



UNOPS



**UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT GROUP**



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT GROUP IRAQ TRUST FUND PROJECT # C10-13
MPTF OFFICE GENERIC FINAL PROGRAMME¹ NARRATIVE REPORT
REPORTING PERIOD: FROM 07.2010 TO 3.2012**

<p align="center">Programme Title & Project Number</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: Bridging for Local Area Development Programme to (LADP) Phase II Programme Number: C10-13 MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ UNDG75169 	<p align="center">Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results²</p> <p><i>Country/Region</i> Iraq - Basra, Missan, Thi Qar, Babil, Sulaymaniyah</p> <p><i>Priority area/ strategic results</i> Priority 2 – Inclusive, more equitable and sustainable economic growth Priority 4 – Increased access to quality essential services</p>
<p align="center">Participating Organization(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) ILO UNOPS UN-Habitat 	<p align="center">Implementing Partners</p> <p>Government of Iraq Ministry of Planning (MoP); Kurdistan Regional Government MoP; MoP Planning Directorates, Governor's Offices, and Governorate Councils in Basra, Missan, Thi Qar, Babil, Sulaymaniyah</p>
<p align="center">Programme/Project Cost (US\$)</p> <p>Total approved budget as per project document: MPTF /JP Contribution⁴: \$2,000,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> by Agency (if applicable) Agency Contribution by Agency (if applicable) <p>Government Contribution (if applicable)</p>	<p align="center">Programme Duration</p> <p>Overall Duration (months) 20 Months Start Date⁵ (dd.mm.yyyy) 8 July 2010 Original End Date⁶ (dd.mm.yyyy) 8 July 2011 Actual End date⁷(dd.mm.yyyy) 8 Mar 2012</p> <p>Have agency(ies) operationally closed the Programme in its(their) system? Yes No X <input type="checkbox"/></p>

¹ The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

² Strategic Results, as formulated in the Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) or project document;

³ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as “Project ID” on the project’s factsheet page on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#).

⁴ The MPTF/JP Contribution is the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations – see [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁵ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁶ As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁷ If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. Please see [MPTF Office Closure Guidelines](#).

Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i>	\$2,499,730 (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency SIDA)
TOTAL:	\$4,499,730
Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.	
Evaluation Completed	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>	
Evaluation Report - Attached	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>	

Expected Financial Closure date⁸: 30 Mar 2013

Report Submitted By

- Name: Lionel Laurens
- Title: Programme Management Advisor of Area-Based Development & Delivery of Local Services
- Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP
- Email address: lionel.laurens@undp.org

⁸ Financial Closure requires the return of unspent balances and submission of the [Certified Final Financial Statement and Report](#).

FINAL PROGRAMME REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The LADP Bridging Phase was intended to be a continuation of the Local Area Development Programme (LADP) Phase 1, a USD 30 million project which ran between 2007 and 2010 and sought to improve district level planning against local needs. It was learned through the course of the programme that the UN-led LADP I planning approach must evolve into more governorate-led planning, with greater focus on federal and regional planning authorities (Ministries of Planning). Thus the LADP Bridging phase is composed of three outputs to prepare the ground for a more comprehensive LADP Phase II to begin in 2013. To effectively address the purpose of the LADP Bridging project, a short description of LADP I is provided, followed by an explanation of the discussions leading to LADP Bridging.

LADP I Overview:

