- Note préliminaire 1 révisée (14 Avril 2003)- FX Merrien, consultant
- Compétitivité économique et efficacité sociale: L'action collective, la recherche de compétitivité et le développement humain durable- Note conceptuelle (30 Juin 2003) - FX Merrien, consultant
- Chaire Philipsson – Managing for Sustainable Human Development: Proposition de Cahier des Charges

#### **International Dialogue on Special and Differential Treatments with ICTSD**

- Memorandum of Understanding with ICTSD, dated 16/12/02
- Draft Meeting Report on "Making S&DT effective and responsive to development needs" – Chavannes-de-Bogis, 5 and 6 May 2003 + list of participants
- "Elements For a New Paradigm On Special and Differential treatment: Special and Differential treatment, the Multilateral Trading System and Economic Development in the 21st century" prepared by Ajit Singh, professor of economics at Queen's college, Cambridge University
- "Recognising reality: Balancing precision and flexibility in WTO Rules" prepared by Dr. Chris Stevens at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex
- "Spaces for Development Policy: Revisiting Special and Differential Treatment" prepared in-house at the ICTSD by Werner Corrales with Mahesh Sugathan and David Primack

#### **Activities with Policy and Capacity building Branch, UNCTAD's Division on Investment, Technology and Enterprise**

##### *Case studies on Transfer of Technology for Successful Integration into the Global Economy*

- PUBLICATION: "A case study of Embraer in Brazil". Jose E. Cassiolato, Roberto Bernardes and Helena Lastres. (UNCTAD/ITE/IPC/Misc.20)

- PUBLICATION: "A case study of the South African Automotive Industry". Trudi Hartzenberg and Samson Muradzikwa. (UNCTAD/ITE/IPC/Misc.21).
- PUBLICATION: "A case study of the Pharmaceutical Industry in India". Biswajit Dhar and C. Niranjana Rao, with inputs by Veena Gupta. (UNCTAD/ITE/IPC/Misc.22).

#### *Home Country Measures facilitating access to technology by developing countries*

- Draft Paper: Initiatives and Measures Promoting Transfer of Technology (2002)

#### Energy

- Mission report to South American Summit, July 2002
- Declaracion del Consejo Presidencial Andino
- Consenso De Guyaquil sobre Integracion, seguridad e infraestructura para el desarrollo
- Informe preliminar a los Presidentes de los paises andino

#### Book "Solving the Riddle of Globalization and Development"

- Preface
- Table of Content and Introduction

#### Partnership with the ILO

- E-mails from Mr. Figueredo to the Regional Directors of the ILO, May 2003

#### Competitiveness

- "Competitiveness policies and the Trade and Development: agenda for developing countries", January 2003

#### Global Forum

- Report on "Workshop Trade and Investment in a globalised economy", session organized by the Global Program at the Global Forum in Marrakech, December 2002

#### Country Assessments

- A common framework for country assessment studies
- PUBLICATION: Globalization, Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges in Central America Countries (**El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua**). Manuel R. Agosin, David E. Bloom and Eduardo Gitli. Published in English and Spanish. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.126)
- PUBLICATION: Globalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges for **Botswana**: Prof. Charles Harvey, Dr. Happy Siphambe and Dr. Eagilwe Segosebe. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.127)
- PUBLICATION: Globalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges for **Malawi**. Ajit Bhalla, Chinyamata Chipeta, Haile Taye and Mjedo Mkandawire. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.129)
- PUBLICATION: L'Intégration de la **Tunisie** dans l'économie mondiale: opportunités et défis. Francesco Abbate. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.198)
- PUBLICATION: Globalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges for **Zimbabwe**. Ajit Bhalla, Rob Davies, Margaret Chitiga Mabugu and Ramos Mabugu. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.128)
- PUBLICATION: Globalization and Sustainable Human Development: An Assessment of Challenges facing **Nepal**. Prof. A.R. Khan (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.124)

- PUBLICATION: Globalizations Liberalization and Sustainable Human Development: Progress and Challenges in **Jamaica**. David E. Bloom, Ajay Mahal, Damien King, Fiorina Mugione, Aldrie Henry-Lee, Dillon Alleyne, Philip Castillo and River Path Associates. (UNCTAD/EDM/Misc.176)

#### Africa

- Report on country assessment studies and national workshops in Africa
- Mission Report to African Countries, March-April 1999
- Mission Report on Workshop on the IPR in Botswana, July 2002

#### Central America

- Mission Report to Central America, March 1999
- Letter from Honduras's government, March 1999
- Notes on Mission to Central America, July 1999

#### Jamaica

- Letter from Government, May 1999
- 2 Mission Reports to Jamaica, August 2000

#### Nepal

- Letter from Government, February 1999
- Letter from UNDP Nepal, February 1999
- Mission Reports to Nepal, December 2000

