

**FINAL MDG-F JOINT PROGRAMME
NARRATIVE REPORT**

Participating UN Organization(s)	Sector(s)/Area(s)/Theme(s)
<i>(indicate the lead agency)</i> FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNESCO (lead), UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIDO, WHO	Please indicate Thematic window and other relevant sub thematic areas Culture and Development

Joint Programme Title	Joint Programme Number
China Culture and Development Partnership Framework	00067155

Joint Programme Cost [Sharing - if applicable]	Joint Programme [Location]																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>[Fund Contribution]:</td> <td>6,000,000USD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Govt. Contribution:</td> <td>1,371,000USD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agency Core Contribution:</td> <td>92,000USD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL:</td> <td>7,463,000USD</td> </tr> </table>	[Fund Contribution]:	6,000,000USD	Govt. Contribution:	1,371,000USD	Agency Core Contribution:	92,000USD	Other:		TOTAL:	7,463,000USD	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Region (s):</td> <td>China, Asia Pacific</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governorate(s):</td> <td>Guizhou, Yunnan, Qinghai, Tibet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District(s)</td> <td>Leishan and Congjiang Counties, Qiandongnan Prefecture, Guizhou Province Longchuang County and Luxi City, Dehong Prefecture, Yunnan Province Hualong County, Haidong Region, Qinghai Gymda and Linzhi, Nyingchi Prefecture, Tibet</td> </tr> </table>	Region (s):	China, Asia Pacific	Governorate(s):	Guizhou, Yunnan, Qinghai, Tibet	District(s)	Leishan and Congjiang Counties, Qiandongnan Prefecture, Guizhou Province Longchuang County and Luxi City, Dehong Prefecture, Yunnan Province Hualong County, Haidong Region, Qinghai Gymda and Linzhi, Nyingchi Prefecture, Tibet
[Fund Contribution]:	6,000,000USD																
Govt. Contribution:	1,371,000USD																
Agency Core Contribution:	92,000USD																
Other:																	
TOTAL:	7,463,000USD																
Region (s):	China, Asia Pacific																
Governorate(s):	Guizhou, Yunnan, Qinghai, Tibet																
District(s)	Leishan and Congjiang Counties, Qiandongnan Prefecture, Guizhou Province Longchuang County and Luxi City, Dehong Prefecture, Yunnan Province Hualong County, Haidong Region, Qinghai Gymda and Linzhi, Nyingchi Prefecture, Tibet																

Final Joint Programme Evaluation	Joint Programme Timeline										
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Final Evaluation Done</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation Report Attached</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Date of delivery of final report</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Final Evaluation Done	Yes	Evaluation Report Attached	Yes	Date of delivery of final report		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Original start date</td> <td>4 November 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final end date</td> <td>3 March 2012</td> </tr> </table>	Original start date	4 November 2008	Final end date	3 March 2012
Final Evaluation Done	Yes										
Evaluation Report Attached	Yes										
Date of delivery of final report											
Original start date	4 November 2008										
Final end date	3 March 2012										

Participating Implementing Line Ministries and/or other organisations (CSO, etc)

Beijing Cultural Heritage Protection Center (CHP); China Arts and Crafts Association (CA&CA); China International Center for Economic and Technical Exchange (CICETE); China National Museum of Ethnology (CNME); Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS); Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences (IGSNRR); Ministry of Agriculture (MOA); Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM); Ministry of Education (MOE)/National Commission for UNESCO; Ministry of Health (MOH); Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MOHRSS); National Population & Family Planning Commission (NPFPC); State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH); State Ethnic Affairs Commission (SEAC)

Please see Annex 6 for the exhaustive list of joint programme partners.

Report Formatting Instructions:

- Number all sections and paragraphs as indicated below.
- Format the entire document using the following font: 12point _ Times New Roman.

I. PURPOSE

- a. Provide a brief introduction on the socio economic context and the development problems addressed by the programme.

China has the world's biggest ethnic minority population (106 million people), and this population is disproportionately poor, including 56% of China's entire population still in extreme poverty. China owes much of its cultural wealth to the unique diversity of its 55 recognized ethnic minority groups, yet these minorities risk becoming increasingly vulnerable without the capacity and opportunities to access the benefits of China's overall development.

China is strongly committed to lifting its minorities out of poverty, and is investing substantial domestic resources to this end. China has also committed itself to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 and the sustainable and harmonious Xiaokang Society by 2020. To do so, China is looking to the UN for a diverse, cross-sectoral range of international advice and expertise to enable it to move to an increasingly rights-based approach to development for minorities.

