



# DESA Survey of UN Agency Headquarters 2017

---

February 2018

**Development Cooperation Policy Branch  
Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
United Nations**

*Disclaimer: The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*

## Table of Contents

FOREWORD.....	4
I. Alignment with the 2030 Agenda .....	5
II. FUNDING .....	8
A. Enhancing Quality and Quantity of Funding.....	8
B. Transparency and Accountability of Funding Flows.....	10
C. Cost Recovery of core and non-core funding sources.....	11
D. Innovative Funding Modalities.....	12
III. ENABLING PROGRAMME COUNTRIES TO ACHIEVE THE SDGs.....	14
A. Strengthening National Capacities.....	14
B. Strengthening Partnership Approaches .....	15
C. South-South Cooperation.....	17
D. Providing Greater Complementarity between Humanitarian, Development and Peacebuilding efforts.....	20
IV. IMPROVING FUNCTIONING.....	22
A. Resident Coordinator System .....	22
B. Programmatic and Operational Coherence.....	24
C. Physical Presence.....	28
D. Joint Programming.....	30
E. Harmonization and simplification of business practices .....	32
V. MONITORING AND REPORTING.....	34
A. Managing for results .....	34
B. Evaluation .....	40
C. QCPR Follow-up and Reporting .....	41

## ACRONYMS

DESA	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
DOCO	Development Operations Coordination Office
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
MAS	Management and Accountability System
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
PIUs	Parallel Implementation Units
QCPR	Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review
RBM	Results-based Management
RC(s)	United Nations Resident Coordinator(s)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDS	United Nations development system

## FOREWORD

To monitor the implementation of resolution 71/243 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review (QCPR), the General Assembly called on the Secretary-General to regularly assess and report on a comprehensive and quantitative basis on progress in furthering programme and operational coordination at the country level, in order to inform annual reporting to the Economic and Social Council (paragraph 83). In this context, and in line with previous requests in General Assembly resolution 67/226, a survey of UN agency headquarters was conducted in 2014 and 2015, in addition to the 2017 survey.

The 2017 survey of UN entities headquarters (referred to as ‘the survey’), administered by UN-DESA, was carried between July and September 2017. Responses were received from 29 entities, an increase of four over the number of entities that responded to the survey in 2015. The 29 entities that responded in 2017 represent 97 per cent of UN operational activities for development, by volume of funding based on 2016 expenditure data. They include nine Funds and Programmes: UNDP (including UNV and UNCDF), UNFPA, UNICEF, UNHCR, UNEP, UN-Habitat, UNRWA, UN-Women, and WFP; seven specialized agencies: FAO, ILO, ITU, UNESCO, UNIDO, WHO and WIPO; and thirteen other entities: ITC, UNODC, UNAIDS, UNCTAD, UNISDR, UNOPS, OHCHR, the five regional commissions and IFAD.

To facilitate the responses from UN entities, a quotation from the relevant operative paragraphs of the 2016 QCPR resolution was provided as a preamble to most questions. For simplicity of language and consistency with the survey of programme countries, the term “agency” was generally used in the questionnaire, to refer collectively to UN development system entities, whether Funds and Programmes, Specialized Agencies, Departments of the UN Secretariat and others. The same language is used in this report.

## I. Alignment with the 2030 Agenda

- 2. Has your entity in its strategic plan, elaborated how it plans to engage in coherence and integrated support as called for in the 2030 Agenda?*
- 3. Please provide a link to the relevant document and reference the page number where the document elaborates on how the entity plans to engage in coherent and integrated support as called for in the 2030 Agenda.*
- 4. Please briefly mention why this was not covered in the strategic plan, and if there are plans to do so in the future.*
- 5. Does your entity address the goal of poverty eradication in its Strategic Plan?*
- 6. Does your entity's Strategic Plan outline how your organization plans to mainstream poverty eradication?*
- 7. Has your entity, in its strategic plan, outlined how it will reach the furthest behind first?*
- 8. Please copy the relevant text below or provide a link to the relevant document and reference the page number where the document outlines how it will target the furthest behind first.*
- 9. Please briefly mention why this was not covered in the strategic plan and if there are plans to do in future.*
- 10. In the last two years, have specific measures been taken at headquarters level to simplify and harmonize your agency-specific programming and reporting instruments, in alignment with the UNDAF or equivalent planning framework?*
- 11. Please briefly reference and describe which measures have been adopted in this regard.*
- 12. Please briefly mention why specific measures have not been adopted in this regard.*
- 13. To what extent is your entity's planning and budgetary cycle aligned with the QCPR cycle?*
- 14. Please identify what plans, if any, your entity has in response to the above-mentioned request in operational paragraph 78, which was a reiteration of an earlier mandate in GA resolution 67/226 (OP121).*

### **Key findings**

- **About half of UN entities have aligned their planning and budgeting cycles with the QCPR cycle.**
- **The strategic plans of entities generally address poverty eradication and outline how they will reach the furthest behind, except in the few cases where these objectives are not part of an entity's mandate.**
- **The new strategic plans of entities elaborate on how entities plan to engage in coherent and integrated support as called for in the Agenda.**

The survey explored the extent to which entities are aligning their work with the 2030 Agenda. Alignment with the Agenda requires a repositioning of the work of the United Nations so that it can deliver shared results through a system-wide approach. Alignment of the strategic planning and budgetary cycles is a first step towards coordinated and coherent action. To that end, the survey asked entities whether their planning and budgetary cycle was aligned with the QCPR cycle. Alignment with the QCPR implies a cycle of 4 years that begins and ends one year after the adoption of a QCPR resolution.

Prior to 2016, the QCPR resolution addressed the alignment of 9 Funds and Programmes, 7 Specialized Agencies, 2 Secretariat Departments and 4 other entities. In the 2016 QCPR resolution, Member States called for the alignment of all UN entities with operational activities, to ensure that

their planning and activities are consistent and guided by the provisions of the resolution, in order to take advantage of synergies and reduce overlap, and identify the entity's specific contribution to the system-wide support.

**The survey revealed that the planning and budgeting cycles of 13 entities are now fully aligned with the QCPR cycle, 5 entities are in the progress of aligning and 8 were not aligned** (see Table 1). Since all Secretariat Departments (including regional commissions) have the same cycle, they are excluded from these numbers so as not to present a misleading picture. However, it could be said that these entities are partially aligned as they have 2-year planning and budgetary cycles that begin on even-numbered years.

