

53188



UNITED NATIONS

Distr. LIMITED
ECA/PADIS/RTC/BD/2
20 January 1991

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Economic Commission for Africa

Original: ENGLISH

Fifth Meeting of the
Regional Technical Committee for PADIS

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
24-25 April 1991

Report:

**Tripartite Review Meeting
of the Project RAF/86/053
PADIS Phase III**

**TRIPARTITE REVIEW MEETING OF THE PROJECT
RAF/86/053 - PADIS PHASE III, 13 JULY 1990,
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA**

Opening and Representation:

The meeting included the following:

- (a) UNDP (Chairman)
- (b) ECA represented by TACOO
- (c) Member States represented by Nigeria in the person of Dr. Adeyemi
- (d) Evaluation Team Members
- (e) RAF/88/053 - PADIS II Acting Project Coordinator and Project Staff Refer to Annex (A) listing the participants.

The Chairman welcomed the participants and the following agenda was adopted:

1. Opening
2. Presentation of Draft Report by the Evaluation Mission
3. Review of Original Project Design and its Relevance/Appropriateness.
4. Review of Project Performance and Operational Issues by Acting Project Coordinator.
5. General Discussion
6. Presentation of Work Plan 1990/91 by Acting Project Coordinator and Discussion.
7. Decisions and Recommendations.
8. Adoption of the Report.

Presentation of Draft Report by the Evaluation Mission

The team leader observed that per TOR, the project document and the findings, the team is in agreement that the project generally achieved its objectives. However, there were some reservations with specific reference to the following:

- (a) While in some member States the project has made significant progress, in others there was little impact. Through more resources the project activities should be broadened.
- (b) PADIS was perceived by member States as a UN institution and also a funding agency. Effort should be directed towards promoting a realistic image of PADIS.
- (c) The project was not adequately targeted for planners and policy makers. Therefore, the future orientation should be better designed for the purpose.

After these general remarks, the team leader guided the TPR participants through the draft report on the findings of the evaluation mission. After that the other team members were invited by the Chairman to add on to the presentation. They concurred with the Team Leader's presentation along with the endorsement of the report on findings.

Acting Project Coordinator Presentation on PPER and Project Design:

The Chairman requested the acting project Coordinator to make her presentation in the broader context recognizing that no TPR has taken place since 1987. In that case, the general remarks included the other two PPERs prior to the one tabled covering the period 31 January to 31 December 1989. Basically, her presentation captured the following:

- (a) The project design in terms of its relevance to the needs of member States was considered appropriate as reflected in the findings of the evaluation mission.
- (b) The linking of overall objective and the immediate objectives was considered still relevant.
- (c) The project inputs were reviewed in the following context:
 - i) The 1991 budget did not include project personnel. According to information provided by the acting Project Coordinator, it was indicated that the UNDP would reconsider the required resources after an in depth evaluation exercise.
 - ii) Savings on CTA, expected to come on board in September 1990, could be rephased to part of 1991.
 - iii) Under administrative support, the Technician was never recruited and the allocation for the micro-computer technician was subsequently spread to other budget lines.

It was then decided the work plan and the budget had to be reconsidered in the light of the fact that the Regional Programme for Africa had scarce resources for the Fifth Cycle. In that consideration, the Acting Project Coordinator had to reconsider savings from other budget lines for the 1991 personnel component without affecting the Group Training and fellowship lines. However, based on the evaluation mission's recommendation for overall need for continuity of the project, the SC would still comply with the recommendation.

Other General Discussion Issues

The general discussion reflected the following issues:

1. The project generally achieved the objectives except in the area of sub-regional centres.
2. The midway change from the documentation emphasis to development information should have been accompanied by increase in resources along with closer monitoring from the UNDP.
3. The follow-up to greater impact scales was hampered by meager resources and overloaded staff coupled with high turnover. Since the departure of the Project Coordinator, the Acting Project Coordinator and staff have been overstretched in keeping the project activities on course.
4. Both the image of PADIS and apparent lack of commitment on the part of member States demand a more vigorous campaign to link the needs with resources provision.
5. The sub-regional centres would need re-examination in view of the political and relocation considerations for effectiveness.
6. Inter-linkages would be needed among related projects such as SDPA/UN-PAAERD/PADIS, etc., so that integration and complementarity can bear on efficient information generation and utilization.
7. Reference was made to the need for making a distinction between PADIS the project and institution/programme. In that direction, the hiring of a Project Coordinator with specified functions would assist in separating the functions of the project against those of the programme/subprogrammes and the institution. Effort underway by the ECA to seek a regularized position of the Director of PADIS is in recognition of that.
8. Income generating activities may need to be streamlined in line with the UNDP regulations on one hand, and on the other the need to support the project activities in the face of scarce resources for the project. This goes for other resources that may be attracted by the project in the form of separate projects under parallel/shared costing arrangements.