In LADP I, a large-scale Joint Programme, seven UN Agencies worked in districts in Northern, Central and Southern Iraq on local area development planning. Work and coordination in different governorates was led by Iraqi Area Coordinators: ILO/UNOPS led in Sulaymaniyah, UN-Habitat led in Babylon, and UNDP led the Marshlands area in Basrah, Missan and Thi-Qar. These Coordinators guided a group of local politicians, representatives of the private sector, community based organisations and local leaders and academics through participatory planning processes to determine local development priorities across sectors from water and sanitation to education, health and municipal services. Following a prescribed methodology, together they framed a vision for their area, prepared district profiles, analysed priorities across sectors, reviewed maps of the area to highlight problems and issues, determined a set of priority programmes and prioritised them against estimates of the forthcoming budget for the next year and the following five years. In addition, for each area, an economic recovery plan was developed with local inputs. Finally, some priority but small infrastructure projects were “fast-tracked” and implemented under LADP. Local politicians, representatives of the private sector, community based organisations and local leaders and academics, many of whom were women, showed an appetite for local decision making. The multi-sectoral work undertaken in the districts with community input was well received by political representatives and technical staff in the Ministries who for the first time had a forum to present district priorities to wide range of local decision makers.

Transitioning the LADP Method:

Following the conclusion of LADP Phase I, Governorate representatives requested further assistance from the UN to extend the programme to all districts within their governorates and to additional governorates and other areas of Iraq. A Lessons Learned workshop at the end of LADP I enabled key project stakeholders and project management to determine that the focus and approach of LADP should shift in two ways, first from the district to the governorate level, and second from UN-led capacity building and capital project support, to locally-owned hands-on capacity building. This shift was due to a number of realizations about local governance procedures, funding and revenue issues, and an overall change in the approach of UN assistance to Iraq, and has been further explained in the “lessons learned” section. To achieve this shift, thought was given to the technical and advocacy work necessary to pave the way for an LADP Phase II to institutionalize integrated participatory local planning on a sustainable basis into governorate-level planning cycles, with support as needed from national-level bodies. It is in this context that the LADP Bridging phase was conceived.

LADP Bridging Overview:

The overall project objective was to build on the lessons from the LADP I (2007–2010) and pave the way for mainstreaming and replicating the LADP methodology in governorates throughout Iraq in Phase II. The programme provided further support to the LADP I Governorates (Basra, Thi-Qar, Missan, Babylon, and Sulaymaniyah) through promoting inclusive and participatory planning practices to promote the prioritization of development programmes and annual planning and budgeting; while providing focused technical assistance to the Governorates to improve essential service delivery. In addition, two further work

streams focused on citizen empowerment to encourage an active voice in governorate affairs and on engagement with ministries at a national level to institutionalize a devolved framework for improved local planning and service delivery. The intent was to ensure that frameworks and processes were in place for organic, locally-led development planning, and to begin building the required capacity for LADP II.

Results and Transition to LADP II:

It was intended that LADP Phase II would emerge from the lessons learned during implementation of LADP I and pending success of the continuation activities under LADP Bridging. With some momentum from LADP I in terms of relationships with local-level authorities and service providers, LADP Bridging was successfully implemented and achieved all of its key expected outputs. Improved ties with the Ministry of Planning led to a keenness of GoI and KRG to implement LADP Principles in all Iraqi governorates. This also led to a Project Document for LADP II that was finalized by UNDP in mid-2012 and approved by GoI.

Pending receipt of funds, LADP II will begin implementation, representing a successful LADP Bridging project overall, and strong ties with all governorates. LADP II will continue forward from LADP Bridging and represent not just an expansion but an enhancement of the existing model, moving from LADP I's district-based, UN-led pilot planning processes to strengthened, institutionalized, inclusive governorate-wide iterative development planning and implementation processes.

I. Purpose

The overall goal of the Local Area Development Programme (LADP) is sustainable local, social and economic development. LADP Phase I laid the groundwork in Basra, Missan, Thi Qar, Babylon, Sulaymaniyah for local participatory planning, pilot initiatives to address urgent needs, and future sustainable planning processes. LADP Bridging intended to continue the work done in these governorates, while further adapting the approach used in LADP I for launching and supporting sustainable mechanisms and institutions at the governorate and at the central level (GoI/KRG Ministries of Planning). This adaptation effort set the stage to link LADP I to a Phase II, focusing on all governorates in Iraq and with a deeper focus on planning processes rather than capital projects.