The overarching objective of the 2030 Agenda poverty eradication and **24 out of 29 entities answering the survey indicated that poverty eradication is addressed in their entity's strategic plan**. Another 4 entities<sup>1</sup> indicated the question was not applicable to them since poverty eradication is not part of their organization's mandate. **22 out of 29 respondents indicated that their entity's strategic plan outlines how the entity plans to mainstream poverty eradication** while five indicated that the question was not applicable.

Twenty-six of the 29 entities responding indicated that their strategic plan elaborates on how it plans to engage in coherent and integrated support as called for in the Agenda. The three exceptions were primarily due to current strategic plans (2014-17) having been formulated prior to the adoption of the 2030 Agenda.

Also 23 entities indicated that their strategic plan outlines how it will reach the furthest behind first, with another 5 deemed this as not applicable to their entity.

About two-thirds of entities indicated that they have taken specific measures at headquarters level in the last two years to simply and harmonize agency-specific programming and reporting requirements, in alignment with the UNDAF.

---

<sup>1</sup> OHCHR, UNHCR, UNODC, WIPO

**Table 1. Alignment of strategic planning cycles with the QCPR cycle**

Entity <sup>2</sup>	Strategic Planning Cycle		QCPR alignment		
	Timeframe	# of years	2016	2018	
<b>Funds and Programmes</b>					
UNDP (including UNV & UNCDF)	2018-2021	4	Yes	Yes	
UNEP	2018-2021	4	Yes	Yes	
UNFPA	2018-2021	4	Yes	Yes	
UN-Habitat	2014-2019	6	No	No	
UNHCR	2018-2019	2	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes	
UNICEF	2018-2021	4	Yes	Yes	
UNWRA	2016-2021	6	In progress	In progress <sup>4</sup>	
UN-Women	2018-2021	4	Yes	Yes	
WFP	2017-2021	5	Yes	In progress <sup>5</sup>	
<b>Specialized Agencies</b>					
FAO	2018-2019	2020-2021	2	Yes	Yes
ICAO	2017-2019		3	No	No
IFAD	2018-2021		4	Yes	Yes <sup>6</sup>
ILO	2018-2021		4	Yes	Yes
IMO	2016-2021		6	No	No
ITU	2016-2019		4	No	No
UNESCO	2018-2021		4	Yes	Yes
UNIDO	2018-2021 <sup>7</sup>		4	In progress	In progress
UNWTO	-	-	-	-	No
UPU	2017-2020		4	No	No
WHO	2014-2019		6	No	No
WIPO	2017-2021		5	In progress	In progress <sup>8</sup>
WMO	2016-2019		4	No	No
<b>Research and Training Institutions</b>					
UNICRI	-	-	-	-	No
UNIDIR	2017-2020		4	No	No
UNITAR	2018-2021		4	Yes	Yes
UNRISD	2016-2020		5	No	No
UNSSC	-	-	-	-	No
UNU	2015-2019		5	No	No
<b>Other entities</b>					
ITC	2016-2017		2	In progress	Yes
UNAIDS	2016-2021		6	In progress	In progress <sup>9</sup>
UNOPS	2018-2021		4	Yes	Yes

<sup>2</sup> For a full list of entities covered by the 2016 QCPR, see Box 1 of A/73/63-E/2018/8

<sup>3</sup> Considered fully aligned with the QCPR given the two-year cycle is consistent with the QCPR.

<sup>4</sup> UNRWA operates within a 6-year strategic planning cycle and GA-approved biennial programme plans, UNRWA plans to align its next cycle with the QCPR in 2021.

<sup>5</sup> WFP submitted the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan one year early as an exception, with a five-year duration that would enable return to the four-year strategic plan duration foreseen by General Rule VI.1 in 2018.

<sup>6</sup> IFAD has 3 year medium term plans aligned to the 3 year replenishment cycles, as it is an IFI with funding determined through replenishment exercises.

<sup>7</sup> UNIDO's strategic plan (initially MTPF 2016-2019) was extended to 2018-2021 to align it to the QCPR cycle. The budgetary cycle is still biannual (current 2018-2019).

<sup>8</sup> WIPO's Medium Term Strategic Plan is for 6 years (2016-2022), and its budget covers a period of 2 years (2018-2019 and 2020-2021).

<sup>9</sup> UNAIDS joint budgets are prepared and presented on a biennial basis. The Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework extends for a six-year period, and is synchronized with the planning cycles of the Co-sponsors.

## II. FUNDING

### A. Enhancing Quality and Quantity of Funding

- 15. Does your entity report annually as part of its regular reporting to its governing body on concrete measures to broaden the donor base?*
- 16. Please estimate the percentage of the financial contributions your organization received in 2016 that were part of a multi-year commitment.*
- 17. Has your entity defined common principles for the concept of ‘critical mass’ of core resources?*
- 18. Please describe briefly these common principles for the concept of “critical mass” of core resources*
- 19. Please mention briefly steps planned to be undertaken on defining such common principles prior to the end of next year, if any*
- 20. Has your entity determined and reported to the Governing body on its level of “critical mass” of core resources?*
- 21. Please provide the link and/or source where this amount is reported on:*
- 22. Please mention briefly steps planned to be undertaken in this regard prior to the end of next year, if any.*
- 26: Has the governing body of your entity held such a dialogue in the past year on how to finance the development results agreed in the new strategic planning cycle.*
- 27: Please include web links to any summary, outcome document or other relevant material connected to this financing dialogue.*
- 28. Please mention briefly any plans of your entity to organize such a dialogue prior to the end of 2017.*
- 29: Has your entity presented options to your governing body for improving the functioning and effectiveness of the structured financing dialogues:*
- 30. Please mention briefly any steps taken or plans made related to improving the functioning and effectiveness of your financing dialogue (please provide a web link to any relevant documentation):*

#### **Key findings**

- **Entities overwhelmingly report annually to their governing bodies on concrete measures to broaden their donor base;**
- **More than half of entities indicated that a structured financing dialogue was held by their governing body in the last year;**
- **Eight entities have determined its level of ‘critical mass’ of core resources and reported this amount to its governing body.**

QCPR resolutions have repeatedly urged the UNDS to explore options to broaden and diversify its donor base. **Out of 29 UN entities responding to the survey, 24 indicated reporting annually to their governing body on concrete measures to broaden their donor base.** Several entities of the UN Secretariat explained that this request did not apply to them, as the Secretariat guidelines for reporting do not require reporting on measures taken to broaden the donor base.