The China Culture and Development Partnership Framework (CDPF) thus brought together the work of eight UN Agencies (UNICEF, UNFPA, UNESCO, UNDP, WHO, ILO, UNIDO, FAO) in close coordination and partnership with their government counterparts (e.g. State Ethnic Affairs Commission, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, [National Population and Family Planning Commission](#), Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security, Ministry of Agriculture) and civil society.

As the Programme document says, CDPF sought to address the task of integrating culture into development specifically for China's ethnic minority population, through a project framework with two primary aims based on six main issues. These issues are: (i) strengthening government on all levels which is sensitive to needs of ethnic minorities and has stronger awareness of the importance – economic and otherwise – of cultural diversity; (ii) promoting and making possible quality and culturally sensitive education for ethnic minority children; (iii) supporting the creation of policy promoting linguistically and culturally appropriate MCH care; (iv) fostering improved access to the labour market; (v) strengthening the local capacity of the ethnic minorities for protecting and utilizing their cultural resources; and (vi) promoting cultural-based economic growth, including tourism and ethnic crafts.

CDPF encompassed a wide range of goals, outcomes, and cross-cutting issues ranging from governance to education, health, economic empowerment and preservation of cultural heritage. Nonetheless, there was a common thread linking them all – preservation of culture in the context of sustainable economic development. Significantly, the CDPF programme concept did not regard culture as an obstacle to be overcome, but rather as a “tool” to further the development process.

- b. List joint programme outcomes and associated outputs as per the final approved version of the joint programme Document or last agreed revision.

CDPF had two primary outcomes:

1. The inclusion of ethnic minorities in cultural, socio-economic and political life strengthened through improved public policies and services. There are 4 outputs under this (below).
2. Ethnic minorities empowered in the management of cultural resources and benefiting from cultural-based economic development. There are three 3 outputs under this (below).

The seven outputs were as follows:

Output 1.1: Governance processes made more inclusive of ethnic minorities and sensitive

- to culturally based development strategies.
- Output 1.2: Strengthened policy and institutional capacities in developing and implementing culturally sensitive and quality basic education for ethnic minority children.
- Output 1.3: Facilitate local adaptation of national MCH policy to assure improved participation in, quality of, access to and knowledge and uptake of an essential package of evidence-based MCH and FP services and associated practices in ethnic minority areas, acknowledging culture and traditional beliefs as key influences on service strategies and uptake, prioritized by local administrators; and in incorporating improvements in human and financial resources, health systems management, and monitoring and evaluation systems that specifically focus on the ethnicity of the providers and beneficiaries.
- Output 1.4: Inclusion issues of minorities are better addressed through culture-based economic empowerment and non-discrimination.
- Output 2.1: Improved approaches and capacity of ethnic minorities in understanding and protecting cultural (tangible and intangible) capital and ethnic awareness of cultural diversity.
- Output 2.2: Capacity built and examples piloted on using participatory processes in managing minority community resources, and sustainability leveraging tourism for local livelihoods.
- Output 2.3: Culture Based Local Economic Development and livelihood creation through: (i) provision of entrepreneurship and business development services, and (ii) strengthening policy and institutional environment for ethnic minority arts and crafts sector.

c. Explain the overall contribution of the joint programme to National Plan and Priorities

CDPF was grounded in the plans and policies of the government of China. For more than a decade, ethnic minority development has been targeted as a high priority in the overall development framework for China. The conceptualization of CDPF outcomes and outputs was based on a number of national plans launched since 2000. They include:

- The Ten Year Rural Poverty Alleviation and Development Plan (2001-2010).
- The Western Development Initiative (WDI), initiated in 2000.
- In 2003, the State Council's Leading Group for Poverty Alleviation and Development (LGOP) launched a participatory village poverty reduction planning program for 140,000 poor villages including 345 small ethnic minority villages.
- In May 2005 the State Council adopted the Development Plan for Small Ethnic Minorities (2006-2010) developed jointly by State Ethnic Affairs Commission (SEAC), the National Development and Reform Commission, Ministry of Finance, People's Bank of China and State Council Poverty Alleviation Office to support the acceleration of the development of ethnic minorities with small populations.
- In 2007 the State Council adopted the '11th Five Year Plan on the Development of Public Affairs for Ethnic Minorities' formulated by SEAC. It set the guiding principles and the overall objectives for the development of public affairs for ethnic minorities, which raised 11 main tasks and 11 key projects.
- In 2007 the State Council adopted the '11th Five-Year Plan for Prospering the Border Areas and Enriching the Residents Therein' formulated by SEAC.

