

The One UN Programme 2007-2010
Building capacities for development

between the

Government of Uruguay

and the

United Nations System in Uruguay



Contents

Glossary	3
Framework	5
Part I. Basis for the Relationship	5
Part II. Situation Analysis	7
Part III. Cooperation and expertise acquired in the past: results obtained and lessons learnt	12
Part IV. The One UN Programme	13
Budgetary Framework of the One UN Programme in Uruguay (2007-2010) by financing source and estimated funding gap. In USD.	15
Part V. Strategy regarding cooperation partnerships	16
Part VI. The One UN Programme Management	16
Part VII. Monitoring and Evaluation	18
Part VIII. Commitments by UN System and the Government	19
Part IX. Other provisions	19
Signatures	20
Annex. Outputs and resources matrix	22

Glossary

AECI	<i>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional</i> (Spanish Agency for International Cooperation)
ANEP	<i>Administración Nacional de Educación Pública</i> (National Administration for State Education)
BCU	<i>Banco Central del Uruguay</i> (Central Bank of Uruguay)
BDP	<i>Bureau on Development Policies</i>
BPS	<i>Banco de Previsión Social</i> (State Pension Fund)
CAIF	<i>Centros de Atención a la Infancia y la Familia</i> (Attention Centres for Infancy and Family)
CAU	<i>Colegio de Abogados del Uruguay</i> (Uruguay's Bar Association)
CCA	<i>Common Country Assessment</i>
CIU	<i>Cámara de Industrias del Uruguay</i> (Chamber of Industry of Uruguay)
DEX	<i>Direct Execution</i>
DINACIA	<i>Dirección Nacional de Aviación Civil</i> (Department for Aviation)
DINARA	<i>Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos</i> (Aquatic Resources Office)
ECLAC	<i>Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean</i>
FAO	<i>FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</i>
FLACSO	<i>Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales</i> (Latin American Social Science Faculty)
GEF	<i>GEF – Global Environmental Facility</i>
HIV/AIDS	<i>Human Immune Deficiency Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</i>
IAEA	<i>International Atomic Energy Agency</i>
IDB	Inter American Development Bank
IFAD	<i>International Fund for Agricultural Development</i>
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INAMU	<i>Instituto Nacional de la Mujer</i> (National Institute for Women)
INAU	<i>Instituto del Niño y Adolescente del Uruguay</i> (Uruguayan Institute for Children and Adolescents)
INDA	<i>Instituto Nacional de Alimentación</i> (National Food Institute)
INE	<i>Instituto Nacional de Estadística</i> (National Statistics Institute)
INFAMILIA	<i>Programa Infancia, Adolescencia y Familia</i> (Programme on Infancy, Adolescence and Family)
ILO/CINTERFOR	<i>International Labour Organization / Inter-American Research and Documentation Centre on Vocational Training</i>
IOM	<i>International Organization for Migration</i>
IPU	<i>Inter-Parliamentary Union</i>
MDG	<i>Millennium Development Goals</i>
MDN	<i>Ministerio de Defensa Nacional</i> (Chief of Staff)
MEC	<i>Ministerio de Educación y Cultura</i> (Ministry of Education and Culture)
MEF	<i>Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas</i> (Treasury)
MERCOSUR	<i>Mercado Común del Sur</i> (Customs Union)
MGAP	<i>Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca</i> (Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries)
MI	<i>Ministerio del Interior</i> (Ministry of the Interior)
MIDES	<i>Ministerio de Desarrollo Social</i> (Ministry of Social Development)
MIEM	<i>Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Minería</i> (Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining)
MRREE	<i>Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores</i> (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
MSP	<i>Ministerio de Salud Pública</i> (Ministry of Public Health)
MT	<i>Ministerio de Turismo y Deporte</i> (Ministry of Tourism and Sports)
MTSS	<i>Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social</i> (Ministry of Labour and Social Security)
MVOTMA	<i>Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente</i> (Ministry of Housing, Land Use Management and Environment)

NGO	<i>Non-Governmental Organization</i>
OCHA	<i>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</i>
ONSC	<i>Oficina Nacional de Servicio Civil</i> (Department of Civil Service)
OPP	<i>Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto</i> (Budget and Planning Office)
PEDECIBA	<i>Programa de Desarrollo de las Ciencias Básicas</i> (Programme to Develop Basic Sciences)
PRODAL	<i>Programa de Desarrollo de la Democracia en América Latina</i> (Programme of Democracy Development in Latin America)
RCUN	<i>Resident Coordinator of the United Nations</i>
REDEL	<i>Proyecto de recuperación del empleo a través de apoyo a la creación y consolidación de micro y pequeñas empresas en el marco de estrategias de desarrollo económico local.</i> (Project on Employment)
SCJ	<i>Suprema Corte de Justicia</i> (Supreme Court of Justice)
UdeLaR	<i>Universidad de la República</i> (University of the Republic)
UNAIDS	<i>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</i>
UNCT	<i>United Nations Country Team</i>
UNDAF	<i>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</i>
UNDP	<i>United Nations Development Programme</i>
UNEP	<i>United Nations Environment Programme</i>
UNESCO	<i>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</i>
UNFPA	<i>United Nations Population Fund</i>
UN-Habitat	<i>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</i>
UNHCR	<i>United Nations Commissioner for Refugees</i>
UNHCHR	<i>United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights</i>
UNICEF	<i>United Nations Children's Fund (previously: United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund)</i>
UNIDO	<i>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</i>
UNIFEM	<i>United Nations Development Fund for Women</i>
UNOPS	<i>United Nations Office for Project Services</i>
WB	<i>World Bank</i>
WHO/PHAO	<i>World Health Organization / Pan American Health Organization</i>
WOT	<i>World Tourism Organization</i>

Framework¹

The Director of the Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto² (hereinafter “the OPP”) on behalf of the Government of Uruguay and the Resident Coordinator (hereinafter the “RC”) of the United Nations System (hereinafter the “UNS”) in Uruguay on its behalf, have agreed upon the content of this document and their respective responsibilities in the implementation of the One UN Programme in Uruguay (hereinafter the “One UN Programme”).

In order to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (hereinafter the “MDG”) and the other internationally agreed goals and targets concerning development, and building on previous cooperation background between the Government and the UN Country Team (hereinafter the “UNCT”), in particular within the *United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2007-2010* (hereinafter the “UNDAF”) signed by both parties on 28 April 2006, and

In response to the Government's letter, dated 6 December 2006, to the Chair of the United Nations Development Group (hereinafter the “UNDG”), expressing the country's interest in becoming one of the "pilot" countries in the United Nations Reform (“Delivering as One”), in order to foster more policy, programmatic and substantive coherence, synergy and complementarity among the UN Agencies, Commissions, Funds and Programmes (hereinafter “Agencies”);

Within the cooperation period spelled out in the UNDAF (2007-2010),

Declare that such responsibilities will be met in a spirit of close cooperation and have agreed on the following:

Part I. Basis for the Relationship

- 1.1 In 2004, the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR) called for an effort to enhance UN System-wide coherence and effectiveness. Later on, in 2005, the General Assembly invited the Secretary General to promote the process of improved management and coordination of UN activities.
- 1.2 Stemming from the TCPR mandate, the High-Level Panel for the United Nations System Reform submitted a report, in November 2006, whereby they presented a set of recommendations to be followed, geared to enhancing coherence, efficacy and impact of UN System delivery. Among such recommendations, pilot experiences called "Delivering as One" were suggested to be carried out during 2007 -in parallel with the inter-governmental discussion of such report-.
- 1.3 Between October 2003 and April 2004, the UN System in Uruguay promoted a broad dialogue on the MDG, in cooperation with different State stakeholders (National Government and Local Governments) and the civil society (NGOs, labour unions, business and academic institutions), with the objective of building a wide national consensus around the national goals to be achieved by 2015.

¹ This is a translation of the original agreement signed in Spanish. Only the Spanish version is authentic.

² Budget and Planning Office.