Workplan and Budget

UNDP pointed out that the Regional Programme had no additional funds for the personnel component not budgeted for 1991. Suggestions were made for the Project Coordinator to be hired beginning 1991 so that the savings could be phased into 1991. Also the budget lines for consultants as well as training could be reduced in order to stretch the activities into 1991. With that in mind, the meeting tasked ECA to re-examine the workplan and the budget in the light of the UNDP position.

It was also suggested that ECA explores the possibility of redirecting savings from other related projects with the view to bridge-gap the PADIS activities. Yet, again some related projects could carry some of the PADIS activities. Reference was made to RAF/86/052 SDPA and TACOO/ECA was requested to explore that possibility.

Conclusion:

Broadly, three conclusive remarks are in order.

1. The project generally achieved its objectives except for the sub-regional centres that are either non-operative or non-existent.
2. It was the general consensus that the project, since its inception, lacked adequate monitoring as reflected in the absence of a TPR despite the project complexity.
3. It was noted that there was confusion over the ECA/EDP functions on one hand and on the other the project activities against the PADIS programme/sub-programmes as an institution.

Recommendations

The meeting endorsed the position of the evaluation mission and strongly recommended that the UNDP considers funding the project into the Fifth Cycle. In redesigning the project to meet the reprioritized needs of Africa, consideration should be given to include various donors and other funding agencies. More specifically the following recommendations were made:

1. Sub-regional centres should be recommended for better location that may consider IGOs. That would take into consideration their economic role in harmonizing development in the sub-regions.
2. Closer scrutiny should be made for relevant inter-linkages so that UNDP funded projects can be harmonized for greater effectiveness.
3. In view of scarce resources in the Regional Programme, consideration should be given to income generated by the project being ploughed back to support project activities.

4. For continuity to the end of the Fourth Cycle, emphasis should be paid to redirect resources from some budget lines to accommodate project personnel. In view of this position, ECA was directed by the meeting to re-examine the workplan 1990/91 in the light of the budgetary constraints. Refer to Annex "B".
5. For greater and more effective monitoring, the meeting endorsed the recommendation of the evaluation mission for the immediate institution of a Steering Committee. That will include representatives of related projects and member States.
6. An independent or ECA evaluation should be made to re-examine the evaluation of printed outputs of PADIS by users in order to streamline the image and relevance of the institution.
7. The recruitment of the Chief of PADIS and the Project Coordinator with specified functions would entail separation of functions between ECA/EDP and PADIS project/programme. This would bring into focus the relationship between PADIS and related projects in the programme.

Adoption of the Report:

The report was accordingly adopted.

The next TPR was tentatively scheduled for January 1991 on the understanding that the exact date would be specified in due course.

ANNEX A LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Representative of the Government of Nigeria

Mr. M. Adeyemi

UNDP

Mr. O. Silla (Chairman)

Mr. T.I. Chivore

ECA

Mr. Hans Van Den Heuij

Evaluation Team Members

Mr. H. Andima (UNDP Team Leader)

Mr. N. Adeyemi (Member States Representative)

Mr. H. Van den Heuij (ECA)

RAF/86/053 PADIS III Project Staff

Ms. N. Hafkin (Acting Project Coordinator)

Mr. F. Inganji

Mr. F. Faye

Mr. S. Solbi

RAF/86/052 - SDPA (Statistics Division/ECA)

Mr. A.M. Farazi

Ms. C. Kronauer

ANNEX B

WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

Following the TPR meeting of 13 July 1991, the RLO and the ECA held two meetings which culminated in the meeting of 20 July 1990. At the said meeting, the following was noted:

1. The ECA was finding it difficult to reduce some 1990 budget lines since most of the 1990 activities were already on course.
2. The RLO reiterated that the Regional Programme had no additional resources to cater for the 1991 personnel component of PADIS.

In the light of the above, a decision was taken for the project to continue as already planned and reflected in Revision "G". Then in November 1990, a mandatory rephasing exercise would be mounted involving ECA and the RLO. In the meantime the UNDP would be alerted about this problem.