The joint programme successfully contributed to the development priorities for Chinese ethnic minorities in the following ways:

- built capacity of local governments and communities to make consultation processes more inclusive and culturally sensitive;
- promoted culturally sensitive quality education;
- improved the quality and cultural sensitivity of and increase the uptake of maternal and child

- health (MCH) services;
 - researched and addressed the employment situation of ethnic minorities and the cultural and linguistic obstacles they face;
 - contributed to a better understanding and the protection of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, including agricultural heritage
 - adopted participatory processes to promote cultural tourism; and
 - fostered culture-based economic development by strengthening local crafts sectors.
- d. Describe and assess how the programme development partners have jointly contributed to achieve development results

Achieving the expected results of the CDPF required the involvement of a wide array of partners. The management and coordination mechanism established by the CDPF was key to facilitate collaboration among partners, despite their diverse institutional requirements and administrative hierarchy. The achievements of the CDPF are, therefore, the result of the coordinated work of a broad number of institutions which contributed to the programme. The table below shows progress on the indicators on major institutional arrangements to support joint programming and joint implementation:

Indicators Bas	eline	Final Value
Number of managerial practices (financial, procurement, etc) implemented jointly by the UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 NSC & PMC meetings • 10 inter-agency meetings, incl. 2 learning sessions • 2 inter-ministerial consultation meetings • 20 output meetings • 9 joint training courses/workshops • 11 joint consultants
Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 joint baseline surveys • 1 joint report • 2 joint programme brochure
Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 joint missions

Within the UN system, the CDPF fell under the working scope of the Theme Group on Poverty and Inequality (UNTGPI) and was co-chaired by the UNESCO Director and Representative in his capacity as Vice Chair of the UNTGPI.

Regular inter-agency meetings, mailing lists and the UN intranet were among the key mechanisms to foster joint planning and information sharing. Joint delivery was facilitated by means of joint missions, joint workshops and training courses, joint baseline surveys and publications, and the joint hiring of consultants. Moreover, a Joint Communication Strategy and Communication Guidelines had been developed.

Parallel to CDPF, China was implementing another three Joint Programmes (JPs) funded by the MDG-F. Supported by the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), the respective Programme Coordinators regularly shared information and experiences with each other. In addition, the Programme Coordinators regularly met together with the RCO to discuss and reflect upon cross-cutting issues.

In addition, the CDPF actively joined hands with other ongoing UN programmes, e.g. the MDG-F-funded Joint Programme on Youth, Employment and Migration and the UNDP programme "Poverty Reduction for Ethnic Minorities in China".

III. ASSESSMENT OF JOINT PROGRAMME RESULTS

- a. Report on the key outcomes achieved and explain any variance in achieved versus planned results. The narrative should be results oriented to present results and illustrate impacts of the pilot at policy level)

Edited from extract of the Final Evaluation Report (see Annex 4)

Good governance (Output 1.1) targeted government representatives, civil society actors, and local community leaders, through training in culturally sensitive policy approaches towards ethnic minorities and has sought to formulate policy recommendations and create exchange platforms between and among local development stakeholders. Both the enhanced capacity and the adoption of participatory and culture-based development concepts approaches by government achieved are crucial for the sustainability of programme results. In addition, the community associations and platforms for exchange established have come to be highly regarded by both local government and communities. Important policy recommendations on culturally inclusive development for ethnic minorities have been formulated, and key messages integrated into development policy making processes.

The **Basic Education** component (Output 1.2) aimed at introducing culturally sensitive approaches and materials for ethnic minority primary schoolchildren. All formal targets had been exceeded in terms of ethnic minority children, teachers, principals, local and national policy makers benefited by child-sensitive school awareness programmes and culturally sensitive educational approaches. Major documentary results of this output are likely to have sustainable and long-term effects in affecting general policies towards minority education.

The **Maternal and Child Health** (MCH) component (1.3) researched the relationship between culture and health targets and formulated models from these results to integrate into health care programmes in ethnic minority areas. The strategy was to augment the existing work of UN agencies and the Ministry of Health (MoH) in improving overall access of ethnic minorities to MCH services, and generate new culture-based packages and models to impact health programmes. The strong national ownership generally demonstrated by the CD PF programme was well exemplified in this component through matching funds supplied by partner agencies and local uptake of project models and good practices. Among the achievements of this component was an overall increase in hospital delivery rates and in regular antenatal care in programme sites. Other and sustainable results were a generally improved capacity of a substantial proportion of MCH providers, Family Planning (FP) workers and village doctors in all the project sites; the training of village doctors, township MCH providers, and trainers; and the testing and validation and uptake of routine MCH indicators. Minority cultural media were also employed to transmit MCH messages.

Cultural Heritage Protection was the most innovative and creative part of this programme and succeeded in contributing to a new awareness of the importance of cultural heritage at the local level and the ways in which it can be dynamically conserved. The component produced astonishingly rich results in the form of newspaper articles, films, and reports of all kinds and should receive great praise for its Communication and Advocacy (C&A) strategy as well as its Monitoring and Evaluation (M &E) arrangements. The component well exceeded its publication targets and also its training targets, training more than two hundred local stakeholders in conservation and development methods under the agro-culture element, for instance, which also established the local ecosystem as a Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS). Experience of the joint programme suggested that cultural mapping is such an intrinsically important and participatory activity that it should not only had been at the basis of the museum enhancement and agro-cultural elements but also supplied an important basis for the establishment of other tourism and cultural crafts enterprises.