- 1.4 Based on this experience, the Government and the UN System in Uruguay elaborated - between March 2005 and April 2006- the UNDAF 2007-2010, where four “National Priorities” are established, expressing the Government’s strategic framework, to orientate the country’s action with the support of the UN System, during that four years period, namely:
- a) “**Achieve sustained and sustainable economic growth**”, emphasizing diversification of production, international insertion (in and out of the region), incorporating scientific innovation in the processes of production and increasing investment;
 - b) “**Reduce poverty** (particularly among the youngest generations) **and eradicate extreme poverty**”;
 - c) “**Reduce inequities** (economic, social, territorial, inter-generational, gender, ethnic or other) from the outset and in terms of access to high quality social services”;
 - d) “**Promote the enforcement of human rights and increase the quality of democracy**, by enhancing civil, political and social citizenship.”³
- 1.5 Like the UNDAF, the One Programme will be developed through three complementary intervention modalities: (a) support for the design, execution and evaluation of public policies; (b) support for capacity building; (c) implementation of “pilot” experiences in the territory, which can serve as examples, with emphasis on citizen participation and empowerment. Such intervention modalities have certain specific features in Uruguay, as a result of its condition of “high -middle income” country and its budgetary capacities to face expenses, shown in a high degree of public spending in comparison to GDP. In a “high-middle income” and “high human development” country, the UN System added value depends a lot more on its capacity to support the design, execution and evaluation of high-quality public policies to strengthen national capacities, to encourage dialogue among different stakeholders and to promote model experiences in the territory, rather than the financial contribution it can make.
- 1.6 Since the letter of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated 6 December 2006, expressing Uruguay’s interest in becoming a “Delivering as One” pilot country, the leadership of the pilot process in Uruguay has been undertaken jointly by the Director of the OPP, on behalf of the Government, and the RC, on behalf of the UNS, including the Non-Resident Agencies (hereinafter the “NRA”), those UN Agencies which do not have a Resident Representative accredited in Uruguay.
- 1.7 The One UN Programme is based on both a Human Rights and a Human Development approach steering the delivery of the UN as a more coherent system, and of each of its Agencies at the national, regional and global level.
- 1.8 On the basis of this integrated approach, the One UN Programme will be duly owned by all the national stakeholders (State, civil society stakeholders and citizenship) who will join their efforts to advance towards and ultimately achieve the MDG through the elaboration of appropriate policies and the implementation of the corresponding strategies.⁴

³ United Nations System in Uruguay: *Common Country Assessment 2005 - UN Development Assistance Framework 2007-2010*, Trilce, Montevideo, 2006.

⁴ On 10 March 2005, the Government of Uruguay submitted the "Report on the Roundtable Panels on the Millennium Development Goals" to the United Nations. This report contains the main lessons learnt in the dialogue process on the MDG, carried out with the participation of a wide range of stakeholders during 2003 and 2004. In addition, it includes the agreements on the national MDG targets the country is committed to attain by 2015.

- 1.9 Towards contributing to the achievement of the MDG, the One UN Programme is geared to become a tool, both for the Government and civil society, to address the four National Priorities spelled out in the UNDAF.
- 1.10 During the process of elaboration of the One Programme, the Government expressed its interest in strengthening the UN System cooperation in some of the programmatic areas included in the UNDAF, namely: (a) to strengthen state capacities to plan development strategies; (b) to promote citizen participation in the territory as well as local development; (c) to strengthen social public policies, social inclusion programmes and plans to fight against different sources of inequity and discrimination.
- 1.11 Finally, in order to successfully meet the four UNDAF National Priorities as well as their corresponding Outcomes, the One UN Programme aims at reaching a series of Outputs that reflect the missions, mandates and the expertise of the different UN Agencies.⁵
- 1.12 These outputs reflect the UN traditional inter-agency thematic areas:
- a) Support for the design of policies to **promote production** (especially small **and medium scale enterprises**) and **scientific and technological innovation**.
 - b) Support for **territorial planning** and for promotion of policies aiming at **local sustainable development**.
 - c) Support for **social policies** (education, employment oriented towards reaching the objective of decent work, health, social security and housing) and plans of **poverty reduction** and eradication of extreme poverty (especially targeting women, children and youth);
 - d) Support for **policies, plans and programmes to fight inequity** (economic, social, territorial, inter-generational, gender, ethnic or other) **and discrimination**.
 - e) Support for processes of **modernization of State institutions** and promotion of **citizens' participation** in the design, management, monitoring and evaluation of public policies at national and local levels.
 - f) Promotion of **HIV/AIDS-related** policies and strategies.
 - g) Support for the design of **population policies**, including as well issues such as migration, relationship with the Uruguayan Diaspora and demographic dimensions.

Part II. Situation Analysis

- 2.1. During most of the 20th Century, Uruguay was considered a relatively developed society within Latin America. According to the *2006 Human Development Report*, Uruguay ranks 43rd among 63 countries with “high human development”. With life expectancy of around 75.6, a literacy rate of 97.7% in the age bracket over 15⁶, a combined school enrolment rate of 89% and per capita GDP of USD 9.421 (PPP 2004), Uruguay is still one of the most developed societies in the continent. In addition to these rather positive indicators –in comparison with other countries in the region– Uruguay has historically stood out within the region for its low levels of poverty and inequality.

⁵ Resident Agencies in the country (The World Bank, the IMF, ECLAC, FAO, UNIDO, PAHO/WHO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF), as well as Agencies that have technical and managerial staff (ILO/CINTERFOR, UNIFEM, IFAD, UNOPS) and Non-Resident Agencies (DPI, UNEP, OCHA, IAEA, etc). The IOM is also a member of the UNCT.

⁶ Human Development Report 2005.

- 2.2. When examining some democratic quality and political culture variables –in particular, the Democracy Support Index⁷– and the historical relevance social policies and social public spending have had in the country (20.9% of GDP in 2003⁸) Uruguay also stands out among the countries in the region.
- 2.3. Even though Uruguay is one of the 96 countries in the World labelled as “middle income countries” – and, within that group, one of the 44 countries labelled as “high-middle income countries”–, its evolution over the last four decades leads to the conclusion that the Uruguayan society is facing serious problems or obstacles to reach higher levels of human development: in particular, to achieve sustained and sustainable economic growth, to reduce the incidence of poverty and inequality in income distribution and to strengthen the quality of its institutions and policies. The fact of being a “high-middle income” country (the only among eight “pilot” countries in the United Nations System Reform, “Delivering as One”) does not imply that Uruguay has assured, in the mid and long term, the human development indicators reached. In fact, Uruguay has not been able to develop sustained and sustainable growth trajectory, or to prevent the dramatic erosion of the social progress previously made.⁹
- 2.4. An analysis of the Uruguayan economic performance over the last four decades clearly reveals the vulnerability of the country in terms of external shocks and its relative inability to deploy a sustainable development process that provides quality jobs to broad population sectors. To describe the timid dynamics of the Uruguayan economy over the last forty years, in comparison with the rest of the world, it is enough to mention that real GDP growth rate between 1960 and 2004 accounted for 1.9% in Uruguay *vis-à-vis* an average 3.7% worldwide¹⁰. These dynamics are associated to weak investment and saving capacities as well as the difficulties to incorporate scientific innovations in processes of production. One of the main challenges Uruguay has to face so as to consolidate economic growth is to diversify its productive structure, incorporating activities that require intensive use of knowledge and innovation, adding greater value to the present structure and allowing a better international insertion. This implies that the country will not only resort to its comparative advantages -its capacity to export agricultural and farming production- and its service areas, but also to industrialization, strengthening the existing agro-industrial chains and generating new ones.
- 2.5. The consistent trend to backwardness in terms of economic growth mentioned above is a major explanation of the social problems affecting the country. In addition, the economic recession experienced by Uruguay between 1999 and 2003 -leading to a GDP drop of 17% - placed the State in a situation of high indebtedness. Besides, recession also contributed to accelerating the emigration trend initiated four decades ago, one of the outstanding demographic characteristics in the country. The consequences of international emigration are mainly negative: first, because the emigrants’ educational level and training are above the national average; second, because emigrants are young, which contributes to making the resident population in the country older, generating higher pressures on the social security and health care systems.

⁷ According to the latest Report of the Latin-barometer Project, "Support for Democracy" in Uruguay accounts for 77% of public opinion (the highest level among 18 countries analyzed and 24 points over the regional average).