- **Development Goal/Overall Objective:**

- **The development goal** for this project as stated in the Project Document was *to Enhance key sectors of local economy in most deprived areas*. Further clarified, and as explained in subsequent periodic narrative reports, this meant *improved policies, strategies and related institutional developments that are sensitive to MDGs, social inclusiveness, gender equality and pro-poor economic growth*.

The project also aligned with several broad international, UN and Iraqi strategic development objectives vis-à-vis Iraq. Due to the time of project conception, it is aligned with the previous strategy documents:

- **Iraq National Development Strategy 2007-2010:**

- **Goal 1:** Mitigate poverty and hunger
- **Goal 3:** Enhancing gender equity and strengthening women's issues

- **International Compact with Iraq**

The project aligns with the below benchmarks (per the 2008 Joint Monitoring Matrix):

- **4.3:** Create an enabling environment for investment, public and private, domestic and foreign, as a driver for sustainable and diversified economic growth
- **4.4.1.1:** Eradicate extreme poverty and promote area-based development
- **4.4.1.6:** Reduce gender discrimination, increase participation of women in public life and labour market

- **UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs):**

- **MDG 1** – Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- **MDG 3** – Promote gender equality and empower women
- **MDG 7** – Ensure Environmental Sustainability (with a focus on waste management)

Due to the project’s early conception, it aligned with the above frameworks. However, the project and the subsequent LADP II are aligned with the UNDAF, the most recent UN country-level strategy framework for Iraq:

- **UNDAF Iraq 2011-2014:**
 - **Priority 2** – Inclusive, more equitable and sustainable economic growth
 - **Priority 4** – Increased access to quality essential services

II. Assessment of Programme Results

i) Narrative reporting on results:

- **Outcome:**

The stated outcome of the project was, for the target governorates and planning bodies to *improve policies, strategies and related institutional developments that are sensitive to MDGs, social inclusiveness, gender equality and pro-poor economic growth.*

LADP Bridging work was centered on three areas (outputs) anticipated in the final design of a LADP Phase II. These were (1) inclusive local participatory planning and improved service delivery, (2) local citizen empowerment and civic engagement and (3) developing a national framework and institutional structure for devolved local planning. Combined, these outcomes contributed to the achievement of the project’s outcome.

In terms of local participatory planning, comprehensive Integrated Provincial Annual Plans (IPAPs) for holistic, needs-based local project planning in each target governorate were the result of a series of assessments and capacity-building workshops. The capacity of local and Governorate counterparts and Planning Teams was especially developed towards carrying out this planning process independently as well as for implementing these IPAPs. The importance of incorporating economic principles and outcome-based analyses into planning processes was also inculcated within Governorate planning bodies and working groups, which previously often submitted *ad hoc* plans without a macro level outlook. This represented a shift in planning for outcomes rather than outputs, and it represented alignment with national development priorities (and the MDGs) that includes cross-cutting issues of poverty, environment and gender equality. More importantly, it kick started governorate-led local-level public consultation and poverty-mapping processes that had not previously been employed in the planning process. One particularly promising outcome is that Missan and Basrah Governorates have now established a permanent Planning Team responsible for preparing IPAPs, and have reached out to UNDP proactively for information.

In terms of community engagement, participatory vulnerability assessments in southern governorates were conducted to empower local CSOs and community groups to identify their needs and priorities, to ultimately enable more effective participation in the local planning process. UNDP was able to reach out to numerous communities in Basrah, Thi-Qar, and Missan. Under the ITF-funded portion of the project, initial steps were taken in Sulaymaniyah and Babylon by ILO/UNOPS and UN-HABITAT respectively towards this goal. Additional efforts for more comprehensive community outreach work were funded through the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). LADP Bridging has set the stage for LADP II to fill the gap between ability of local community members to identify and articulate their needs and priorities, into full participation into the process.