Three separate Outputs (1.4, 2.2 and 2.3) addressed issues of unequal access in **Employment** for ethnic minorities and the creation of new culture-based employment opportunities in the

fields of tourism, and minority arts and crafts. With the smallest amount of funding, Output 1.4 sought to address unequal access to employment for ethnic minorities and explore how minorities can be better included through culture-based economic empowerment mechanisms. Training targets and targets for the dissemination of training materials were well exceeded. This output combined training with research in a way which seems to have had a quite major impact on thinking and attitudes among local labour bureau and other officials concerned with ethnic minority employment issues.

Under the **Cultural Tourism** component (Output 2.2), coupled with 1.1, extensive training in community-based tourism development and resource management was given to local government officials, community leaders and civil society representatives. Local culture-based tourism associations were established and strengthened. Villagers saw this as a new way to make a livelihood while preserving aspects of their traditional culture. There are good grounds therefore to hope that programme inputs will have enabled them to resist the more destructive effects of the cultural commodification commonly brought about by the impact of tourism. What was crucial here was the platforms for exchange with government and civil society organizations, which were developed and it was encouraging that the community associations and platforms for exchange which were developed appear to be well thought of by both the local government and the communities. Given the shortness of programme time, they will require some further maintenance and development in future years, and it was therefore a good sign of their future sustainability that both Guizhou and Yunnan Ethnic Affairs Commissions committed themselves to providing further technical and financial support to these associations for an additional three to five years.

The **Crafts Sector Development** component (Output 2.3) while seeming to follow naturally from Outputs 2.1 and 2.2, had to some extent combined with the more policy-oriented Output 1.4 in terms of training exercises and some studies commissioned. An output joint work matrix was developed to guide the work of the various partners. The reports produced on specific craft industries on Local Economic Development (LED) and Value Chain Analysis (VCA) were remarkable in describing clearly the process of market analysis, participatory data collection, and SWOT analysis under which local artisans and entrepreneurs received Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB) training in marketing skills and techniques of improving their products which took place from 2009 onwards in Leishan and Longchuan. Altogether more than sixty-five new product designs were created, and over sixty artisans or small business owners were trained in SIYB aspects of business development including marketing quality and business management. One hundred local stakeholders and ethnic minority crafts workers were trained in product development, emphasizing a balance between criteria of authenticity, innovation, marketing, product quality and artisan well-being. Culturally sensitive understanding of the local crafts employment situation was improved among one hundred and thirty local stakeholders, and awareness of the role of cultural traditions in economic development increased among stakeholders through this component. Three county-level crafts associations were established and strengthened. The number of jobs was reported to have increased by 52.3% in enterprises supported by the programme while women's employment rates in those enterprises had increased by 63%. VCA analysis was an excellent tool for enabling an awareness of the need for associations and networks and linkages between craftspeople, for branding and trademarks, the improvement of products and general professionalization. While some local cultural enterprises were certainly under threat, some of those supported were quite high-profile cultural industries, and were quite successful. There was no credit component in this output. However, some reports specifically declared that the most pressing need is not for money, but for business know-how and technical marketing abilities, so there may be a need for more research on this issue. A pleasing achievement under this component was the receipt in 2010 of Awards for Excellence by nine CDPF beneficiaries out of twenty-six awards made in all, and out of 126 submitted by China, and the participation of CDPF beneficiaries in expos and trade fairs.

- b. In what way do you feel that the capacities developed during the implementation of the joint

programme have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes?

- By emphasizing on the inclusiveness of all CDPF training workshops, cross-cutting themes such as rights-based approach, gender equality and community empowerment were deeply rooted in the hearts of CDPF beneficiaries.
- By offering programming tools and methodologies such as cultural diversity programming lens, VCD analysis, MCH Communication for Behavior Impact (COMBI), CDPF adapted existing programming and training tools developed by UN Agencies to meet the development needs of Chinese ethnic minorities and encouraged strong local and national ownership.
- By providing training to key stakeholder groups including government officials, private sector, community organizations and community leaders, the joint programme ensured the sustainability of capacity-building interventions.
- By organizing joint training workshops, CDPF encouraged dialogue and cooperation among local stakeholder groups and promoted the culture of cooperation and collaboration both within government administrations and between government and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

- c. Report on how outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes based on performance indicators and explain any variance in actual versus planned contributions of these outputs. Highlight any institutional and/or behavioural changes, including capacity development, amongst beneficiaries/right holders.