Structured dialogues have been taking place within a number of UN entities in an effort to address funding-related issues. **17 out of 29 entities indicated that their governing body has held such**



**dialogues to discuss how to finance the development results agreed in their strategic plan since mid-2016.** Some of the common themes in the dialogues across the system include: incentivizing donors to shift away from highly earmarked resources; strengthening transparency and accountability; exploring new partnership modalities towards resource mobilization; and, incentivizing multi-year funding commitments. Relating to the latter, 12 entities indicated that at least 50% of the financial contributions received in 2016 that were part of a multi-year commitment, but only 3 entities that have a large field presence (see Table 2).

**Table 2 - Share of financial contributions that were part of a multi-year commitment**

Percentage of contributions	All 28 entities that responded #	Eleven entities with presence in >50 countries #	9 Funds and Programmes #
Less than 10%	5	2	3
10-20%	3	3	2
20-30%	5	2	2
30-50%	3	1	1
Over 50%	12	3	1
Total	28	11	9

The dialogues held by UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF indicate that achieving these objectives would require strengthening the quality of regular reporting on the use of core and flexible resources, including clarity on the functions being financed through these funds. During the dialogues held at FAO, the topic of increasing assessed contributions was considered but did not gain much traction. In contrast, the decision-making body of WHO approved a 3% increase in Member States' assessed contribution for 2018-19.

About half of the entities responding to the survey, including nearly all the Funds and Programmes, noted that they had already presented options to their governing bodies for improving the structured dialogues, or that they planned to do so before the end of 2017.

Like with earlier QCPR resolutions, the 2016 resolution repeatedly stressed the importance of core resources. **The survey asked if entities had defined common principles for the concept of 'critical mass' of core resources. Twelve responded in the affirmative while 16 answered 'no'. Of the 12 entities that have defined common principles, 8 indicated that they determined its level of 'critical mass' of core resources and reported this amount to its governing body.**

WFP answered 'no' to defining common principles for the concept of 'critical mass' of core resources, while recognizing the benefits of unearmarked, multi-year funding in meeting operational and administrative demands more efficiently and effectively. Areas of WFP's work that could benefit from core funding included humanitarian response in sudden-onset emergencies and its resilience activities; However, consultations with the Executive Board revealed limited willingness to increase core funding. UNICEF explained that it has not set an explicit level for 'critical mass' of core resources, but it has specified in its Integrated Budget for 2018-2021 a target for core resources in support of the new Strategic Plan.

## B. Transparency and Accountability of Funding Flows

- 23. Does your entity ensure that available and projected core and non-core resources are consolidated within an integrated results and resources framework?**
- 24. Does your entity publish data on its funding flows as per the IATI data standards?**
- 25. Please indicate any plans your entity has to begin publishing information using the IATI data standard.**
- 35: Does your entity report expenditures disaggregated by the SDGs?**

### **Key findings**

- **27 out of 29 entities consolidate all of their projected resources within an integrated results and resources framework based on priorities determined in their strategic plan;**

At headquarters level, integrated results and resources frameworks (IRRFs) are intended to hold entities accountable for the funding entrusted to them by linking the resources of entities to strategic plan results. **Out of 29 UN entities responding to the survey, 27 indicated that they consolidate all projected resources of their organization within an IRRF based on priorities determined in the respective strategic plan.** The other two entities indicated that this will be done starting in 2018.

Feedback received through the HQ survey shows that nearly every entity is implementing an IRRF. It also revealed, however, that actual contributions can differ considerably from the estimates provided in the approved IRRF. The median difference between the two was 14% based on feedback received in the survey.

Enrolment in the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) can help to reinforce transparency at entity- and system-wide levels, on budgets, expenditures and results. Currently 14 UNDS entities<sup>10</sup> are publishing in the IATI Standard, and the Secretary-General has recently called for “*reinforced transparency on entity-specific expenditures and results through system-wide enrolment into IATI.*”<sup>11</sup> A 2017 JIU survey<sup>12</sup> indicates that several large Government contributors are starting to make such compliance with IATI a prerequisite for their continued funding.

A new question in the 2017 survey asked if entities report their expenditures disaggregated by the SDG(s) that they target. Six entities, namely FAO, ITC, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNOPS, and WFP, answered “yes”. Among the 23 entities that answered ‘no’, several mentioned the “System-Wide Outline of the Functions and Capacities of the UN Development System” (Dalberg report) carried out earlier in 2017, noting that while such reporting is not standard they had done it on this occasion and/or they were considering the possibility of reporting expenditures disaggregated by SDG in the future.

It may be noted that programme countries see transparency in funding matters as one of the weakest aspects of UN system reporting to governments at the country level. Specifically, in the 2017 survey

<sup>10</sup> 15 UN entities if UNCDF and UNDP are counted separately. 18 UN entities if CERF, the World Bank and UNITAID are also counted, however these entities are not among those listed in Table 1 above.

<sup>11</sup> A/72/124-E/2018/3

<sup>12</sup> [https://www.unjui.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU\\_REP\\_2017\\_2\\_English.pdf](https://www.unjui.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU_REP_2017_2_English.pdf)

of programme country governments, only 48% agreed that sufficient financial data was included in the reports from the UN system. Further details can be found in the report on that survey.

### C. Cost Recovery of core and non-core funding sources

**31: Has the governing body of your organization adopted cost recovery policies and rates based on common cost classifications and cost recovery methodologies?**

**32: Did your entity report on the implementation of your approved cost recovery policies and rates to your respective governing body in the past year?**

**33: Did your entity include estimated cost recovery amounts in its budget presented for approval by the governing body?**

**34: Did your entity report on actual amounts recovered as part of the regular financial reporting to the governing body?**

#### **Key findings**

- **Entities nearly universally have adopted a cost recovery framework aimed to recovery costs of non-core projects that were financed from core resources;**
- **A higher proportion of core resources continue to be used to finance non-programme costs as compared to non-core resources.**

Successive QCPR resolutions have stressed the importance for UN entities to achieve full cost recovery, by avoiding subsidizing non-core funded projects by core resources, as this reduces the amount of core resources available for programming.