In terms of national-level institutionalization of local planning processes, LADP Bridging supported the Iraq Ministries of Planning (MoP) at the federal level and in the Kurdistan Region through a

combination of technical support on assessments, and coordination and communication with the Governorates. MoPs' ability to facilitate and coordinate local area planning – with an eye to further development under LADP II – was strengthened. UNDP took the lead on this capacity development work, whereas all participating agencies supported with capacity development on specialty areas. UN-Habitat provided support on the topics of slum upgrading, urban consultation, conducting feasibility studies, and spatial analysis. ILO/UNOPS supported on integrating economic development goals into the planning process. In addition, a handbook was developed as a guide to local-level planning and will be finalized and disseminated under LADP II.

In all activities, UNDP was able to secure the buy-in of local stakeholders, which facilitated this process. The IPAPs produced were formulated by local appointed planning teams and were endorsed by the Governors of all target Governorates. LADP Bridging built more effective working relationships with Governorates, Provincial Councils and the Provincial-level departments of relevant Line Ministries. Because LADP Bridging began with a stocktaking exercise to better understand the overall planning procedures for each Governorate, LADP techniques have been customized to address key weaknesses and bottlenecks more effectively and to be inserted into these procedures. LADP II will work to more deeply integrate community/local participation into the local planning process by building on the gains from LADP Bridging. Finally, MoPs at the federal and regional levels has been capacitated to be stronger partners in ensuring the sustainability of this all.

b. Outputs:

Output 1: Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development.

- **Output 1.1** Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Basrah, Thi-Qar and Missan (UNDP);
- **Output 1.2** Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Sulaymaniyah Governorate (ILO/UNOPS);
- **Output 1.3** Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Babylon Governorate (UNHABITAT).

Output 1 activities in each targeted governorate included a series of stocktaking exercises and more detailed assessments in each target governorate to better understand current planning procedures, service delivery mechanisms, and institutional effectiveness. This exercise was also used to identify bottlenecks to planning and service delivery and to map and profile all five governorates. This led to 15 planning and capacity development workshops held for relevant government and other stakeholders on local area planning, the development of Integrated Provincial Annual Plans (IPAPs) gender-focused planning among other topics. In each of these workshops, participants included the five Governorates' Planning Teams, governorate-level decision makers, and representatives from the Federal and KRG Ministries of Planning. In addition to the above topics, workshops were held on specific topics applicable to vulnerability and poverty pockets – for example UN-HABITAT provided workshops on spatial planning, slum upgrading (which requires a more careful approach in urban areas due to population density and land ownership history issues), and conducting feasibility studies for planned works and projects. ILO/UNOPS provided training in incorporating basic economic analysis into the planning process. ILO/UNOPS taught planners to identify impediments to the growth of their respective governorates' private sectors and to consider addressing those issues when planning publicly funded projects. Finally, coordination and quality control mechanisms were introduced to participants to improve their respective local governments' administrative capacity to retain lessons learnt and carry these planning processes forward independently in the future. In particular, the Project offered remote support for any beneficiary or counterpart who needed additional advice, support, or feedback in the planning process. These activities resulted in each target governorate increasing its planning capacity, and preparing an IPAP that was approved by governorate authorities. Most importantly, the planning

frameworks introduced were Iraqi-led and owned, and therefore had the added effect of being fully and sustainably incorporated into already-existing planning processes.

Output 2: Local men and women empowered to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction.

- **Output 2.1** *Local men and women empowered to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction in Basrah, Missan and Thi-Qar (UNDP);*
- **Output 2.2** *Local men and women empowered to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction in Sulaymaniyah (ILO/UNOPS);*
- **Output 2.3** *Local men and women empowered to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction in Babylon (UNHABITAT).*

Output 2 activities in each targeted governorate included the preparation of detailed vulnerability assessments for each governorate including the identification of those governorates' most vulnerable geographic pockets and demographic groups. Based on these assessments, the capacity of relevant local CSOs in the target governorates—particularly those with broad reach or those located within identified vulnerability pockets—was developed to empower them to better participate in local development planning through a series of workshops.