Please refer to the attached CDPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Annex 5) and Results Framework (Annex 8) for detailed information on the results logic framework and output indicators. In many cases, the joint programme implementation exceeded the planned indicator benchmarks thanks to the multiplier effects of joint implementation. However, the challenge to measure outputs' contribution to outcome achievements remains, because:

1. Both outcomes require more qualitative data instead of quantitative data;
2. Policy recommendations and capacity-building interventions require a longer period than the joint programme cycle to identify the induced changes;

The most remarkable behavioural change amongst beneficiaries/right holders is the increasing awareness on importance of cultural diversity, gender equality, rights-based approach and the power of participation in governance.

- d. Who are and how have the primary beneficiaries/right holders been engaged in the joint programme implementation? Please disaggregate by relevant category as appropriate for your specific joint programme (e.g. gender, age, etc)

Primary beneficiaries of the joint programme are ethnic minorities living in southwest China provinces of Yunnan, Guizhou, Qinghai and Tibet. The beneficiaries are fully engaged in the joint programme implementation by:

- (1) SEAC taking the lead role in the NSC and PMC for joint programme management and leadership;
- (2) Provincial SEAC taking the lead role in the project implementation at the local level;
- (3) Ethnic minority communities being the main beneficiaries participating in all capacity-building activities;

Please see attached the last biannual monitoring report for disaggregated data of CDPF beneficiaries (Annex 7 2011-II CDPF Biannual Monitoring Report).

- e. Describe and assess how the joint programme and its development partners have addressed issues of social, cultural, political and economic inequalities during the implementation phase of the programme:

- a. To what extent and in which capacities have socially excluded populations been involved throughout this programme?

CDPF has its focus on ethnic minority population in China. This population accounts for approximately 120 million people, or 8% of the total China population.

Usually located in remote and mountainous areas, the ethnic minorities in China have not been able to participate in and enjoy the benefits of the rapid development of China in the last three decades. The ethnic minorities have become, therefore, a vulnerable group which accounts for 50% of the poor in China. 94.31% of CDPF direct beneficiaries are ethnic minorities.

- b. Has the programme contributed to increasing the decision making power of excluded groups vis-à-vis policies that affect their lives? Has there been an increase in dialogue and participation of these groups with local and national governments in relation to these policies?

Yes. Especially through policy research and capacity building activities in Outcome 1 of the CDPF, the joint programme has leveraged participation approach to promote more open decision making process and inclusive governance. For example: (1) consultation mechanism has been established at local level to support community participation at local level; (2) policy recommendations and proposals are communicated to central line ministries to promote inclusive governance and culture-based development for ethnic minorities;

- c. Has the programme and its development partners strengthened the organization of citizen and civil society groups so that they are better placed to advocate for their rights? If so how? Please give concrete examples.

Yes. CDPF successfully involved civil society organizations as implementing partners and beneficiaries of the joint programme, both at the national level and at the local level. The CSO partners were fully involved in the joint programme formulation, design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and communication. The CSO partners played important role in the project implementation and made important contribution to the achievements of the joint programme. The joint programme CSO partners are:

Private Sector:

- Yunnan Louyi Knives Manufacture
- Yunnan Dehong Hongyun Hulusi Cultural Industry Co. Ltd.
- Yunnan Binglin Handicraft Art Development Co. Ltd.
- Kunming Nankan Craft & Gift Factory
- Mao Kexi Tea Company
- Mo Lusheng Workshop
- Leishan Silver Manufacture Company
- Nihua Embroidery Shop
- Anong Miao Family Hotel

CSO:

- Beijing Cultural Heritage Protection Center
- Handicap International
- Winrock International
- Yunnan Health and Development Research Association

Seven Village Cultural Tourism Associations:

- Wudong Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Nanmeng Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Yintan Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Zhanli Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Guangshan Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Mangdan-Xinzhai Village Cultural Tourism Association
- Chudonggua Village Cultural Tourism Association

Three Ethnic Crafts Associations:

- Leishan Miao Embroidery Association
- Longchuan Ethnic Handicraft Association
- Husa Bladesmith Association

- d. To what extent has the programme (whether through local or national level interventions) contributed to improving the lives of socially excluded groups?

In the outcome 1 of the joint programme, CDPF had its interventions on policy research, policy recommendation and capacity-building of ethnic minority government officials, basic education and MCH professionals. These efforts had promising results on producing: (1) evidence-based policy recommendation for the inclusiveness of national and local development policy for ethnic minorities; (2) enhanced capacities of ethnic minority government officials and public service providers; (3) user-friendly tools and manuals to ensure better cultural, education and MCH services to ethnic minorities;

In the design of the joint programme, outcome 2 focused on empowering ethnic minority communities. In this outcome, the joint programme targeted interventions on capacity-building of traditional farming technologies, community cultural mapping, community culture tourism and crafts. It trained thousands of community members and contributed to rise in their income, community infrastructure investment, community organization establishment, community organization staff capacity building and marketing of community cultural products and services.