**The survey revealed that all except two UN entities<sup>13</sup> have adopted a cost recovery framework aimed to recover costs of non-core projects that were financed from core resources.** The two exceptions indicated that steps were being taken in this regard. About half of entities included estimated cost recovery amounts in its budget presented to their respective governing body for approval.

Among the 20 entities that already have a cost recovery policy in place, fifteen answered through the survey that their entity reported on the implementation of its approved cost recovery policies and rates to its governing body in the past year. Another three said it would be reported by the end of 2017.

As part of the survey, entities were also asked to present a high-level breakdown of their expenditures in 2016 between what they classify as programme and non-programme expenses to see whether efforts by entities in recent years have resulted in any progress towards achieving full cost recovery. The Table 3 below contains the cumulative data collected from 16 entities<sup>14</sup> that represent some 70% of total UN-OAD funding.

<sup>13</sup> Though not exempt from the cost recovery mandate, this survey question excludes Secretariat departments since their cost recovery policies are defined centrally and approved by the GA for the entire Secretariat.

<sup>14</sup> UNDP (including UNCDF and UNV), UNFPA, UNICEF, UNOPS, UN-WOMEN, WFP, UNRWA, UN-HABITAT, UNAIDS, ITC, FAO, ILO, UNESCO, ECE, ESCAP, UNISDR

**Table 3: High-level breakdown of funding flows for 16 entities in: 2016**

Type of funding flow	Programme activities	Programme support and management activities	Other (not elsewhere classified)	Total
Core resources (\$ million)	3,248	1,450	324	5,022
Percentage	64.7%	28.9%	6.5%	100%
Non-core resources (\$ million)	14,310	1,343	357	16,010
Percentage	89.4%	8.4%	2.2%	100%
Total resources (\$ million)	17,557	2,794	681	21,032
Percentage	83.5%	13.3%	3.2%	100%

The analysis reveals that **65% of core resources were spent on programme activities in 2016 compared to 89% of non-core resources spent on programme activities.** The remaining portions are spent on non-programme costs such as management, administration and programme support costs. In other words, **relative to non-core resources, a considerably larger portion of core resources were spent on non-programme costs.** Overall, 84% of funding is spent on programme activities.

This means that despite a high proportion of entities adopting a cost recovery framework, the guiding principle established in resolution 67/226 that the financing of all non-programme costs should be based on full cost recovery, proportionally, from core and non-core funding sources was not being adhered to.

#### D. Innovative Funding Modalities

**36: Does your entity report on the estimated resources generated from innovative funding modalities as part of its regular financial reporting?**  
**37: Does your entity report on lessons learned and best practices on “innovative funding” as part of its regular financial reporting?**  
**38. If yes, please list up to three examples of innovative funding modalities that your entity has implemented.**

##### **Key findings**

- **Nearly half of all entities report on resources received through innovative funding modalities;**
- **Just over one-third of entities report on lessons learned and best practices in dealing with innovative funding modalities.**

Although there is no agreed definition for innovative development finance, the term commonly refers to mechanisms that raise funds for development that are complementary to official development assistance (ODA) and predictable and stable in nature. Innovative financing can be grouped into three main categories: innovative sourcing of the public sector used for international development, for example developing new forms of taxes and levies to provide a steady resource flow to supplement ODA; innovative mechanisms that can make existing financing more effective, such as debt swaps or

advanced market commitments, or that can leverage private flows for development objectives; and innovative spending, for example through global funds, including the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

The survey asked entities if they report on the estimated resources generated from innovative funding modalities as well as lessons learned and best practices from such modalities as part of its regular financial reporting. The feedback is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4 – Reporting on innovative funding modalities**

Innovative funding modalities	Entity reports on resources received	Entity reports on lessons learned and best practices
	#	#
Yes	13	10
No	15	18
Total	28	28

A wide variety of “innovative” sources were noted by entities when they were asked to list examples of innovative funding modalities that their organization had implemented. The following were among the more salient:

- UNICEF is partnering with the Islamic Development Bank and other Islamic philanthropies and financial institutions to leverage finance to scale up investments in children, especially those in the member states of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation.
- UNESCO reported bringing together public and private partners around shared priority themes combining funding, scientific expertise, and solid expertise in communication and outreach. The specialized agency identified as a ‘best practice’ the cooperation between Jaeger Lecoultre and the Government of Flanders to support UNESCO’s marine World Heritage Programme.
- ILO listed an innovative domestic funding example from Brazil which generated proceeds from fines resulting from penalties for violations of labour law that are entrusted to the ILO for remedial action in areas such as domestic work and child labour.
- UNDP and FAO mentioned its strong partnerships with the environment vertical funds. UN-Habitat was accredited to the Adaptation Fund and is finalizing the process of accreditation to the Green Climate Fund. Following the Habitat III conference, the agency is working with other UN and development actors to establish a multi partner Implementation Facility for Sustainable Urban Development.

### III. ENABLING PROGRAMME COUNTRIES TO ACHIEVE THE SDGs

#### A. Strengthening National Capacities

##### Questions 39 to 40

*39. Please mention briefly any measures such as revised policies or systems, introduced recently by your entity to better develop and strengthen national capacities including ensuring the long-term impact of capacities built.*

*40. Please mention briefly any obstacles or challenges your entity has encountered in this regard.*

##### **Key findings**

- **Entities consistently emphasised that capacity development was a core function.**
- **Several entities emphasised national ownership and inclusive, nationally-led approaches for capacity needs' assessments and capacity development projects/programmes; and collaboration with other UN entities to share good practices.**
- **Several issues in the efforts to develop and strengthen national capacities were highlighted, most notably the challenge of ensuring that capacity building efforts contribute to long-term and transformative changes.**

WIPO mentioned that they are placing increased emphasis on national ownership and linking intellectual property initiatives to national development policies, plans and priorities in a coherent manner and over an extended period of time. Similarly, ITC highlighted its focus on ensuring national ownership and long-term impact of capacities by strengthening of national and regional capacity building institutions.

UNDP highlighted the UNDG-endorsed Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) approach to support countries in mainstreaming the SDGs, and identifying means to accelerate implementation.

UNCDF works with a wide range of actors on demand-and supply-side data and analytics, as through its Making Access Possible (MAP) diagnostic to create a set of practical actions and develop national strategies aimed at extending financial inclusion (see <http://www.uncdf.org/map>).

