European Commission United Nations Development Programme International IDEA

Joint Training on Effective Electoral Assistance

> DAY 4 Brussels, 22-26 October 2007



UNDP Delivery Methods in Electoral Assistance DEX - NEX

Richard Cox UNDP Brussels

Joint Training on Effective Electoral Assistance Day 4

NEX – DEX Implementation Modalities

NEX – National Execution DEX - Direct Execution

What is meant by National Execution?:

overall responsibility and assumption of accountability by host Government for the formulation and management of UNDPsupported programmes and projects" (Governing Council decision 92/22 of 26 May 1992)

When should National Execution be used?:

NEX for UNDP <u>should be the norm</u>, taking into account needs and capacities of recipient countries

UN General Assembly (Resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992)

When should National Execution be used?

NEX is used when there is adequate capacity in government to undertake the functions and activities of the project

- The UNDP country office ascertains the national capacities during the formulation of the

programme/project.

Key principles for National Execution:

1. Use of government rules and procedures, where they are consistent with internationally recognized practices, to ensure integration with and relevance to national programmes and structures;

 Government accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources through adequate financial reporting and the achievement of programme/project objectives;

3. Adherence to UNDP regulations and rules, when the Country Office provides support services

Key objectives for National Execution:

 Capacity-building, self-reliance and sustainability
Ownership and internalization of external inputs; and
Relevance and impact

When is National Execution used?

Under National Execution or National Implementation, government rules and procedures, where they are consistent with internationally recognized practices, apply as a matter of principle. Or, in other words:

"Where the financial governance of an executing entity or, under the harmonized operational modalities, implementing partner, does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, that of UNDP shall apply" (Source: FRR, Regulation 16.05.b)

Similar to EC Decentralisation procedures

The CFCU advises the Senior Programme Officers (SPO) within the Line Ministries on EU external aid implementation procedures (e.g. procurement and contracting procedures), it being clear however that full responsibility for technical implementation remains with the SPO.

Direct Execution/Implementation Modalities

DEX/DIM is the default modality for electoral assistance*:

This modality sees UNDP taking on the full responsibility for project implementation

*Note of Guidance DPA - UNDP



Direct Execution/Implementation Modalities

When is DEX appropriate?

- When activities require unique technical sector experience, specific management capacity or access to international networks

- Government lacks the required management or substantive capacity (EMBs)

- The parties prefer Agency execution for other reasons (such as neutrality)



Direct Execution/Implementation Modalities

Why DEX in electoral assistance?

- Weak EMBs
- Politically sensitive nature of the activity
- Helps provide neutrality to the process
- Allows the UN and its development partners to play a brokering role



Direct Execution/Implementation Modalities

Who can be Implementation Partners under DEX?

UNDP itself (i.e. direct procurement of programme equipment such as vehicles etc); A government entity: a Ministry, a Dept within a Ministry, or another Govt entity A UN agency eligible to implement UNDP-supported programmes and projects An outside entity: a private company, a consulting firm, or an NGO

Where donors choose UNDP as the implementation mechanism there are two modalities for UNDP to receive these funds:

Scenario 1: Funding is received and managed in support of a UNDP electoral assistance project. Thereafter, 3 possible funding arrangements can be identified: a) standard cost-sharing arrangements b) trust funds c) 'basket fund' arrangements

a) standard cost-sharing arrangements

 When a programme country government or third-party contributes resources to UNDP-supported programmes
Co-financing modality (donor governments, private sector, foundations, CSOs)

- Funds received for specific projects in line with UNDP policies and activities
- Funds are multi-donor in nature
- Funding is co-mingled and can include UNDP core resources
- Financial reporting is undertaken at the project level

a) standard cost-sharing arrangements

 Have the advantage of being easy to manage: CO can enter into the required Agreements as long as they conform to UNDP Regs and Rules

- Donors can earmark their contributions at the ATLAS project level

DEX Implementation Modalities b) Trust Funds

- Is a co-financing modality established as a separate accounting entity under which UNDP receives funds for an activity specified by the donor

- They are established on the basis of a written Agreement with the donor(s) by the issuance of TORS for the TF in anticipation or contribution receipt Signed by the AA. Main disadvantage is that it has to go through a specific Clearance Process. Time expensive.

b) Trust Funds

- All EC contributions are received as a Closed Trust Funds
- This implies that the TF allows receipt of only one contribution from one donor for one project

- They are treated the same way as cost-sharing arrangements in ATLAS as both are considered project level co-financing with financial support at the project level

c) Basket Funds

Basket Funds are not a separate funding arrangement as contributions to a BF can be received through either the cost-sharing or closed TF mechanism

It is the coordination set up – sometimes underlined by an MOU between the partners and stakeholders involved

The contractual set up – where earmarking is discouraged – can be advantageous

Scenario 2: Funding is received and managed on the basis of a Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF)

MDTFs have not been used as a modality in electoral assistance to date but could be applied within the context of large peacekeeping or political missions run by other parts of the UN

Best case scenario of DEX Implementation Modalities

- Early request from Government to the UN for electoral support
- Early EAD deployment or Desk Review, where applicable, and quick release of the report
- Early coordination of EMB, UNDP and the Development Partners (strategic plan, budget, procurement choice, contributions, etc)
- Early involvement of the Task Force, preferably under a joint formulation mission
- Project Document and Contribution Agreements quickly signed up

- UNDP Clearance no longer an issue, unless ...

Best case scenario of DEX Implementation Modalities

- Quick establishment of Technical and Steering Committees
- Early identification of PMU experts (consultative process) and launching of procurement tendering processes
- CO has undertaken the necessary steps to obtain ATLAS override
- CO has sufficiently organised communication systems and administrative support staff to the PMU
- PMU based inside the EMB, where possible