- e. Describe the extent of the contribution of the joint programme to the following categories of results:

a. Paris Declaration Principles

- Leadership of national and local governmental institutions
- Involvement of CSO and citizens
- Alignment and harmonization
- Innovative elements in mutual accountability (justify why these elements are innovative)

b. Delivering as One

- Role of Resident Coordinator Office and synergies with other MDG-F joint programmes
- Innovative elements in harmonization of procedures and managerial practices (justify why these elements are innovative)
- Joint United Nations formulation, planning and management

In the project management mechanism, the national Government and other national implementation partners were fully involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs. They were fully involved in decision making about policy, management, budget, procurement and service provision. The joint programme management unit is seated at the National Government.

The Programme Management Committee (PMC) is co-chaired by the UNESCO Director and Representative in his capacity as Vice Chair of the UN Theme Group on Poverty and Inequality together with the Director of the Finance Department of the State Ethnic Affairs Commission (SEAC).

Civil society partners were fairly involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs. By their presence at the PMC meetings, they were also involved in decision making about policy, management, budget, procurement and service provision.

The CDPF is implemented in close partnership between the UN, the Chinese government and other partners. A large number of programme activities are directly implemented by national and local government partners. The remaining activities are implemented by either research institutions or civil society organizations, in consultation and with the full support of relevant

government institutions.

Both the Ministry of Commerce (MofCOM) as overall coordinator and the State Ethnic Affairs Commission (SEAC) as lead implementing agency have repeatedly demonstrated their strong commitment to the programme. The SEAC Minister participated, for example, in the launching ceremony and the SEAC Vice Minister participated in the NSC meeting and a joint mission together with the UN PMC Co-Chair. All other participating ministries are very supportive of the programme. They participate in key programme events and the development of Annual Work Plans and provide support in terms of coordination with local line bureaus and national research institutions as well as engagement of appropriate international and national expertise.

Civil society organizations, enterprises and citizens participate in varying forms and degrees depending on the specific nature of each intervention. Citizen participation is, for example, particularly strong in the tourism and governance components where villagers have developed their own village-level tourism plans and discussed them with the county government and tourism experts at a deliberative meeting. Villagers are also the driving force behind the cultural mapping process. Civil society organizations feature prominently in the health, cultural mapping and crafts development components and enterprises and artisans play a key role in the crafts development component.

III. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

- a. Report key lessons learned and good practices that would facilitate future joint programme design and implementation

Lessons for the future:

- Limit the number of participating UN agencies to 2-4 as larger numbers make programme coordination exceedingly difficult and time-consuming and as receptivity to the JP modality is often directly related to Agency's budget share;
- Establish procedure to identify and agree upon common pilot sites which are crucial for effective joint programming;
- Ensure strong integration of different programme interventions during the design phase to facilitate subsequent joint implementation;
- Further harmonize Agency administrative procedures and budgeting systems;
- Convening capacity and commitment of lead Government Agency crucial for JP success;
- Integrate communication strategies into programme strategies and budgets.

- b. Report on any innovative development approaches as a result of joint programme implementation

- **Promoting inter-agency knowledge exchange:** Efforts to promote inter-agency knowledge exchange at the UN China helped to capitalize on the findings and recommendations of all agencies and to harmonize the work of the UN in country.
- **Promoting the spirit of joint programming:** There is a general concern on cost and difficulty of coordinating joint programmes. However, experiences show where agencies have voluntarily engaged in joint programming without the need of external funding and/or reward. Joint programming is a mindset, not a design process, and can be made possible through a continuous process of dialogue and information/knowledge sharing among agencies to complement each other while designing programmes, implementing projects and establishing dialogue with government. Example of UNICEF and UNFPA's cooperation in CD PF: UNICEF contributing technical training and equipment, UNFPA contributing research and capacity building on culture-sensitive approaches to MCH and both agencies jointly working

on Communication for Behavioural Impact.

- c. Indicate key constraints including delays (if any) during programme implementation
 - a. Internal to the joint programme
 - b. External to the joint programme
 - c. Main mitigation actions implemented to overcome these constraints

Internal:

Administrative/Financial: The differing administrative procedures of UN Agencies occasionally impede joint implementation. Partners usually need to sign a contract with each Agency, each with different budgeting and reporting requirements. In addition, different budgeting systems and requirements of UN Agencies and the MDG Achievement Fund overburden UN staff in budget reporting exercises.