In addition, potential models of public, private and community initiatives were analyzed and reviewed in relation to the Iraqi context. This included consideration of an Iraqi Diaspora Exchange Programme, which could link the expertise, skills, and resources of Iraqis who departed Iraq with those who remain. This nascent concept was briefly diagrammed under LADP Bridging and will be a key component of LADP II.

ILO/UNOPS's focus on economic analysis in planning better enabled local authorities to identify and seek out the needs and of pockets of poverty. UN-Habitat took the lead on government-facing capacity building for Urban Consultation, to better enable assessments through discussions and consultations with relevant samples of urban populations. These did not directly impact local populations, but did so indirectly by establishing and emphasizing the need for more detailed information from the grassroots in all governorates.

Output 3: Ministry of Planning (MoP) has improved capacities to facilitate and monitor local planning in relation to central planning.

Output 3 sought to address central planning bodies such as the MoP with interim capacity-development activities intended to pave the way for the more intensive capacity development initiatives planned under LADP II. All workshops provided for governorate-level planning teams included MoP participants. All processes recommended for local planning (such as spatial planning, feasibility studies, etc. described above) were compiled into a Local Area Planning Handbook for use under LADP II and in the future. A blueprint was drafted for MoP's institutional development. MoP and other relevant partners approved the LADP II Programme Document, affirming commitment to the next steps in this capacity-development process.

c. Qualitative Assessment:

A key success of the LADP Bridging programme was the institutional shift away from directly implementing capital and infrastructure-intensive projects, which do not fully take advantage of UNDP's comparative advantages in transferring knowledge, expertise, and best-practice methods, to institutional capacity building with a focus on vulnerable communities and the MDGs. The programme achieved its

objectives and successfully laid a foundation for future LADP phases focused on enhancing the work of central and local government actors, rather than relying on UNDP for implementation.

In LADP I, experts were brought in to support governorate counterparts to develop plans, using basic local-level inputs. The exercise of in-depth planning was new to nearly all counterparts, so this step was necessary. However, under LADP Bridging, this concept was owned and carried out by governorate-level planning teams, and demonstrated inherently the value of planning. This prompted some Planning Teams to ask UNDP for support on developing “multi-year development strategies” to help improve capacity and their governorate as a whole. The governorate of Missan especially stepped forward and asked for support on an overarching provincial development strategy, rather than simply asking for assistance in developing a one-year development plan.

Prior to LADP Bridging, governorate planning teams were isolated and lacked access to holistic information pertinent to planning. Individual sectors reported to line ministries but lacked horizontal communication even on issues where multiple sectors were affected or stood to gain from infrastructure or procedural improvements. LADP Bridging introduced an integrated, holistic approach (via the IPAP) which was not onerous to implement, and rather was seen as very beneficial by provincial and sector counterparts.

Also prior to LADP Bridging, governorates had no bodies dedicated to the production of annual governorate plans. Nobody in these governorates were tasked for, trained for, or empowered for this function. Through LADP Bridging, governorates had to nominate and assemble teams for the purpose of producing plans, and all governorates by the end of the project realized that permanent planning bodies were critical – for developing plans as well as continuously obtaining relevant information from various sectoral, district, and community sources. For example, Basrah Governorate established a full-time planning unit, tasked with obtaining proper information on a regular basis, then producing plans at the appropriate time.

The results attained by the project were also in part thanks to good relationships with the GoI and KRG Ministry of Planning, Provincial Councils, relevant Governor’s Offices, and numerous local authorities. These were developed through regular meetings of Area Coordinators and other programme representatives with influential representatives of these institutions. Upon securing the buy-in of these counterparts, they began to act as “champions” to support new, albeit unknown, planning methods such as the IPAP, to support the economic analysis and spatial techniques introduced by ILO/UNOPS and UN-Habitat respectively and finally, to further emphasize the concept of inclusive, participatory planning.