UNICEF's new Strategic Plan for 2018-21 states its intention to enhance the capacity of key systems, including information management, accountability and evaluation systems.

IFAD is preparing to launch the CLEAR (Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results) initiative which aims to strengthen at country level capacity to monitor and measure the results achieved by development projects.

UNFPA noted that three interdependent levels of capacity building (individual, environmental and institutional) have been identified as a mode of engagement to achieve the anticipated results of the strategic plan 2018-2021, with correlated indicators.

UNISDR mentioned its work with ESCAP, ECE and other entities on the Global Partnership for Disaster-Related Data for Sustainable Development as a multi-stakeholder initiative to assist

countries fill gaps in disaster-related data, build national capacity, and improve data quality. ECA mentioned a Capacity Development Strategy (CDS) developed in 2015 to strengthen the capacity of the African Union, the Regional Economic Communities and other Pan-African institutions, building on the synergy between Commission-wide and regional expertise in provision of evidence based policy services.

OHCHR has created an internet-based Performance Monitoring System that allows for planning, monitoring and reporting on results including where capacity changes supported by the OHCHR have led to behavioural, legislative or institutional changes .

Under its new 2017-21 Strategic Plan, WFP has prioritized building, development and strengthening of national capacities to support the achievement of the SDGs. UNOPS strategic plan, 2018-2021 refer to standards, guidance and tool-kits including for building different aspects of national capacity. WHO's General Programme of Work (2014-2020) identifies leadership priorities that will contribute to strengthen national capacities.

Other entities also mentioned plans to strengthen national statistical systems, or other measures to align their capacity building practices more closely with the 2030 Agenda.

There were several prominent themes among the 23 responses to this question. Possibly the most crucial challenge was ensuring that capacity building efforts contribute to long-term and transformative changes. Strengthening capacities generally requires a holistic approach and a sustained commitment from all parties. Entities highlighted the factors that often prevented them from pursuing such approaches. Key amongst these was lack of funds, funding that is available for only one year at a time, non-core funding, or funding that is otherwise unpredictable. Another challenge mentioned by several entities was staff turnover on the national side.

## B. Strengthening Partnership Approaches

### Questions 41 to 46

- 41. Does your entity have a functioning monitoring and reporting platform or mechanism/s that tracks the annual status and results of each partnership?**
- 42. Please briefly describe the platform or mechanism/s, how it tracks the annual status and results of each partnership, and whether this mechanism is shared with other entities.**
- 43. Please briefly mention if there are plans to do so in the future.**
- 44. How many partnerships does your entity have at the global and regional level? (Please provide an approximate figure if the exact number is not known).**
- 45. How many of these partnerships are newly-formed since the start of this calendar year? (Please provide an approximate figure if the exact number is not known).**
- 46. How many of these partnerships will end at the end of this calendar year? (Please provide an approximate figure if the exact number is not known).**

#### **Key findings**

- **Three-quarters of entities responded that they have a functioning monitoring and reporting platform that tracks the annual status and results of their partnerships.**

**Three-quarters of entities responded that they have a functioning monitoring and reporting platform that tracks the annual status and results of their partnerships.** Entities also provided information on the name of the platform or mechanism (such as ‘Compendium of Resource Partner Contributions’) and on how it worked. A few entities noted that the data was publicly available, while others mentioned plans to improve their systems. UN-Women mentioned a ‘Donor Agreements Management System’, while adding that for reporting to implementing partners, civil society partners, media partners, and advocacy/non-donor partners, the main mechanism is the Executive Director’s Annual Report and the specific annual reports of each unit, section or division. Other entities appear to follow similar approaches, sometimes mentioning that selected information is issued in press releases, put on the website, etc.

UNHCR mentioned they engage in yearly bilateral meetings with its main international NGO and UN partners in which the status of partnership, collaboration, best practices and key lessons are shared. UNHCR also organizes annual UNHCR-NGO consultations ([www.unhcr.org/annual-consultations-ngos.html](http://www.unhcr.org/annual-consultations-ngos.html)) with NGOs and other civil society’s actors.

WFP noted that it uses its country office tool to track the annual status and results of each partnership, and this includes the lessons and best practices in the annual standard reports which are public and shared with all the partners. In addition, lessons learned are shared in thematic fora at the country office level. Within the private sector division of WFP, ‘Salesforce’ has been used since 2010 to capture private partnerships.

WHO mentioned its ‘List of non-State actors in official relations with WHO’<sup>15</sup> (currently 206) explaining that “official relations” is a privilege that the Executive Board may grant to nongovernmental organizations, international business associations and philanthropic foundations that have had and continue to have a sustained and systematic engagement in the interest of the Organization.

UNIDO reported that they have tracking systems for each of its key types of partnership: financial institutions and the business sector. UNIDO maintains databases to track status of these partnerships, at institutional and project level. Looking forward, UNIDO plans to integrate substantive progress reports into its Enterprise Resource Planning system. This aims to facilitate UNIDO’s ability to extract data and results related to partnerships with the business sector and financial institutions for further analysis.

Among the entities that replied that they did not have a reporting mechanism to track their partnerships, ECLAC noted that Umoja is a transactional platform, not a monitoring and reporting one, so to overcome Umoja’s limitations in this regard ECLAC along other entities from the UN Secretariat are piloting a Donors’ Reporting System to track the status and results of each partnership.

Not surprisingly, the survey revealed that the larger entities already work with a very large number of partners. For example, UNHCR explained that it has 929 partners for implementation across all regions of the world, 310 Strategic Agreements signed with different partners (NGOs, UN, academia, private sector, governmental agencies, intergovernmental organizations, foundations, think tanks, etc.), and 60 private and corporate partnerships, again across all regions. Similarly, WFP noted “*over 1,500 current partnership arrangements, including more than 90 companies and 17 corporate partners, and hundreds of NGO field based cooperating partnership agreements.*”

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.who.int/about/collaborations/non-state-actors/non-state-actors-july-2016.pdf?ua=1>