⁸ ECLAC: *Panorama Social de América Latina 2006*, Ed. ECLAC, Santiago de Chile, 2007.

⁹ Concentration of poverty among children and adolescents, growth of inequalities in income distribution, outburst of social exclusion processes, high emigration rates among the youth, etc.

¹⁰ Bértola, Luis and Gustavo Bittencourt: “Veinte años de democracia sin desarrollo”. See, Caetano, Gerardo (Dir.): *20 años de democracia. Uruguay: miradas múltiples*. Taurus, Montevideo, 2005 p.314 – 315.

- 2.6 However, it is important to point out that, after the crisis, the country has given out clear signs of recovery and therefore some of these trends could be slowed down and even reversed. It must be highlighted that Uruguay has recovered the economic growth trend in the course of the last three years, recording a real annual GDP variation of 11.8% in 2004, 6.6% in 2005, and 7% in 2006¹¹, which is reflected on a significant reduction of unemployment (going from a rate of about 20% in the last quarter of 2002 to 9.6%¹² recorded in the last quarter of 2006), a real increase in terms of household income and the subsequent reduction of poverty and extreme poverty levels. Between 2004 and the second semester of 2006, the percentage of population under the "poverty line" was reduced from 31.9 to 24.3%, as well as that of the population in a situation of abject poverty (from 3.9% to 1.4%).¹³
- 2.7 Despite the recent economic recovery and the corresponding improvement in social indicators, the situation is still very dramatic. Regardless of a reduction in poverty and extreme poverty recorded in the last two years, the proportion of poverty-ridden population is still significantly higher in the second half of 2006 compared to 1999: 24.3% and 15.3%, respectively.¹⁴ Changes in the labour market and reproductive patterns in society over the last fifteen years have contributed to reinforce the reproduction of poverty and to concentrate it on the youngest generations. This situation is particularly unfavourable to children, adolescents and youth. In this sense, there is a series of phenomena requiring special attention: psycho-motor disorders in children, malnutrition early in life and adolescent pregnancy.
- 2.8 The processes and phenomena mentioned above are reflected in the educational system. The insufficient educational results still present in the Uruguayan system (high levels of repetition and over-aged students in school and extremely high dropout levels in high-school), regardless of the efforts made over the last years in this field can, to a great extent, be attributed to deficits faced by a high proportion of the households having boys, girls and adolescents. On this issue, it is important to highlight the need to advance on educational reforms that incorporate, among other elements, subjects that contribute in citizen education, encouraging their entrepreneurial capacities and incorporating them to the labour dynamics in the different geographic areas of the country. Finally, it is key to pay attention to the results of the educational system, especially those of adolescents and young people; in particular, those who abandon school as a result of accumulated experiences of failure (with the subsequent scanty accumulation of human capital), as these processes contribute to the absence or at least weakness of socialization in adolescence, leading to serious deficits in terms of human development and social integration.
- 2.9 Regarding the demographic profile of the country and its recent evolution, Uruguay is different from the majority of the countries in the continent because its process of demographic transition started very early, showing at present an ageing population structure. Uruguay is the most ageing country in Latin America and the Caribbean, with 13% of its population being 65 years old, or older. The fall in terms of birth rate has not been homogeneous; there is greater polarization in reproductive patterns, that is, women who have access to information and those with lower educational levels who have children at a

¹¹ Economics Institute, School of Economics, Udelar: *Report on Present Situation by the Economics Institute, School of Economics*, Montevideo, June 2007.

¹² Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Uruguay.

¹³ Amarante, Verónica and Vigorito, Andrea: *Evolution of Poverty in Uruguay 2001-2006*. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Montevideo, 2007, p. 4- 5.

¹⁴ Instituto Nacional de Estadística: *Evolución de la pobreza por el método del ingreso. Uruguay 1986-2001*, Montevideo, 2002.

younger age and, therefore, tend to have more (2.3 versus 5.7 children per women on average, respectively; whereas the desirable number for most of the women, independently of their social performance, is 2). This situation can be associated to a lack of options, ineffective fulfilment of reproductive rights, absence of sexual education in the formal curriculum and to serious restrictions to manage reproductive health (especially among adolescents).

- 2.10 Inequalities between men and women, as well as other kinds of discrimination, persist and are manifested both in the public and private arena. Poor access of women to decision-making spheres is one of the main weaknesses in this regard, also present in the three Government Branches. As an example, women account for only 11% of Parliament. In the private sector, one flagrant manifestation of inequality is domestic violence. Even though women reach higher educational levels compared to men and they are increasingly becoming part of the labour market, there is still great horizontal and vertical segregation of female workers in Uruguay. Finally, sexual division of labour is a source of concern: women devote 67% of their time to non-remunerated work and 33% to remunerated work, whereas in the case of men, the opposite applies.
- 2.11 With reference to the situation of the health system, the Government has started a profound reform of the health sector aiming at generating a less segmented service provision, more equitable in terms of quality and more efficient in a country that allocates approximately 10% of its GDP to health, combining public and private spending (UNDP 2006). Given this situation, the following challenges need to be pointed out: (a) move ahead to reduce child mortality putting an emphasis on neo-natal and post-neo-natal components; (b) ensure equity during pregnancy, birth and early infancy of girls and boys; (c) reduce maternal mortality due to avoidable causes such as unsafe abortion; (d) achieve greater equity in the quality of health-care services and the reduction of overlapping in different health sub-systems.
- 2.12 Concerning HIV/AIDS, the epidemic in Uruguay has grown; there is a tendency towards the infection of more women and young people. The absence of sustained public policies to promote access to information, self-care and mutual care in sexual practices needs to be highlighted. In addition, there is neither mass information nor awareness campaigns oriented to fighting against this epidemic.
- 2.13 Besides, ensuring sustainable development is a key factor in a country where natural resources represent the basis of its main productive activities. Uruguay has experienced increased vulnerability and risk as a result of human activities that generate environmental changes of local and global scale (climate change). Also, changes taking place in the productive use of land and related activities need to be harmonized with local economic activities and protection of the environment. Coastal areas are under stress due to inappropriate use of land. Climate change generates important social, environmental and economic consequences. Renewable energies, in particular hydroelectric energy, play an important role in the Uruguayan energy matrix. Given the increase in energy consumption and the uncertainty of the fossil-fuels market, the country is moving towards diversification of its energy sources as well as greater energy efficiency. There is great informality in recycling activities in the solid urban waste management sector, linked to poverty, which requires social inclusion programmes. Likewise, it is clear that one of the main challenges in this field is to improve treatment systems and final disposal of solid household and industrial waste, as well as to strengthen legal, monitoring and control instruments (of liquid and atmospheric emissions). In order for natural resources management to contribute to the building of a country that is productive, competitive and sustainable, several actions

are being undertaken in the field of information dissemination and environmental education, to build on local capacity and to increase citizenship participation in decision-making processes relative to environmental issues.

- 2.14 Finally, though Uruguay has been able to move ahead during recent years in strengthening its State institutions, it is possible to pinpoint some areas that require more concerted effort. In this sense, one must bear in mind that strengthening "the quality of democracy"¹⁵ is closely related to the fulfilment of human rights (civil, political, economic and cultural); the quality and strength of democratic institutions depend on the effective fulfilment of human rights and are, at the same time, an essential condition to protect citizens' rights effectively. To guarantee human rights and to increase democratic quality it is necessary to strengthen institutional capacities in governmental branches (Executive, Legislative and Judiciary) to design, implement, monitor and evaluate high quality public policies and also to generate a "culture of rights" in society so as to strengthen citizens and social organizations' participation as agents with capacity to express and promote demands. The State's institutional capacity needs to be strategic and must be deployed in all fields of public policy: population, childhood, competitiveness, employment oriented towards decent work, education, health, security, defence, etc. and, above all, it must allow for better articulation of policies and programmes both horizontally (across State sectors) and vertically (across local, department¹⁶ and national levels). In the field of social policies, it is necessary to advance in the direction steered by the Government to strengthen coordination across the different public entities in charge of executing social policies: ANEP, BPS, MEC, MIDES, MSP, MTSS, etc.
- 2.15 Historically, the Uruguayan territory has been administered through a centralized modality. This has produced a notorious unbalance in the distribution of population, public and private investment and development of services and, especially, opportunities for the inhabitants of the hinterland, in particular of rural areas. This lack of balance in the distribution and use of resources has led to different levels of development observed when comparing the different regions in the country. In this context, we must pay attention to the recent evolution of local governments; over the last few years they have gained more participation in the management of public policies, beyond their traditional areas of competence. This advance is part of a tendency, present in other political systems in the region and in the world: to strengthen the institutional mechanisms directed to fostering political decentralization, local development and community participation. However, the local governments' management capacity has not necessarily followed the rhythm of demands and new challenges the municipalities have to face. In this sense, the Government has set as an objective, within the framework of the One Programme, to stimulate an important process of political decentralization (reinforcing the role of local governments and citizen participation in their communities), to contribute in improving the quality of public policies and direct control of citizens over public services management.
- 2.16 To summarise, the complexity of those social and economic processes affecting the country for several decades¹⁷ requires the development of active and integrated public policies -not just the aggregation of different sectoral policies in one territory-, articulating multiple interventions and resources. Despite the positive evolution observed over the last two years