One of the project’s strength was the decision to liaise in detail with the GoI and KRG Ministries of Planning. Forward-thinking counterparts at these Ministries were interested and committed to improving the overall planning process at the local and central level. Incorporating these ministries had a twofold purpose: (i) to ensure the adoption and funding of 2012 Integrated Plans resulting from the IPAP process; (ii) to secure GoI and KRG MoP buy-in on the IPAP methodology, in view of a possible replication of the LADP programme in other governorates. Ultimately, the two Ministries contributed to the review of the IPAP methodology and provided input for its improvement. Ultimately, this led to an agreement to co-financing LADP II by GoI and KRG, for USD \$4.2 million and \$5.7 million, respectively.

ii) Indicator Based Performance Assessment:

The LADP Bridging project was funded through a combination of ITF and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) funding. The indicators listed below reflect only those that in the Project Document were supported by ITF funding. Programme Outputs with sub-indicators and activities wholly funded by other sources have been clearly labelled.

	Achieved Indicator Targets	Reasons for Variance with Planned Target	Source of Verification
Outcome 1⁹ Improved policies, strategies, and related institutional development that are sensitive to MDGs, social inclusiveness, gender equality and pro-poor economic growth Indicator: Baseline: 0 Planned Target: Yes	Partial	All indicator targets achieved aside from target trainee numbers, due to higher-than-expected male to female ratios in governorate planning teams	Training reports, Letters of Endorsement, Programme records, Governorate council records, strategy/planning documents produced
JP Output 1 <i>Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development</i>			
Output 1.1 <i>Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Basrah, Thi-Qar and Missan</i>			
Indicator 1.1.1 Local planning methodology, capacity development and implementation plan endorsed Baseline: 0 Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Letters of Endorsement
Indicator 1.1.3 Number of government officials trained on local development planning (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 50 (25 Male, 25 Female)	Partial	No Variance	Training reports
Indicator 1.1.5 Number of government officials in 5 LADP Governorates trained on project management and other issues on administrative bottlenecks & corrective measures (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 20 (10 Male, 10 Female)	Partial	No Variance	Training reports
Indicator 1.1.6 Number of government officials trained on natural resource management and climate change (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 20 (10 Male, 10 Female)	Partial	No Variance	Programme records
Indicator 1.1.8 A citizen accountability mechanism for public spending scrutiny and quality control of essential service delivery in place in the Marshlands Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Governorate council records

⁹ Note: Outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets should be as outlines in the Project Document so that you report on your actual achievements against planned targets. Add rows as required for Outcome 2, 3 etc.

Indicator 1.1.9 Number of plans and initiatives taken for strengthening institutional equitable delivery capacities with regard to Municipal Services, Urban Management, Economic Development, Electricity, Water Resources, Health, Education Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 1 Service Plan	Yes	No Variance	Programme records
Output 1.2 <i>Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Sulaymaniyah Governorate</i>			
Indicator 1.2.1 Local planning methodology, capacity development and implementation plan for Sulaymaniyah endorsed Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Letter of endorsement; programme records
Indicator 1.2.3 Number of Government officials trained on economic development and inclusive growth (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 20 (10 Male, 10 Female)	Partial	No Variance	Training reports
Indicator 1.2.5 A citizen accountability mechanism for public spending scrutiny and quality control of essential service delivery in Sulaymaniyah in place Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Governorate council records
Indicator 1.2.6 A plan for strengthening institutional equitable delivery capacities with regard to Municipal Services, Urban Management, Economic Development, Electricity, Water Resources, Health, Education prepared Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Programme records
Output 1.3 <i>Governorate and district officials have strengthened institutional capacities to plan and manage sustainable socio-economic development in Babylon Governorate</i>			
Indicator 1.3.1 Local planning methodology, capacity development and implementation plan for Babylon endorsed Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Letter of endorsement; programme records
Indicator 1.3.3 Number of Government officials trained on urbanization management (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 20 (10 Male, 10 Female)	Partial	No Variance	Training reports
Indicator 1.3.5 A citizen accountability mechanism for public spending scrutiny and quality control of essential service delivery in Babylon in place Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Governorate council records
Indicator 1.3.6 A plan for strengthening institutional equitable delivery capacities with regard to Municipal Services, Urban Management, Economic Development, Electricity, Water Resources, Health, Education for Babylon in place Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Programme records
JP Output 2 <i>Local men and women empowered to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction.</i>			
Output 2.1 <i>Local men and women empowered in Basrah, Missan, and Thi-Qar to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction.</i>			