## C. South-South Cooperation

### Questions 47 to 57

- 47. Has your entity integrated South-South cooperation into its strategic plan?*
- 48. If no, please briefly mention why this was not covered in the strategic plan and if there are plans to do so in the future.*
- 49. Does your agency report on south-south cooperation in its annual report?*
- 50. Please briefly mention why this was not covered in the annual report and if there are plans to do so in the future.*
- 51. Does your entity have a unit dedicated to South-South cooperation?*
- 52. Approximately how much of this unit's staff's time is allocated to South-South and triangular cooperation?*
- 53. Does your entity have a budget dedicated to South-South and triangular cooperation?*
- 54. Please mention briefly any challenges your entity faces in regard to mainstreaming and enhancing support for South-South cooperation:*
- 55. Please mention briefly any incentives that your entity has in place to mainstream and enhance support for South-South cooperation:*
- 56. Does your entity provide assistance to the UN Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC) in any way?*
- 57. Please mention briefly any lesson learned from the implementation of successful South-South and triangular cooperation projects and programmes:*

#### **Key findings**

- **Almost all entities have incorporated South-South Cooperation into their strategic plans, but progress is more limited in terms of reporting on SSC**
- **Several entities mentioned a lack of procedures or systems for monitoring, evaluation and reporting, whereby lessons could be learned that would lead to enhanced support and mainstreaming of SSC.**
- **About half of UN entities have a unit dedicated to South-South Cooperation**

**A clear majority of UNDS entities have incorporated South-South Cooperation (SSC) into their strategic plans** (see Table 5). The only exceptions were OHCHR, UN Habitat, UNISDR and UNRWA. UN-Habitat, while acknowledging that the strategic plan does not refer specifically to SSC, added that it is ready to intensify efforts to support SSC as a means of implementation of the New Urban Agenda and to enhance alignment with the UNDS reform. UNRWA commented that it is not a development agency but a public service agency.

UNODC mentioned that while there is no explicit mention of the term South-South cooperation in its Strategic Framework, all of UNODC's regional and country programmes prioritise cross-border cooperation within and across regions in order to effectively address transnational drugs and crime challenges. Also, South-South experience-sharing is a firm component of UNODC's Global Programmes.

**Table 5 Has your entity integrated SSC into its strategic plan?**

	2014	2015	2017
<b>Yes</b>	20	23	25
<b>No</b>	1	2	4
<b>Skipped</b>	1	0	0
	<b>22</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>29</b>

Progress is more limited in terms of reporting on SSC (see Table 6). **Twenty-one entities indicated that they report on SSC in its annual report, compared to 20 the 2015 survey.** The entities that answered 'no' in 2017 included three (OHCHR, UNISDR and UNRWA) of the four entities mentioned above that have not included SSC in their strategic plans, as well as ECLAC, ESCWA, UNCTAD, UNHCR and WHO. ESCWA explained that its sub-programmes are active on South-South cooperation, but they do not treat this as a separate topic in their annual report. Likewise, UNCTAD noted that SSC is a cross-cutting issue in many areas of work, but is not reported on separately. UNHCR mentioned that references to cooperation with organizations in the Global South are mainstreamed in the partnership chapter of their report, and WHO added that some regional offices have incorporated the issue in the respective Regional Director's annual report.

Fifteen entities indicated that they have a unit dedicated to SSC, compared with 12 entities in 2015 and seven in 2014. Table 6 shows the number of staff in these units dedicated to SSC and the percentage of their time that is devoted to SSC.

**Table 6 – Data on units dedicated to south-south cooperation**

Agency	Number of staff	% of staff time	Amount of budget dedicated to south-south and triangular cooperation
<b>ECA</b>	4	25-50%	\$16 to \$20m.
<b>FAO</b>	1	100%	Not quantified
<b>IFAD</b>	1	100%	Not quantified
<b>ILO</b>	3	51-75%	Not quantified
<b>ITC</b>	1	100%	\$2.7m regular budget, \$9.7m extra-budgetary
<b>ITU</b>	4	75-100%	5m Swiss Francs
<b>UNCTAD</b>	6	75-100%	\$1.4 m per year (staff costs)
<b>UNDP</b>	6	75-100%	A minimum of \$14.0 million for UNOSSC for the period 2014-2017. SSC programme outputs are estimated to entail expenditures of about \$20m.
<b>UNEP</b>	1	100%	No dedicated budget, but resources are used as part of programme budgets.
<b>UNFPA</b>	2	100%	\$560,000 plus country offices can use programme funds for South-South related activities.
<b>UNICEF</b>	1 (and 8 part-time)	Less than 25% overall	No dedicated budget, but country offices can use programme funds for South-South related activities.
<b>UNIDO</b>	2	100%	Not quantified
<b>UN-Women</b>	1	25-50%	Not quantified
<b>WFP</b>	1	100%	No
<b>WIPO</b>	2	Over 75%	1.36m Swiss Francs

It should be noted that several other entities mentioned that, while they have no dedicated unit to SSC, some staff members at Headquarters, regional or country level do have south-south cooperation as part of their job descriptions. For example, ESCAP noted that they operate a number of regional institutions and networks that actively engage in south-south cooperation. WFP explained that its Policy and Programme Division hosts the SSC function and coordinates WFP's work on South-South cooperation in close collaboration with SSC focal points in Regional Bureaus and Country Offices. Importantly, WFP has established two of Centres of Excellence working on SSC and partnerships: one in Brazil and one in China.

**Through the survey, entities also outlined the key challenges they face in regard to mainstreaming and enhancing support for SSC. Several entities mentioned a lack of procedures or systems for monitoring, evaluation and reporting, whereby lessons could be learned.** Reflecting the experience of a number of other organizations, one entity had learned from a survey of field staff that a significant number of south-south activities were not designed as an integral part of a planned programme but rather were one-time, small-scale activities, the impact of which was difficult to assess. Some entities mentioned that they lacked resources to support south-south cooperation while others indicated that south-south cooperation called for unfamiliar operational procedures.

It is worth noting that in the survey of Governments, many confirmed similar challenges. A leading Southern partner mentioned the difficulty that some UN entities seem to have in understanding SSC as a modality of multilateral cooperation, as well as in providing guidelines and practices on how to proceed on the ground.

A wide variety of measures were mentioned under the heading of incentives, a key one being the existence of a dedicated unit with a budget. Also mentioned were extensive field presence, strong regional offices, an 'exchange platform' to share demand for services, programme and project review criteria that include focus on SSC, a dedicated fund for SSC, and a mechanism to tag initiatives that have a significant SSC component.

With regard to providing assistance to the UN Office for SSC (UNOSSC), the survey revealed a strong trend in the direction of stronger and more widespread support to the UNOSSC (see Table 7). All the larger development-oriented entities confirmed support for UNOSSC.