¹⁵ UNDP: *La democracia en América Latina. Hacia una democracia de ciudadanas y ciudadanos*, PRODAL-UNDP, Madrid, 2004.

¹⁶ Administrative division of the country.

¹⁷ The growth of extreme poverty, increasing inequalities, the emergence of new patterns of social exclusion, residential segregation, transformations at the level of family structure, the demographic structure of the country, business competitiveness, the incorporation of technological innovation into productive processes, etc.

– the recovery of economic growth, the improvement of major social indicators, etc. – Uruguay must face in the coming years a series of challenges in order to achieve sustained and sustainable development (challenges that have been identified by the Government and the UN System in the UNDAF). Accordingly, it must be pointed out that several economic and social policies, as well as institutional reforms the Government has implemented over the last two years -in many instances with support from the UN System- are stewarded towards that same direction.

Part III. Cooperation and expertise acquired in the past: results obtained and lessons learnt

- 3.1 Between October 2003 and April 2004, the UNS together with the Government promoted a broad and profound debate on the MDG with the purpose of cooperating to attain those goals the Government engaged in achieving by 2015. On the basis of that participatory experience, the Government and the UNS elaborated the UNDAF 2007-2010 in 2005-2006 and signed it on April 28 that year. It must be pointed out that the preparation of the UNDAF was not a mandate for the UNS, given the characteristics of the country. However, the UNCT considered it relevant -so as to build on the UNS strategic planning capacity to ensure coherence in deliveries by Agencies and to maximize impact and efficiency- to formulate an UNDAF, the first since UNS is present in the country. The Government expressed their interest in participating actively in the process of formulation of the UNDAF as this represented an excellent opportunity to cement cooperation ties with the UNS.
- 3.2 The “Delivering as One” process stands on cooperative work across Agencies, characterized by their coming together to share ideas and make decisions collectively. This working methodology is allowing for significant improvement in mutual knowledge across Representatives and technical staff of the different Agencies, as well as of the projects each Agency develops in the country. Thus, the lessons learnt by working jointly have allowed for enhanced coordination in UNS deliveries. It is to be highlighted the work on new programming processes of the agencies, implemented in line with national priorities and the CCA/UNDAF.
- 3.3 In addition to the above, it is essential to highlight the contribution to strengthen UNS coherence and impact of its interventions in the field, and the work being carried out for several years by different thematic groups: "Population and Gender", "HIV/AIDS", "Food Security", "CCA-UNDAF and Human Rights", "Communications" and "Disaster Management".
- 3.4 Also, the active and growing participation of Non-Resident Agencies over the last two years through technical missions and fluid and permanent contact with the Resident Coordinator's Office must be acknowledged.
- 3.5 Among the positive outcomes stemming from the work performed by resident and non-resident Agencies, the following stand out:
 - a) The UNCT has consolidated its role as strategic steering body of the UNS in Uruguay.
 - b) A more intense dialogue is observed between NRA and the UN System in Uruguay.

- c) A learning process has been generated spurred by joint work of UNS Agencies; this has allowed for the creation of inter-agency professional groups with great potential.
- d) The elaboration of joint projects and of the One UN Programme has allowed for the generation of a new communications and information system.

3.6 Lastly, inter-agency response capacity has improved and this has been reflected on joint field activities as, for example, cooperation provided during a national emergency triggered by floods in May this year. This has contributed to a greater -though still insufficient-visibility of the UNS as a whole, at the level of the mass media.

Part IV. The One UN Programme

4.1. The One UN Programme includes several outputs oriented towards reaching those four outcomes agreed upon by the Government and the UNS in the UNDAF. It also joins –due to its strategic character– a sub-group of the Outputs included in the UNDAF and it incorporates nine new Outcomes – defined by the UN System and the Government together – (see Annex: Outputs and Resources Matrix) so as to strengthen the “added value” of the UNS working jointly.

4.2. In order to attain these new outputs –incorporated into the UNDAF Results Matrix– the UNS will develop, together with the different “Implementing Partners”, a series of projects and activities that will be fully articulated with those the Agencies are already carrying out within the UNDAF.

4.3 The One Programme contains four programmatic areas. Regarding the first, the Agencies will implement a series of projects and actions for the country to advance, between 2007 and 2010, on: product diversification, incorporation of knowledge and innovation on production processes, improvement of the insertion of the Uruguayan economy in and out of the region. The actions to be developed jointly by the Agencies in this area, in cooperation with the Government, will aim at generating high quality jobs, thus contributing to the improvement of welfare levels in society. In connection with this area, the emphasis of cooperation is placed on entrepreneurial promotion -especially micro, small and medium-sized enterprises- stimulating local development and protection of the environment. The second area refers to projects focused on strengthening social policies and plans to overcome abject poverty, with the objective of reinforcing human capital and reversing processes of social exclusion, especially among the most vulnerable sectors: children, young people and women. The third area corresponds to actions aiming at reducing inequity gaps (gender, generational, territorial, ethnic, etc.), as well as to confront discrimination. Finally, the fourth area, points at advancing in terms of democratic quality, by means of strengthening State institutions and promoting citizen participation. In this sense, the One Programme will intend – by means of mobilizing new resources, to contribute to the Government’s objective of promoting political decentralization processes in the framework of the State Reform.

4.4 Here follows a matrix which summarises the Budgetary Framework of the One Programme, where existing resources (regular and extra budgetary) and the funding gap – estimated by the Government and the UN System – can be identified.

4.5 Regarding the figures shown in the matrix that follows – in the columns corresponding to “regular resources” and “other resources” (bilateral cooperation, UN Funds, private sector and others)- as well as the ones presented in the Annex of this document (Outputs and Resources Matrix) it is necessary to clarify that they are, in many cases, estimations, due to two reasons: (a) concerning Agencies’ “regular resources”, the amounts allocated for

programs or cooperation plans by some of them, are estimations subject to availability of resources (of their own or to be mobilized), for some other Agencies, such programs expire before 2010 and, therefore, they will have to sign new cooperation programs in the following years so as to obtain new resources; (b) regarding “other resources” (bilateral cooperation, decentralized, UN Funds, private sector, others), such funds are still being negotiated or are estimations agreed between the Agencies and their counterparts, within their respective cooperation agreements.