- This issue has to be addressed primarily at the global level. In the meantime, the UN in China is actively exploring how it can work together more effectively in order to contribute to China's development.

External:

- 1) Poor road conditions, particularly in Guizhou, and the existence of several minority languages in the various pilot sites pose a larger challenge than originally envisaged.
- 2) The large distance between Beijing (where UN Agencies and their national partners are located) and the pilot sites complicates the communication, monitoring and supervision work.
- 3) A programming approach that is sensitive to culture and tradition and that regards diverse cultures as valuable resources needs time to take root.

- In light of challenges such as poor transportation and multiple minority languages and given budget limitations, a number of outputs decided to concentrate their resources in selected pilot sites or implement one set of activities in one county and another set in another county to allow for maximum impact.

- The development and strengthening of local capacities is progressive and will have to be pursued continuously during the entire program duration and possibly beyond.

- To promote a culture-based approach, the CDPF organizes learning events on culture-based development for UN staff and partner agencies. In addition, UN agencies and their national partners exert considerable efforts to sensitize CDPF stakeholders about the added value of cultural programming and strengthen relevant capacity (for further information see also annual report 2009). UNDP, for example, supports the participation of the National Programme Coordinator and community organizations capacity building expert in training/ exchange activities organized by the UNDP Regional Initiative on Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Development (RIPP) to learn about international policies and practices concerning rights-based inclusive development and to share China's experiences in ethnic affairs administration and culture-based socio-economic development with other developing countries.

- d. Describe and assess how the monitoring and evaluation function has contributed to the:
 - a. Improvement in programme management and the attainment of development results
 - b. Improvement in transparency and mutual accountability
 - c. Increasing national capacities and procedures in M&E and data
 - d. To what extent was the mid-term evaluation process useful to the joint programme?

The monitoring and evaluation framework served as regular self-monitoring tools for UN agencies and implementing partners. Recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation and agency internal monitoring exercises were selectively followed up to make timely adjustment of project implementation and activity design, in order to better serve the local development needs, further

promote gender mainstreaming, ensure attainment of the expected results. The Mid-Term Evaluation was useful in providing comprehensive and thorough information about all outputs to all stakeholders involved and enhance the transparency of project management.

- e. Describe and assess how the communication and advocacy functions have contributed to the:
 - a. Improve the sustainability of the joint programme
 - b. Improve the opportunities for scaling up or replication of the joint programme or any of its components
 - c. Providing information to beneficiaries/right holders

Following MDG- F Guidelines, the overall strategic goal of the CDPF Communication Strategy is to “accelerate progress on the MDGs by raising awareness, strengthening broad-based support and action and increasing citizen engagement in MDG related policy and practice”. Expected key outcomes are: i) Increased awareness and support for the MDGs and the MDG-F both at policy and general public level; ii) Programmes are leveraged for increased MDG results and citizen engagement in MDG-F and MDG processes is strengthened and iii) Improved accountability and transparency towards all partners.

To achieve these outcomes, the Strategy targets the following audiences: local governments; media; the public; civil society; academia; and the private sector.

At the programme level, the PMO is responsible for facilitating communication and information sharing between all partners as well as communicating with the public, the media and other donor agencies by e.g. maintaining the programme website, liaising with donors and organizing public events and press conferences.

At the output level, UN agencies and their national partners reach out to the various audiences mentioned above by e.g. publishing survey and research results, engaging with national and local media, conducting training workshops, policy dialogue and health communication, and collaborating with community-based organizations, academic institutions and private enterprises.

- f. Please report on scalability of the joint programme and/or any of its components
 - a. To what extent has the joint programme assessed and systematized development results with the intention to use as evidence for replication or scaling up the joint programme or any of its components?
 - b. Describe example, if any, of replication or scaling up that are being undertaken
 - c. Describe the joint programme exit strategy and assess how it has improved the sustainability of the joint program

The programme had been designed to bring about changes both at the local and national level. Sustainability of programme interventions at the local level was fostered by building capacity of local stakeholders, including through Training of Trainers, and by ensuring ownership through alignment with local and national development strategies and the use of participatory approaches. Sustainability at the national level was similarly fostered by closely aligning the programme with national plans and strategies and by strengthening the capacity of national partners through joint programme delivery. Several national and provincial workshops were held to share programme lessons and policy recommendations with senior decision makers and other key stakeholders, including a programme-wide Concluding Symposium in November 2011. Culture-based development for ethnic minorities has, moreover, been included among the outputs of the new UNDAF in China (2011-2015) and in some Agency country plans and strategies (e.g. UNFPA, UNDP, UNESCO) reflecting the intention of UN Agencies to continue the efforts initiated by the CDPF.