**Table 7 - Provision of assistance to the UN Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC)**

Response	2017	2015	2014
Yes	21	15	11
No	7	10	9
Skipped the question	1	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>

UNDP noted that, in consultation with the UNOSSC, it had developed a corporate strategy on South-South and triangular cooperation, clarifying and deepening the relationship with UNOSSC. It recognises the complementarity of UNOSSC's role at the system-wide level and UNDP's role as an operational arm for SSC and Triangular Cooperation in the field. UNDP recently provided technical and financial support to the UNOSSC to produce a report on "Good Practices in South-South and Triangular Cooperation for Sustainable Development" which provides information on 61 SSC mechanisms, addressing challenges in all the 17 SDGs.

IFAD noted that it has been partnering and participating in the annual UNOSSC Global South-South Development (GSSD) Expo, which is focused on a different theme each year and is hosted by a different partner Government. IFAD is also supporting UNOSSC with preparations for the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (BAPA) +40 conference, which is being organized to mark 40 years of SSC and the adoption of the BAPA. The event will encourage further South-South efforts towards the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Several other entities also mentioned their support for these two initiatives.

Entities identified a number of factors that make for successful implementation of south-south and triangular cooperation. They included: the activities are part of a larger programme of support by the entity, and are in the entity's core areas of expertise; where the activities are demand driven, well aligned with country-led mechanisms, and coordinated with UN entities and other partners. Several entities stressed the importance of stakeholder participation and engagement, expressed through contributions with own resources, as a key to success and sustainability of South-South projects and programmes.

UNFPA, with a long history of supporting SSC, commented that in their experience SSC has tended to comprise ad hoc, scattered initiatives implemented on a small scale. With the adoption of a new Corporate Strategy on South-South and Triangular Cooperation, UNFPA is addressing this challenge, introducing tools and procedures to strengthen current initiatives, and also to include implementation and monitoring tools and evaluation standards in new SSC initiatives.

One entity indicated that knowledge networks and exchange of experience among countries facing similar development policy challenges is an effective modality of effecting and sustaining change. Another commented that the use of information-communication-technology affords unprecedented opportunities for matching supply with demand.

Several entities highlighted the value of SSC and triangular cooperation in promoting regional integration and strengthening the capacity of regional organizations, and some entities outlined specific country or regional level initiatives that they are supporting.

#### D. Providing Greater Complementarity between Humanitarian, Development and Peacebuilding efforts

Questions 58 to 60

**58. Please identify any relevant programming instruments or processes or business practices that your entity has developed to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations.**

**59. Please describe any relevant actions that your entity has taken to ensure greater cooperation and complementarity among development, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian action and sustaining peace in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in conflict and post-conflict situations.**

**60. Please make any further suggestions on how the complementarity among humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts can be strengthening in the UN system.**

### **Key findings**

- **While bilateral efforts among UN entities aimed at enhancing coordination and complementarity across the humanitarian, development, peacebuilding, disaster risk reduction divide appear common, few entities mentioned actions they were taking at the system-wide level to enhance cross-sectoral coordination.**

Entities identified several mechanisms and action plans to enhance coordination between humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts in countries facing humanitarian emergencies. Several entities mentioned internal action plans and bilateral programs with another UN entities. For example, in 2016 UNDP and DPA deployed 42 Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs) globally under their joint program, “Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention.” In 2016, UNICEF and UNFPA finalized revisions to the IASC Guideless for Integrating GBV interventions in Humanitarian Action.

In terms of more global programming instruments to enhance coordination between development, humanitarian, and peacebuilding actors, several UN entities mentioned actions to implement the New Way of Working<sup>16</sup>, which was adopted at the 2016 Humanitarian Summit. UNDP reported that it is engaged in promoting coordination and complementarity between humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts through the development and implementation of the Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support (MAPS)<sup>17</sup> for relevant countries. UN entities also reported that they engage in cross-sectoral coordination through interagency coordination mechanisms based in the field. For instance, OHCHR noted that they support joint assessments and analysis among UN entities as a leader in protection cluster working groups in the field. Other entities mentioned the importance of regional action plans to coordinate cross-sectoral assistance, such as the Great Lakes Regional Strategic Framework and the Sahel Regional Response Plan.

**Nevertheless, some entities suggested that more robust coordination mechanisms between development, humanitarian, and peacebuilding actors are needed at Headquarters, where senior managers set policies and procedures for their relative entities.**

Several entities provided examples of bilateral programs they implemented with other UN entities or with other donor nations aimed at ensuring greater cooperation and complementarity among development, DRR, humanitarian and/or sustaining peace actions. However, very few entities mentioned actions they were taking at the system-wide level to enhance cross-sectoral coordination. UNDP noted that it has played a key role in rolling out the New Way of Working to allow humanitarian, development and peace actors to work better together across pillars and engage in joint analysis and planning. UNDP, PBSO, DPA, DPKO and the World Bank also published the flagship report, “Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflicts.”

**Entities provided several recommendations to promote coordination between humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding efforts, but suggested that real change will require bold reforms at UN Headquarters.**

---

<sup>16</sup> At the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016, former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the heads of UNICEF, UNHCR, WHO, OCHA, WFP, FAO, UNFPA and UNDP, with the endorsement of the World Bank and the International Organization of Migration signed a document, in which they agreed on a “New Way of Working” in crises. Its aim is not only to meet humanitarian needs, but also to reduce needs, risks and vulnerability over time.

<sup>17</sup> MAPS was adopted by the UNDG in October 2015 as a common approach to its support to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the country level

Other entities suggested that policies such as Human Rights Up Front Initiative<sup>18</sup> and the New Way of Working should be further defined and more widely promoted both by UN leadership and Member States to ensure cross-pillar coordination .