Budgetary Framework of the One UN Programme in Uruguay (2007-2010) by financing source and estimated funding gap (in USD)

<i>UNDAF Outcomes</i>	Agencies' Regular Resources	Other resources being negotiated or already mobilized by the Agencies		Funding Gap	Total
		Bilateral Cooperation, decentralized, UN Funds, private sector, others.	Governmental Budget and Loans from International Financial Institutions (IDB and WB) executed by the Agencies		
1. "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services."	2,522,084	20,867,367	8,945,279	4,880,000	37,214,730
2. "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies to eradicate extreme poverty and reduce poverty."	1,676,790	11,548,934	11,729,014	3,450,000	28,404,738
3. "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies that facilitate access to high quality, equitable social services, the reduction of discrimination and the promotion of social integration processes."	1,424,000	21,17,993	0	900,000	4,441,993
4. "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the effective harmonization of its legislation and national practices relative to international commitments and in strengthening public institutions and the civil society to formulate, execute, follow-up and evaluate public policies."	1,023,151	1,425,823	17,179,922	5,770,000	25,398,896
Total	6,646,025	35,960,117	37,854,215	15,000,000	95,460,357

Part V. Strategy regarding cooperation partnerships

- 5.1. In order to carry out this One UN Programme, the UNS and the Agencies it gathers build on the expertise and capacities developed over recent years. Each Agency's experience of joint and individual work consolidates the UNS: i) to contribute to the articulation of the different public sector stakeholders and of the latter with society, and promote dialogue around country visions and strategic issues; ii) to provide technical input to formulate policies and strategies; iii) to contribute to building national capacities for its execution; iv) to support the implementation of public policies and development programmes; and v) to provide technical assistance to the National Government, Provincial Governments and other State institutions so they can improve their efficiency in the provision of public goods and services.
- 5.2. In addition to the close collaboration with the Government and other State institutions, the UN System -in particular, within the framework of the One Programme- will seek to strengthen its cooperation ties with donors, NGOs, academia and the private sector.
- 5.3. The strategic repositioning of the Government's international cooperation policy implies substantive institutional changes which will optimize the capacities to get, receive, implement, monitor, follow-up and evaluate the cooperation resources the country will be provided with. In that sense, law 18.172, article 116, from 31 August 2007, establishes the creation of the Uruguayan Institute for International Cooperation (IUCI), chaired by OPP.

Part VI. The One UN Programme management

- 6.1 The UNDAF constitutes the basis for the One UN Programme. The Programme contributes in the development of synergies among the UN Agencies; it provides strategic direction to the programmes of the Agencies participating in the "Delivering as One" pilot and it is designed in such a way that the programmes of other organs of the UNS can easily be incorporated if seen as relevant, together with the other Agencies subscribing the One UN Programme and the Government.
- 6.2 The One UN Programme will be implemented in collaboration between the Government, under the overall coordination of the OPP, and the UNS, lead by the Resident Coordinator. The State (Executive, Legislative, Judiciary, Entes Autónomos and Servicios Descentralizados¹⁸, Local Governments), NGOs, other civil society organizations and the UNS Agencies will implement the activities of the programme.
- 6.3 In order to develop the One UN Programme there will be a Budgetary Framework to coordinate the diversity of funding sources and instruments, reduce overlapping and ensure that its programmatic initiatives and priorities are adequately financed.
- 6.4 This Budgetary Framework comprises all the effects, outputs and outcomes of the One Programme. It is a consolidated financial framework which shows the planned resources for each of the UN Agencies participating in the One Programme, stating its financial source (regular resources or others). Likewise, it is the financial expression of the "One Programme" as a whole, including: (a) **core/regular resources** from the participating Agencies; (b) **other existing/ongoing resources** –from all sources-; (c) the **funding gap** between the existing resources and the total cost of the One Programme.

¹⁸ Entities under Public Law which develop different State activities such as education, commerce and social services.

- 6.5 To bridge the “funding gap” the One UN Coherence Fund will be created. The One UN Coherence Fund is a joint development fund, modelled on UNDG “Joint Programme Pass-through Modality”. The fund is meant to streamline, simplify and increase harmonization and predictability of resources.
- 6.6 The One UN Coherence Fund must embrace those development priorities of the One Programme for which resources are not available (funding gap), rather than specifics of individual contributions to it.
- 6.7 The use of the One UN Coherence Fund will be determined by a Steering Committee composed by the RC, participating Agencies and the Government (through OPP). Such committee will be chaired by the RCUN and the Director of OPP. Following the country’s interests regarding international cooperation and the norms ruling the Coherence Fund, the Steering Committee will set the deduction on the contributions received by the Fund, so as to recover indirect administrative costs of Participating Agencies.
- 6.8 The Steering Committee will be responsible for the definition of projects and activities to obtain the outcomes of the One Programme to be financed by the One UN Coherence Fund.
- 6.9 The RC is responsible for the strategic leadership and ultimate allocation decisions of the One UN Coherence Fund.
- 6.10 The Steering Committee will be advised by the UNCT and the donors who participate in financing the One UN Coherence Fund.
- 6.11 UNDP will perform the function of Administrative Agent of the Coherence Fund and Headquarters (MDTF Office) will support the RC when presenting financial reports and accountability models.
- 6.12 The RC is accountable and responsible for consolidated Fund level reporting and donor reporting based on reports from participating Agencies and with the support of the Administrative Agent.
- 6.13 Following the “Joint Programme Pass-through Modality”, participating Agencies will receive resources from the One UN Coherence Fund -through the Administrative Agent- and execute different projects and activities jointly with Implementing Partners, to reach the agreed outputs and outcomes. As it was pointed out, the Steering Committee will be responsible for the allocation of resources from this fund.
- 6.14 The Agencies will sign, together with Implementing Partners, the documents connected with specific projects, according to common practices and regulations of the UNS.
- 6.15 Contributions by participating Agencies to their Implementing Partners are subject to their respective practices and regulations.
- 6.16 Participating Agencies will be responsible for their respective programmatic results, the use of resources and the submission of reports together with their Implementing Partners.

Part VII. Monitoring and evaluation

- 7.1 The OPP and the UNCT, with support from the Resident Coordinator's Office, shall be responsible for establishing the M&E mechanisms, tools and revisions necessary to ensure the permanent monitoring and evaluation of the One Programme, aiming at ensuring the efficient use of Programme resources as well as accountability, transparency and integrity.
- 7.2 The Participating Agencies taking part will provide periodical reports on the progress, achievements and results of their projects, summarizing the challenges they face in the execution of the project and the use of resources, pursuant to the project documents.
- 7.3 The presentation of reports will be carried out, as long as possible, in accordance with the procedures of participating Agencies.
- 7.4 The evaluations and audits of non-governmental Implementing Partners will be carried out in conformity with policies and procedures followed by Participating Agencies.
- 7.5 Follow-up of outputs and outcomes of the One Programme will be carried out through the following mechanism:

Programme Outputs:

- 7.6 The participating Agencies will design their own follow-up indicators which will be duly communicated to the RC's Office. Likewise, the participating Agencies shall be responsible for the compilation of information on these indicators, which will then be forwarded to the RC's Office to be systematized within the framework of the One Programme.

Programme Outcomes:

- 7.7 On the basis of the Follow-up and Evaluation framework established, the selected Agencies will be in charge of compiling and verifying the relevant information. Given that the Programme Outcomes are shared by different Agencies, the specific follow-up roles of each of the participating Agencies and the coordinated follow-up actions -which may include joint visits to selected geographic areas, regular meetings of experts and Representatives, *inter alia*- will be decided co-ordinately during the second semester of 2008 and facilitated by the RC's Office. As it is the case of the output follow-up, the RC's Office will be in charge of systematizing the information.
- 7.8 However, the compilation of information for the follow-up of indicators depends, in many cases, on the availability of timely information at the official verifying sources. In this sense, it is suggested conducting specific follow-up activities twice a year; these should coincide with the periods when national statistics are produced (regional, local, sectoral, etc.).
- 7.9 The evaluation of the One UN Programme 2007-2010 will be carried out in two stages, together with the evaluation of the UNDAF:
 - The mid-term evaluation, in the fourth quarter of the second year of the UNDAF Programmatic cycle (2008).
 - The end-of-term evaluation, in the fourth quarter of the last year of the UNDAF Programmatic cycle (2010).

- 7.10 The evaluation will be carried out by a team integrated as follows:
- An official from the Resident Coordinator's Office.
 - Two officials from the UN System (at least one of them should belong to Agencies with harmonized cycles), preferably with experience in follow-up and evaluation.
 - An expert in follow-up and evaluation from OPP.
- 7.11 The inputs for such evaluations will be (i) information contained in the Follow - up and Evaluation framework; (ii) minutes of meetings containing different follow-up procedures, and (iii) consultation meetings carried out with the counterparts, basically the Government, international financial institutions and donors.
- 7.12 The mid-term evaluation results will allow for the necessary adjustments to the One UN Programme. Besides, the results of the end-of-term evaluation will serve, beyond their natural objective, as relevant input in the design and further implementation of the UNDAF in the following period.