Indicator 2.1.1 Number of representatives of selected CSOs (including from most vulnerable districts) trained on civil society role and engagement, management, strategic planning, monitoring & evaluation, human rights, gender (disaggregated by gender) Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 10 (5 Male, 5 Female)	Yes	No Variance	Programme records
Indicator 2.1.4 A gender-sensitive analysis of potential models of public, private and community initiatives and partnerships and their applicability to the Iraqi context completed for all LADP areas Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Analysis reports
Output 2.2 Local men and women empowered in Sulaymaniyah to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction. <i>*All activities / indicators under Non-ITF funding</i>			
Output 2.3 Local men and women empowered in Babylon to identify and address their needs and priorities for poverty reduction. <i>*All activities / indicators under Non-ITF funding</i>			
JP Output 3 MOPDC has improved capacities to facilitate and monitor local planning in relation with central planning.			
Output 3.1 MOPDC has improved capacities to facilitate and monitor local planning in relation with central planning.			
Indicator 3.1.1 Sub-national planning guidelines for the use of governorates completed Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Sub-national planning guidelines
Indicator 3.1.2 Revised local area planning handbook completed Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Planning handbook
Indicator 3.1.3 Blueprint for MoPDC institutional development including contribution of LADP Phase II drafted Baseline: No Planned Target: Yes	Yes	No Variance	Programme records

iii) Evaluation, Best Practices and Lessons Learned

- **Evaluation**

An evaluation of this project has not been conducted.

- **Challenges**

One challenge faced by the project was the reluctance from the Ministry of Planning to fully decentralize the planning process, thereby empowering governorates to a greater degree on issues of budget execution, implementation details, etc. Therefore, certain aspects of the LADP concept, specifically those focusing on locally-led planning, had to be adapted to better incorporate federal-level decision makers. This was reflected in the carefully-crafted Output 3, which calls for MoP participation in all training activities under LADP Bridging.

Additionally, careful coordination was required with government counterparts to ensure that the MoP was cooperating with the process. Although planners from MoP were participants in all the workshops held under LADP Bridging, higher-level MoP officials claimed to not know about the project's details, thus delaying progress and causing friction between the different government stakeholders.

High turnover rates for government officials and staff at the central and governorate level presented an additional challenge to the project. For example, in the Sulaymaniyah governorate, several members of the IPAP team left and joined the planning team during the course of the project. This caused some implementation delays as new staff needed additional time to become familiar with all the material covered by the project. However, stability and continuity towards intended results was ensured by core partnerships with senior counterparts, Provincial Council and the Governor's Office.

The final challenge relates to beneficiary enthusiasm, absorption, and follow-through. Learning and absorption from the capacity building workshops could not be predicted in this project, which was intended to be user-owned (rather than a UNDP-owned). The quality, scope, and depth of the draft plans varied from one governorate to another. Some governorates required additional guidance and support (*see section on "remote support" under Best Practices*), which the project provided upon request. The use of this additional support also varied from governorate to governorate, and it was therefore difficult to tell the extent of buy-in of every single counterpart. While the project overall was a success, it was difficult to inculcate into all involved the value and social responsibility of inclusive planning.

Lessons Learned

It was learned that key budget decision-making authority rests with the governorates, not with district authorities. Therefore, the kind of district-level planning processes championed under LADP I would neither be sustainable in the long run nor pragmatic for the LADP Phase II that might cover all of Iraq.