#### Indonesia

- Draft approach paper for country assessment study
- Report on Visit to Indonesia, January 2003
- Outline UNCTAD report, January 2003
- Letter from Government, February 1999
- Memo regarding financial issues with UNSFIR (which includes MoU with Indonesia)
- Draft of the synthesis study with comments on draft of the synthesis study
- Early drafts of the national studies

#### Viet Nam

- Mission report, September 2002
- Identification mission to Viet Nam, October 2002
- Mission report, January 2003
- Mission report, May-June 2003
- Mission report, October 2003
- UNDP/EO Country Evaluation Assessment of Development Results
- Vietnam Report as part of the UNDP/EO Global Evaluation of the PRSP
- **Asia Trade Initiative**
  - Terms of reference for the three studies relating trade in services to human development:
    - Movement of natural persons, Trade and Investment and Energy
    - Draft study on Movement of Natural Persons
    - Draft study on Trade and Investment
- Correspondence from Government of Viet Nam (June 2003)
- Mission report, May-June 2003

- **Using ICTs to enhance trade capacities in rural areas**
  1. Early draft of pre-feasibility study following outcome of mission in May/June
  2. Introduction to latest draft of pre-feasibility study in English and in French
- 3 reports of meetings in Viet Nam, October 2003

### **Bolivia**

- Mission report, February 2003
- Ayuda Memoria, February 2003
- Correspondence from Government and Parliament of Bolivia (January, March, April 2003)
- Primer Borrador de Proyecto, Competitividad y Eficiencia Social, Abril 2003
- Mission report, June 2003
- Mission report to Geneva, July 2003
- Mission report, July 2003
- Ayuda Memoria, July 2003
- Programa Noche Parlamentaria and Seminario Internacional, July 2003
- Foro – Documento de Proyecto "Bolivia: insercion internacional, energia y desarrollo humano duradero – Competitividad y eficiencia social"

### **Ecuador**

- Letter from government, June 2002
- Mission report, September – October 2002
- Primer Borrador de Proyecto, Competitividad, Modernizacion Institucional y Desarrollo Humano Sustentable, Enero 2003
- Mission report, March 2003
- Mission report, May - June 2003

### **Senegal**

#### ***Integrated Framework Report***

- Mission report June 2003
- Mission report July 2003

#### **Competitiveness and Social Efficiency**

- Note de présentation: l'action collective, la compétitivité économique et l'efficacité sociale, application au cas sénégalais. (FX Merrien, consultant)
- Sénégal-Phase 2: Pour le développement de secteurs compétitifs à fort impact en termes de développement humain durable (FX Merrien, consultant)
- L'action collective, la compétitivité économique et l'efficacité sociale, application au cas sénégalais: le cas du tourisme (FX Merrien, consultant)
- Rapport provisoire: Formation spécialisée et développement du secteur des services informatiques (PB Guissé, consultant local) et lettre de commentaire de FX Merrien (en charge du projet)
- Rapport provisoire: Grand tourisme international et écotourisme - Application au cas Sénégalais (M. Sène, consultant local)
- Rapport Final: Secteur agricole et aménagement de la vallée du fleuve Sénégal (I. Sané - consultant local)
- Mission report, July 2003.

- Sénégal: pour le développement de secteurs compétitifs à fort impact en termes de développement humain durable - updated (FX Merrien, consultant)
- Note: appui au développement de l'enseignement supérieur et à une dynamique d'efficacité économique contribuant au processus de résolution du conflit en Casamance, Sénégal.
- E-mail de FX Merrien à A. Diop, ILO

#### **Trade expansion and Employment generation in Creative industries in developing Countries (Senegal)**

- Agreement between the Special Program for LDCs, UNCTAD and the UNCTAD-UNDP Global Program
- Mission report June 2003
- Questionnaire on the Senegalese Music Industry

#### **Kenya**

- Mission report January-February 2003

#### **Morocco**

- Mission report April-May 2003

#### **Mali (Follow-up activities)**

- Mission report April 2002
- Compte-rendu de mission, Novembre 2002
- Compte-rendu de mission – Note complémentaire, Avril 2003

#### **Romania**

- Mission Report, June 2002
- "Romanian Energy Sector Overview"

#### **UNDP**

- Making Global Trade Work for People, New York 2003
- Assessment of the Millennium Development Goals 2003
- Human Development Report 1997 Chapter 4
- Global Cooperation Framework 2001-2003
- Regional Cooperation Framework RBAP 2002-2006

#### **Other documents**

- JITAP Evaluation Report June 2002
- IF Evaluation Report September 2003
- DAC Guidelines on Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development
- The Development Dimension of Trade OECD Publication 2001
- Second Joint WTO/OECD Report on Trade-Related TA and Capacity Building July 2003
- Report of the Third UN Conference on the LDCs May 2001
- Paul Trân Van-Thinh, Future of Globalization (unpublished paper)

• APPENDIX 4

ORGANIZATION CHART OF THE PROGRAM