Part VIII. Commitments by UN System and the Government

- 8.1 Subject to resource availability, during the period 2007-2010, UNS estimates resources allocated for the One UN Programme will be USD 95,460,357. This number includes Agencies' "regular resources" approved for the period or estimated in cases where Agencies have to sign new specific programmes or cooperation plans, reaching USD 6,646,025; "other resources" they estimate they will have available for the achievement of the outcomes (USD 35,960,117)¹⁹ and "other resources" coming from the State and executed by the Agencies (USD 37,854,215)²⁰, and resources to be mobilized through the One UN Coherence Fund and other channels to bridge the funding gap: USD15,000,000.
- 8.2 The Government's contribution to the implementation of the One Programme will be expressed by means of those budgetary resources allocated for the achievement of the above mentioned intended outcomes as well as through the participation of local personnel taking part in activities to be defined as part of the Programme.
- 8.3 Likewise, the Government commits to organize follow-up meetings to revise the Programme, so that its execution can be monitored and its impacts and results evaluated. Finally, the Government commits to facilitate coordination and active participation of all the stakeholders involved, in the public sector, civil society and the international community.

Part IX. Other provisions

- 9.1 The present Programme may be modified upon the consent of both parties.
- 9.2 No part of this Programme will be interpreted as excluding or reducing protection to the UNS agreed in the dispositions and spirit of the General Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which has been signed by the Government.

¹⁹ Consists of contributions from bilateral cooperation, decentralized UN funds, private sector and other mechanisms.

²⁰ Government Budget and loans from International Financial Institutions (IDB and WB) executed by UNDP.

- 9.3 The Annex to this document, containing the Outputs and Resources Matrix is also a part of it.
- 9.4 Thus, the undersigned, duly authorized, have agreed on this One Programme on 19 October 2007, in Montevideo, Uruguay.

Prof. Enrique Rubio
Director of the Budget and Planning Office

Mr. Pablo Mandeville
Resident Coordinator of the United Nations
System in Uruguay

Part X. Outputs and resources matrix ²¹

Outcome 1 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services oriented to sustained and sustainable growth.”																
Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		Recursos Regulares (RR)	Otros Recursos (OR)	No financiado (NF)	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
1.1 “State institutions have built on their capacities to design development strategies” (United Nations)	Ministries in economic sphere, OPP	0	0	110,000	0	0	440,000	0	0	440,000	0	0	110000	0	0	1100000
1.2 “Public policies on productive promotion have been strengthened” (United Nations)	Ministries in economic sphere, OPP	0	0	90,000	0	0	360,000	0	0	360,000	0	0	90000	0	0	900000
1.3 “Local economies are strengthened on the basis of support to productive initiatives” (FAO)	Municipalities, MGAP	0	15,000	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30000	0
1.4 “Modernization of fishing sector accomplished” (FAO)	MGAP - DINARA	0	508,000	0	0	2,683,621	0	0	2,618,835	0	0	0	0	0	5810456	0
1.5 “Micro-enterprises have been promoted (REDEL Project)” (ILO)	MTSS, ANEP, Municipalities, productive sector organizations	0	693,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	693000	0
1.6 “Local economic capacities developed” (UNDP)	Municipalities, NGOs; Other partners: AECI, decentralized cooperation entities	0	1,070,160 (IDB)	0	0	807,309 (IDB)	0	0	470,051 (IDB)	0	0	277552 (IDB)	0	0	2625072 (IDB)	0

²¹ This Matrix was prepared on the basis of what was established and agreed in the UNDAF document, signed by the UNS Agencies who participated in its design and the Uruguayan Government. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) who did not participate in the design of the UNDAF, incorporated its active participation in the UNCT, since the beginning of the implementation of the One UN pilot, and in the design of the One UN Programme. In this programme are incorporated: a) the extensión of its credit trade (Loan Agreement 555 -UY - Proyecto Uruguay Rural) executed by MGAP, until 2010; b) the donation of US\$ 200,000 to “Build capacities among Social Organizations of small family-enterprises, to participate in Uruguay’s Programmes of Public Purchases”; c) the formulation, during the first two months of 2008, of the “country strategy”, also agreed by OPP and MGAP, through a highly participatory process, with the corresponding organs of Uruguay’s Government, as well as the UNCT, to make sure the operations supported by IFAD in Uruguay are developed within the framework of a common programme to the whole UNS in Uruguay. Regarding the figures shown in this matrix, it is necessary to highlight as well that, in several cases, they constitute estimations owing to two main reasons: (a) relating to Agencies’ “regular resources”, programmes or cooperation plans, some of them expire before 2010 and, therefore, new cooperation plans in the following years will need to be signed so as to obtain new resources; (b) regarding “other resources”(bilateral cooperation, decentralized, UN Funds, private sector, others), some funds are still being negotiated or are estimations agreed between the Agencies and their counterparts, within their respective cooperation agreements.

1.7 "SMEs' competitiveness in the access to external markets accomplished" (UNIDO)	Government of Italy, MIEM, CIU, org. of exporters, Municipalities	0	350,000	0	0	444,000	0	0	444,000	0	0	444000	0	0	1682000	0
1.8 Micro and medium-sized enterprises in the rest of the country are in motion" (UNIDO)	Government of Italy, MIEM, CIU, org. of exporters, Municipalities	0	200,000	0	0	444,000	0	0	444,000	0	0	444000	0	0	1532000	0
1.9 "Capacities to use renewable energies in the country have been built" (ONUDI)	MIEM	0	15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15000	0
1.10 "Programme to eradicate the use of methyl bromide designed and executed" (ONUDI)	MVOTMA	0	22,000	0	0	50,000	0	0	35,000	0	0	10000	0	0	117000	0
1.11 "Dissemination of MDGs on Information Society achieved" (UNESCO)		3,460	0	0	22,000	0	0	17,000	0	0	0	0	0	42460	0	0

Outcome 1 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services oriented to sustained and sustainable growth.”

Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
1.12 “Environmental protection policies at the local level have been supported.” (United Nations)	Ministries and Central Government Entities, Municipalities and local stakeholders	0	0	60,000	0	0	240,000	0	0	240,000	0	0	60,000	0	0	600,000
1.13 “State and social capacities in the promotion of development in the territory have been strengthened by 2010.” (United Nations)	Ministries and Central Gov. Entities, Municipalities and local stakeholders	0	0	228,000	0	0	912,000	0	0	912,000	0	0	228,000	0	0	2,280,000
1.14 “National government capacity for territorial and water management.”(UNDP-GEF-WB)	MVOTMA MIEM, MRE, MGAP, MTD, NGO, UDELAR, cooperation entities, etc..	120,490	2,409,334 (GEF and cost sharing GEF) 409,131 (IDB and Government)	0	27,000	1,442,185 (GEF and cost sharing GEF) 2,068,480 (IDB and Government)	0	7,000	714,019 (GEF and cost sharing GEF) 1,969,224 (IDB and Government)	0	6000	512,194 (GEF and cost sharing GEF) 854,050 (IDB and Government)	0	160,490	5,077,732 (GEF y cost sharing GEF) 5,300,885 (BID y Gobierno)	0
1.15 “Mitigation Measures and adaptation to climate change.” (UNDP-GEF-WB)	MVOTMA MIEM, MRE, MGAP, MTD, NGO, UDELAR, cooperation entities, etc..	431,400	495,676 (GEF and programme cost sharing) 30,000 (Government)	0	368,600	833684 (GEF y programme cost sharing) 70000 (Government)	0	25,000	357,632 (GEF and programme cost sharing)	0	0	0	0	825,000	1,686,992 (GEF y programme cost sharing) 100,000 (Gobierno)	0
1.16 “Government bodies and municipalities have the capacity to plan, using information and demographic analysis.” (UNFPA)	Ministries and selected Municipalities, INE and UDELAR	50,000	70,000	0	60,000	80,000	0	60,000	80,000	0	55,000	80,000	0	225,000	310,000	0

Outcome 1 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services oriented to sustained and sustainable growth.”

Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
1.17 “Plan to develop cultural industries has been designed and is being executed” (UNESCO)	Public and private institutions	10,000	0	0	12,500	0	0	12,500	0	0	0	0	0	35,000	0	0
1.18 “Input elaborated (to design) development policies (based on) the generation of socio-economic information.” (UNDP)	UNDP (DEX), INE, Presidency of the Republic	516,175	492,259 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 280,447 (WB and Government)	0	331,126	1,579,000 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 268,704 (WB and Government)	0	0	1,714,000 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation)	0	0	0	847,301	3,785,259 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 549,151 (WB and Government)	0	
1.19 “Framework Programme in Río de la Plata Basin Management.” (UNEP-DGFE)	MTOP	0	0	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	0	0	
1.20 “Integrated environmental evaluation of country (GEO Uruguay)” (UNEP-DEWA).	MVOTMA, universities, NGO, Private enterprises, UNDP	15,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35,000	0	0	
1.21 “Evaluation of legal (protection) instruments for environment, accomplished.” (UNEP-DEWA)	MVOTMA	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	0	
1.22. “Integral environmental evaluation of urban municipalities (...) GEO Canelones and GEO San José.” (PNUMA-UN Habitat)	MVOTMA, PNUD, Comuna Canaria and Town Hall of San José, research centres, universities, NGO, private businesses.	35,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,5000	0	0	

1.23 "National Security Framework on Biotechnology in Uruguay, designed and implemented" (UNEP-DEWA)	MVOTMA, DGEF	17,175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,175	0	0
1.24 "Policies and Programmes to promote tourism strengthened" (WOT and UNESCO)	MTD	WOT 26,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	WOT 26,000	0	0

Outcome 1 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services oriented to sustained and sustainable growth.”

Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
1.25 “Circulation processes of highly qualified Uruguayans strengthened” (UNDP, IOM and UNFPA)	OPP, MEC, MTD, MSP, UDELAR, Municipalities, European Union, Business Chambers of Uruguay and PEDECIBA		118,428 (programme cost sharing)											118,428 (programme cost sharing)		
		51,658 UNDP	72,666 (Government)	0	9,000 UNDP	87,088 (Government)	0	3,000 (UNDP)	108,371 (Government)	0	0	102,046 (Government)	0	63,658 (UNDP)	370,171 (Government)	0
		IOM 3,500	IOM 2,000	0	IOM 3,000	0	0	IOM 3,000	0	0	3,000	0	0	IOM 12,500	2,000	0
		UNFPA 30,000	0	0	UNFPA 15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	UNFPA 45,000	0	0
1.26 “Consolidation of capacities to channel and foster investment of capitals derived from savings of Uruguayans abroad.” (IOM)	MRE, UDELAR, Municipalities, BROU and BPS	7,500	7,500	0	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0	22,500	7,500	0
1.27 “Knowledge on the situation of migrants and strengthening of protection standards generated.” (UNESCO)	FLACSO and MERCOSUR Group	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	0

Outcome 2 (UNDAF) "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies to eradicate extreme poverty and reduce poverty"																
Output	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
2.1 "The Central Government's "Plan de Equidad" has been supported in its implementation, follow-up and evaluation." (United Nations)	Ministries, other Central Government entities, Municipalities	0	0	110,000	0	0	440,000	0	0	440,000	0	0	110,000	0	0	1,100,000
2.2 "Proposals to improve situation of pregnant women and early childhood prepared and being implemented" (UNDP)	UNDP DEX, Italian Cooperation, UNICEF, FAO, PAHO, MSP, Municipalities, INAU, INDA, ANEP, MEC, UDELAR, MIDES-Plan CAIF	46,785	965,438 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 119,456 (Government)	0	81,936	375,049 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 43,988 (Government)	0	34,500	251,498 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 46,612 (Government)	0	0	0	0	163,221	1,591,985 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 210,056 (Government)	0
2.3 "Government and UDELAR generate knowledge on the links between demographic dynamics and poverty" (UNFPA and UNESCO)	INE and UDELAR	UNFPA 20,000	75,000	0	32,000	75,000	0	30,000	75,000	0	30,000	75,000	0	112,000	300,000	0
		UNESCO 7,500	0	0	7,500	0	0	7,500	0	0	0	0	0	22,500	0	0
2.4 "Campaigns to encourage maternal breast-feeding designed and being implemented." (UNICEF)	MSP	0	24,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	84,000	0
2.5 "Comprehensive intervention framework (for) children under age of 3." (UNICEF and UNESCO)	MIDES-INFAMILIA	UNICEF 27,000	32,000	0	27,000	40,000	0	27,000	40,000	0	27,000	35,000	0	108,000	147,000	0
		UNESCO 2,500	0	0	2,500	0	0	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	7500	0	0

Outcome 2 (UNDAF) "By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies to eradicate extreme poverty and reduce poverty"																
Output	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
2.6 "Institutions in the social policy system (education, employment, health and social security) have been strengthened" (United Nations)	Ministries, other Central Government entities, Municipalities and local stakeholders	0	0	235,000	0	0	940,000	0	0	940,000	0	0	235,000	0	0	2,350,000
2.7 "Studies and research on factors determining failure in primary and secondary education" (UNICEF and UNESCO)	ANEP / CODICEN and MEC	0	0	0	0	UNICEF 5000	0	0	UNICEF 5000	0	0	UNICEF 5000	0	UNICEF 15000	0	0
2.8 "Programmes on food-security, reproductive health and mother-children have been designed and are being implemented." (PAHO and FAO)	MSP and NGO	WHO 83,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83,000	0	0
		FAO 5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	0
2.9 "Strategy on Healthy and Productive Municipalities implemented" (PAHO)	MSP, Municipalities and NGOs	76,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76,000	0	0
2.10 "Technical inputs elaborated, debates implemented and human resources in the national and local government trained to design and implement public policies to fight against poverty..." (UNDP)	UNDP (DEX); MSP, MVOTMA, MIDES, Municipalities, INE, INAU. Other partners: UNESCO, UNICEF, UNIFEM, UNFPA, UDELAR, ANEP, OPP, IDB, Venezuela's government	476,251	2,553,291 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 6,946,294 (IDB and Government)	0	131,818	6,304,659 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 4,114,815 (IDB and Government)	0	0	457,849 (IDB and Government)	0	0	0	0	608,069	8,857,949 (programme cost sharing and bilateral cooperation) 11,518,958 (IDB and Government)	0
2.11 "Instruments for the protection of women and workers in the informal economy." (ILO)	Ministries involved and org. from productive sector	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0

2.12 “Pilot Project on Neighbourhood Clubs for youth designed and being implemented” (UNESCO)	NGO, Municipalities, Microsoft	4,500	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	44,500	20,000	0
2.13 “Practitioners and technical experts capable of linking demographic dynamics with development processes and the fight against poverty”(UNFPA)	Selected Ministries, INE and UDELAR	0	103,000	0	107,000	103,000	0	100,000	102,000	0	100,000	102,000	0	307,000	410,000	0
2.14 “Programme on Health-care attention addressed to adolescents designed and implemented.” (UNICEF and UNFPA ²²)	MSP	0	33,000	0	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	0	0	123,000	0
2.15 “Sexual and reproductive health education incorporated in the curricula of Primary and Secondary Education” (UNFPA)	ANEP-CODICEN	10000	0	0	35000	0	0	30000	0	0	0	0	0	75000	0	0

²²See UNFPA’s contribution in output 3.8.