UNDP realized after LADP I that locally-led and informed planning processes would be critical to continued achievement towards Iraq's national development goals; local institutions may not be able to fully replicate the LADP I process, which was led and owned by UNDP and its experts. Thus project steering committee members determined a need to shift the project's focus toward hands-on or on-the-job capacity building of Government and local officials to conduct participatory local planning.

While expertise can be provided by UNDP, UNDP's efforts no longer need to be capital-intensive. There was a reduction in international aid funding to projects in Iraq and a greater availability of resources and funding within Iraq itself as a result of increased oil revenue. It had become critical to shift UNDP's focus

from brick-and-mortar “jumpstart” projects into detailed capacity development efforts. Therefore, LADP Bridging had to shift away from the UN-led planning processes and the “fast track” capital construction/rehabilitation projects and loans that were a key part of LADP I.

Finally, it was learned that not all governorates were very keen to begin approaching the public for input on planning, as this was not emphasized under previous centralized governments. However, other governorates were very interested in new methods for obtaining actionable information from the public. For example, Missan Governorate launched an SMS campaign, sending 30,000 SMS messages directly from the Governor, requesting input on local development priorities. While there was some uncertainty among the public about the messages’ authenticity, in the end the messages resulted in useful information on a variety of needs, and which could support additional statistical analyses of the governorate’s needs. Other governorates and planning teams can learn from this example that public consultation yields useful information.

Best Practices

The shift from LADP I to LADP Bridging improved the way in which UNDP supported the planning process in different governorates. As indicated above, it was learned that budget-owners and decision makers are at the Governorate level, but that districts provide key inputs. UNDP helped streamline information flows in various governorates by working with concerned counterparts to look at relevant sectors and priorities, to better allocate budget between sectors/priorities, and plan integrated works to align with national priorities.

The hands-on, on-the-job approach used in LADP Bridging built sustainable institutional knowledge. UNDP’s sequenced workshops and in-between remote mentoring provided governorate-planning teams with tools and theory and encouraged them to apply those tools using their own resources after the conclusion of each workshop. The UN-led planning approach was necessary at the beginning of LADP I, but this hands-on approach of LADP Bridging has helped to develop sustainable capacity among local counterparts. It has also been a strong motivator for local counterparts.

A ‘remote coaching’ component of the capacity-building workshops in LADP Bridging was well received by the participants. UNDP provided a website where local-level planners could post their questions publicly, so that helpful answers could be shared with all beneficiaries. For more specific issues, e-mail support was provided by project consultants and to address the specificities of certain governorates, consultants had some face-to-face interactions.

Prior to LADP Bridging, governorates had no bodies dedicated to the production of annual governorate plans and any governorate planning teams were isolated and lacked access to holistic information pertinent to planning. Individual sectors reported to line ministries but lacked horizontal communication even on issues where multiple sectors were affected or stood to gain from infrastructure/procedural improvements. LADP Bridging introduced an integrated, holistic approach to planning (the IPAP) which was not onerous to implement, and rather was seen as very beneficial by provincial and sector counterparts. Through LADP Bridging, governorates had to nominate and assemble teams for the purpose of producing plans, and all governorates by the end of the project realized that permanent planning bodies were critical – for developing plans as well as continuously obtaining relevant information from various sectoral, district, and community sources.

The process of preparing these IPAPs was always owned by the governorate planning teams, with guidance and technical inputs from UNDP. Upon approval of an IPAP by a Governor, it represented a strong overview of the governorate-level planning landscape for that year, and was a tool for local decision makers to understand all key priorities within a governorate. Within an IPAP, every project were intended to be housed under different funding mechanisms, implementing institutions and ministries, but nevertheless it represented a unified approach to addressing governorate-wide needs.

The local planning manual that was produced, for Output 3, was primarily intended to be a tool for the federal and regional Ministries of Planning to provide necessary and useful guidance to local planners. Noticeably, the manual was also seen as a valuable tool by the governorate planning teams. Under LADP II, KRG requested that the manual be updated for the specific needs of Kurdistan region and to be translated into Kurdish.