Some examples may illustrate the sustainable impact of the programme:

- The Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security will continue to support Start-Your-Business activities in the pilot counties.
- The Ministry of Health has scaled up the newly developed M&E indicators for maternal and child health (MCH) to the whole MCH system in the country.
- The Ministry of Education has confirmed the feasibility of the language/ culture-sensitive training model for ethnic minority teachers and called for provincial action to replicate it.
- In Linzhi Prefecture, Tibet, the local government has decided to use its own resources to replicate certain programme interventions (education, health).
- The government in Longchuan County, Yunnan, has asked local stakeholders to adopt Value-Chain Analysis also in other sectors' planning processes.
- Effective linkage of local artisans with specialized craft NGOs, designers and relevant institutes ensures continuous intellectual support and mentoring for local artisan communities.
- An advocacy toolkit has been designed by UNFPA for health managers and providers operating in ethnic minority areas encouraging the adoption of culturally sensitive approaches in MCH programs.

In addition, national and provincial workshops have been held by a number of programme outputs to share programme lessons and policy recommendations with decision makers and other key stakeholders.

CDPF Concluding Symposium

The high-level event will showcase CDPF achievements, share good practices and policy recommendations and make the case for more efforts and resources for ethnic minority areas in general and for culture-based development in particular. Participants will include about 100 key stakeholders, including senior officials from relevant national ministries and other government agencies, senior representatives from donor agencies, embassies and NGOs, and researchers from key universities and think tanks. In addition, media representatives will be invited to the morning session. The proceedings of the event will be published and widely disseminated.

CDPF Brochure on Culture-Based Development

A 20-page brochure is currently under development in both English and Chinese. The brochure aims to summarize the CDPF's good practices and policy recommendations in the area of culture-based ethnic minority development and advocate for the better integration of culture into development programming in ethnic minority areas. The brochure's target audience includes national policy makers, potential donors and development practitioners. Hard copies will be disseminated at the Concluding Symposium and a digital version will be made available online on the UN China website.

CDPF webpage

The CDPF webpage on the UN China website will be maintained and major publications will stay available for the interested public for download.

IV. FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

a. Provide a final financial status of the joint programme in the following categories:

1. Total Approved Budget 2.Total Budget Transferred 3. Total Budget Committed 4.Total Budget Disbursed

	Total Approved Budget	Total Budget Transferred	Total Budget Committed	Total Budget Disbursed
FAO	\$236,094	\$236,094	\$201,135	\$201,135
ILO	\$471,206	\$471,206	\$468,927	\$468,927
UNDP	\$1,457,190	\$1,457,190	\$1,457,190	\$1,457,190
UNESCO	\$1,244,034	\$1,244,034	\$1,244,034	\$1,244,034
UNFPA	\$500,152	\$500,152	\$500,057	\$500,057
UNICEF	\$1,185,529	\$1,185,529	\$1,185,529	\$1,185,529
UNIDO	\$428,321	\$428,321	\$427,781	\$427,781
WHO \$47	7,474	\$477,474	\$477,474	\$477,474
Total \$6,000	,000	\$6,000,000	\$5,962,127	\$5,962,127

b. Explain any outstanding balance or variances with the original budget

FAO: Because of joint implementation of CDPF with FAO's GIAHS project two planned CDPF publications: 1. Study on tourism potentials in GIAHS Sites and 2. Study on Agro-biodiversity in GIAHS sites were eventually covered by the GIAHS project, hence the savings of \$34,959 from CDPF.

ILO: \$700 savings from the budget for equipment, \$1579 savings from the final workshop.

UNFPA: \$95 savings from miscellaneous.

UNIDO: \$372 savings from the training workshop, and \$168 savings from miscellaneous.

V. OTHER COMMENTS AND/OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

VI. CERTIFICATION ON OPERATIONAL CLOSURE OF THE PROJECT

By signing, Participating United Nations Organizations (PUNO) certify that the project has been operationally completed.

PUNO	NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
FAO	Percy Misika	Representative		20/2/05/12
ILO	Ann Herbert	Director		9 May 2012
UNDP	Christophe Bahuet	Country Director		15 th May 2012
UNESCO	Abhimanyu Singh	Director and Representative		17 May 2012
UNFPA	Arie Hoekman	Representative		10/5/2012
UNICEF	Gillian Mellsop	Representative		14/5/2012
UNIDO	Edward Clarence-Smith	Representative		10/5/12
WHO	Michael O'Leary	Representative		14.05.12

VII. ANNEXES

1. CDPF List of Publications
2. CDPF List of Communication Products
3. CDPF Concluding Symposium Report
4. CDPF Final Evaluation Report
5. CDPF Final M&E Framework
6. CDPF List of Partners
7. CDPF Final Biannual Monitoring Report (2011-II)
8. CDPF Results Framework