Outcome 3 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies that facilitate access to high quality, equitable social services, the reduction of discrimination and the promotion of social integration processes”

Output	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
3.1 “Policies, plans and Programmes to fight inequity (in particular, gender and generations) have been supported in their design and execution” (United Nations)	Ministries, other Central Government bodies, Municipalities, local stakeholders	0	0	90,000	0	0	360,000	0	0	360,000	0	0	90,000	0	0	900000
3.2 “National and local strategies and policies to safeguard gender, generational as well as sexual and reproductive equity have been designed and are being executed.” (UNFPA)	Presidency, MSP, Municipalities, ANEP, INAMU, Women’s Secretariat, Women Parliamentarians Bench, NGO	225,000	182,000	0	48,000	133,000	0	48,000	133,000	0	47,000	132,000	0	368,000	580,000	0
3.3 “National Plan on Equal Opportunities and Rights, designed, implemented and evaluated” (UNIFEM and UNFPA)	MIDES, INAMU, Catalonian Cooperation	0	UNIFEM 95,000	0	UNFPA 30,000	UNIFEM 95,000 UNFPA 50,000	0	UNFPA 30,000	UNFPA 50,000	0	UNFPA 30,000	UNFPA 50,000	0	UNFPA 90,000	UNIFEM 190,000 UNFPA 150,000	0
3.4 “Reduced inequities in gender and health, different capacities, the elder, (etc.)” (PAHO and UNFPA)	MSP, Honorary Committees, NGO, Legislative Health Commissions-Both Houses (Gov. Of Italy)	PAHO 125,000 UNFPA 30,000	PAHO 530,000	0	UNFPA 33,000	0	0	UNFPA 33,000	0	0	UNFPA 31,000	0	0	PAHO 125,000 UNFPA 127,000	PAHO 530,000	0
3.5 “Institutional capacities for the design and management of Programmes and policies on equal opportunities in jobs for women and youth have been developed” (ILO)	MTSS, MIDES, INAMU, MEC, ANEP, Women Parliamentarians Bench	90,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90,000	0	0
3.6 “Proposals to promote equal opportunities in jobs to eliminate discrimination, have been designed and are being implemented” (ILO)	MTSS, MIDES, INAMU, MEC, ANEP, Women Parliamentarians Bench	28,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28,000	0	0
3.7 “Promotion of health	MSP,	PAHO 35,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	PAHO 35,000	0	0

and food security in national border areas, strengthened" (PAHO and FAO)	Municipalities in national border areas	FAO 10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FAO 10,000	0	0
--	---	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------	---	---

Outcome 3 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the formulation and management of policies that facilitate access to high quality, equitable social services, the reduction of discrimination and the promotion of social integration processes”

Output	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
3.8 “Policies in response to HIV/AIDS (especially in components relative to access to information, prevention services and appropriate treatment) strengthened” (UNAIDS, PAHO, ILO, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP) (*)	MSP, MIDES, Municipalities and NGOs	ILO 3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ILO 3,000	0	0
		PAHO 113,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	PAHO 113,000	0	0
		UNFPA 25,000	UNFPA 113,000	0	UNFPA 82,000	UNFPA 113,000	0	UNFPA 82,000	UNFPA 112,000	0	UNFPA 81,000	UNFPA 112,000	0	UNFPA 270,000	UNFPA 450,000	0
		UNESCO 9,000	UNDP- UNODC 14,993	0	UNESCO 24,000	0	0	UNESCO 24,000	0	0	0	0	0	UNESCO 57,000	UNDP- UNODC 14,993	0
		UNICEF 27,000	UNICEF 53,000	0	UNICEF 27,000	UNICEF 50,000	0	UNICEF 27,000	UNICEF 50,000	0	UNICEF 27,000	UNICEF 50,000	0	UNICEF 108,000	UNICEF 203,000	0

Note (*): This output brings together a series of specific outputs of the different agencies mentioned, which appear in the UNDAF and in the Programming documents of the respective Agencies.

Outcome 4 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the effective harmonization of its legislation and national practices relative to international commitments and in strengthening public institutions and the civil society to formulate, execute, follow-up and evaluate public policies”

Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
4.1 “Programmes to modernize public administration and attention to citizens have been designed and are being implemented” (United Nations)	Ministries, other State institutions, provincial governments and NGOs	0	0	369,000	0	0	1,476,000	0	0	1,476,000	0	0	369,000	0	0	369,000
4.2 “Policies on decentralization and promotion of citizen participation in the territory will have been supported by 2010” (United Nations)	Ministries, other State institutions, provincial governments and NGOs	0	0	208,000	0	0	832,000	0	0	832,000	0	0	208,000	0	0	208,000
4.3 “Planning capacity of provincial governments has been expanded.” (UNDP)	Congress of Mayors, OPP; Other partners: AECI, IDB	30,708	31,234 (programme cost sharing) 1,426,766 (IDB and Government)	0	52,580	1,277,652 (IDB and Government)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83,288	31,234 (programme cost sharing) 2,704,418 (IDB and Government)	0
4.4 “Primary Health Attention Strategy consolidated, with emphasis on citizen participation” (PAHO)	MSP	30,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30,000	0	0
4.5 “Health policies that strengthen reform processes and direction of the health sector will have been designed” (PAHO and UNFPA)	MSP	PAHO 62,000 UNFPA 20,000	0	0	UNFPA 20,000	0	0	0	UNFPA 20,000	0	0	0	0	PAHO 62,000 UNFPA 40,000	UNFPA 20,000	0
4.6 “Institutional and stakeholders’ capacity building in tracking implementation of international labour laws (...) with special emphasis on equal opportunities and gender equity attained” (ILO and UNIFEM)	MTSS (Equal Opportunities Commission), Parliament, Judiciary, UdelaR	ILO 20,000 UNIFEM 5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ILO 20,000 UNIFEM 15,000	0	0

Outcome 4 (UNDAF) “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the effective harmonization of the legislation and national practices relative to international commitments and in the strengthening of public institutions and the civil society for the formulation, execution, follow-up and evaluation of public policies”

Outputs	Implementing Partners	2007			2008			2009			2010			2007/2010		
		RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF	RR	OR	NF
4.7 “Key strategic areas of the national government action in the field of security and human rights, strengthened.” (UNDP)	UNDP (DEX), OPP, SCJ, BCU, MEF, ONSC, DINACIA, MEC, MDN, UDELAR, MEC, NGOs, BDP, MIDES, MTSS, IDB, World Bank	72,612	120,617 (UNHCR and programme cost sharing) 8,517,750 (IDB, WB and Government)	0		1,915,564 (IDB, WB and Government)	0		1,144,882 (IDB, WB and Government)	0	0	0	0	72612	120617 (UNHCR and programme cost sharing) 11578195 (IDB, WB and Government)	0
4.8 “Expert advice to parliamentarians on human rights, developed.” (UNDP- UNHCHR)	UNDP (DEX), IPU, AECL, United Kingdom Embassy, Uruguayan Parliament, MRE, MEC, MI, ACNUR, SCJ.	107,851	459,452 (UNHCR and programme cost sharing) 1,458,399 (IDB y Gobierno)	0	32,000	66,315 (UNHCR y programme cost sharing) 1,438,910 (IDB y Gobierno)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139851	525767 (UNHCR and programme cost sharing) 2897309 (IDB and Government)	0
4.9 “Adaptation of national legislation (to the CRC) completed” (UNICEF)	Legislative Branch, SCJ, MEC (Attorney's Office), MIDES (INAU), MI.	27,000	67,205	0	27,000	65,000	0	27,000	65,000	0	27,000	65,000	0	108,000	262,205	0
4.10 “Training of social institutions staff on CRC, designed and ongoing” (UNICEF)	The Judiciary, SCJ, CAU, MI, MIDES (INAU)	0	10,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	70,000	0
4.11 “Training Programmes on human rights in education centres, strengthened” (UNICEF)	ANEP and UNESCO	8,400	156,000	0	0	80,000	0	0	80,000	0	0	80,000	0	8,400	396,000	0
4.12 “Capacities developed at the level of organized civil society to design, monitor and evaluate public policies” (UNIFEM and UNFPA)	MEC, AECL-CCE, ANONG, NGOs, networks of Women organizations	UNIFEM 40,000 UNFPA 60,000	0	0	UNIFEM 60,000 UNFPA 60,000	0	0	UNIFEM 40,000 UNFPA 60,000	0	0	UNIFEM 40,000 UNFPA 60,000	0	0	UNIFEM 180,000 UNFPA 240,000	0	0

4.13 "Consultative councils with migrant Uruguayans worldwide, facilitating the exercise of citizenship" (IOM)	IOM, MRREE, UdelaR, Municipalities, UNFPA	4,000	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	5000	0	0	5,000	0	0	24,000	0	0
--	---	-------	-------	---	-------	---	---	------	---	---	-------	---	---	--------	---	---