## IV. IMPROVING FUNCTIONING

### A. Resident Coordinator System

#### Questions 61 to 69

- 61. Does the job descriptions of your Country Representatives include provisions that recognize the country representative's role vis a vis UN Resident Coordinator?**
- 62. Please briefly specify how this recognition of the RC's role is written in the Terms of Reference of your Country Representatives or in any HQ policy guidance (include any direct quotes that would be appropriate in response to this question).**
- 63. Does your entity recognize reporting obligations to the UN Resident Coordinator for the following field activities?**
- 64. Does your entity require inputs from the UN Resident Coordinator to Country Representatives' performance appraisal?**
- 65. Does your entity report on use and contribution to the UNDG RC cost-sharing mechanism to its respective governing body?**
- 66. Did your entity pay its contribution in full to the UNDG RC cost-sharing system?**
- 67. Please briefly explain why not.**

#### **Key findings**

- **Almost all entities with country offices have implemented the first element of the MAS pertaining to the recognition of the role of the RC.**
- **Only about half of the Funds and Programmes recognize reporting obligations to the RC for certain field activities.**
- **There is a firm commitment on the part of the Funds and Programmes to the RC cost-sharing mechanism**

In the framework of the current “primus inter pares” arrangements, and in order to encourage teamwork among the members of UN country teams, the UNDG approved a ‘Management and Accountability System’ (MAS). Key elements of the system were that the TORs of agency heads should recognize their role vis-à-vis the RC, that the agency performance appraisal system should include UNCT results areas, that RCs should have an input to the performance report of agency heads and vice-versa, and that entities should report to the RC on funding and programme performance of UNDAF elements led by the entity. For several years the HQ survey has captured the

---

<sup>18</sup> Human Rights up Front is a Secretary-General initiative to strengthen prevention of serious concerns that cut across the UN's three pillars of peace and security, development, and human rights. The initiative aims to realize a cultural change within the UN system, so all staff and UN entities to conduct their work with an awareness of their wider responsibility to support the UN Charter and overall UN mandates. It encourages staff to take a principled stance and to act with moral courage to prevent serious and large-scale violations, and pledges Headquarters support for those who do so.

evolving policies and procedures of UN entities on these topics. The responses in 2017 are shown in the table below.

Seventeen entities indicated that the job descriptions of UNCT members, as heads of agencies, recognize the role of the Resident Coordinator.

Ten entities, including regional commissions, UNCTAD, ITC, WIPO and UNISDR, pointed out that these questions were not relevant to them, as they do not have country offices.

**The job description of most entities’ representatives is limited to stipulating the representatives will be a member of the UNCT and collaborate with the RC.** This is the case for UNICEF, UNHCR and FAO.

Five entities mentioned job descriptions that indicate support for the RC system while reiterating the role of the representative in advocating within the UNCT for the entity’s individual mandate. One entity wrote, for example: “As member of the UN Country Team, the incumbent will work closely with the Resident Coordinator and the other UN agencies and promote, advocate and disseminate [entity]’s ideals and objectives, build alliances, promote activities, discuss, identify, influence and participate in joint activities/projects.” Advocating for the entity’s interests is naturally part of a representative’s job description, but its attachment to the MAS provision could be seen as expressing a reservation, particularly as four of the five entities also reported that they do not seek an input from the RC on their representative’s performance (item 2 in the above table) in either ‘all’ or ‘most’ countries. (Two said some countries and two said none.)

The DESA surveys have also sought to capture a field level perspective on how the MAS is being implemented. The relevant data can be found in the report on the RC survey.

Entities were asked whether they recognize reporting obligations to the RC in respect to certain types of field activities, namely, planning, implementation and resources mobilization. The data received from this question can be seen in Table 8.

**Table 8 - UNCT members’ reporting to the RC**

Agency recognises reporting obligation in respect of:	Planning		Implementation		Resource mobilization	
	All	F/Ps	All	Fs+Ps	All	Fs+Ps
Yes	14	5	15	6	12	5
No	12	5	11	4	14	5
Total	26	10	26	10	26	10

**The feedback indicates a very mixed picture regarding these aspects of support for the RC system.** An interesting feature of the data is that the responses from Funds and Programmes seem as mixed as the responses from the other entities. Among the six specialized agencies that responded to the survey, four answered “yes” (FAO, ILO, UNIDO and WHO) on each of the above topics while two (UNESCO and ITU) answered “no”.

The survey revealed a firm commitment on the part of the Funds and Programmes to the cost-sharing mechanism. The only two entities classed as a F/Ps that answered “no” to whether they paid their RC cost-sharing contribution in full and report this contribution to its governing body were UNEP, which explained that the questions do not apply to them as they do not have country offices, and

UNRWA which has a mandate that is limited to a specific territory. UN-Habitat skipped the question. The regional commissions also noted that the topic did not apply to them.

**Table 9 – Involvement in the UNDG RC cost-sharing mechanism**

Agency involvement in UNDG RC cost-sharing mechanism:	Provides reports to governing body		Pays contribution in full	
	All	F/Ps	All	Fs+Ps
Yes	14	7	13	7
No	11	2	13	2
Total	25	9 <sup>19</sup>	26	9

As with the preceding topic, the specialized agencies with a substantial field presence (i.e. present in at least 50 countries - FAO, ILO, UNESCO and WHO) answered that their organization provides reports to its governing body on its use and contribution to the RC cost-sharing mechanism, and all but UNESCO also indicated that they pay their contributions in full. UNAIDS, UNIDO and UNOPS answered 'yes' to both of these questions. One entity mentioned concerns about growing costs, and noted that a review was being carried out into how the mechanism was working.

Some UN Secretariat entities (including UNODC and UNCTAD) that said 'no' explained that they are covered by the UN Secretariat contribution to the RC-cost-sharing, which was still under negotiation at the level of the UN General Assembly.

## B. Programmatic and Operational Coherence

### Questions 70 to 74 & 77-78

- 70. Has your entity reported to its governing body on any recent actions taken to identify and address institutional bottlenecks with the aim of promoting greater programmatic coherence within the UN country teams?**
- 71. Please briefly describe some recent actions taken to remove institutional bottlenecks.**
- 72. If you answered no, please explain briefly why not.**
- 73. Please briefly outline which steps your entity has taken with regards to offering an integrated package of support in programme countries, as outlined in OP 61 above, specifically:**
- 74. Does your entity's strategic plan include a common chapter with other UN entities?**
- 77. Please indicate the number of regional knowledge products produced as part of the Regional Forums on Sustainable Development :**
- 78. What steps has your entity taken to ensure implementation of the Statement of collaboration [between the UNDG and the regional commissions]. Please make reference to the use of common data and statistics, integrated capacity development, common methodologies and approaches to mainstreaming the SDGs and sharing information**

<sup>19</sup> UN-Habitat skipped this question



### **Key findings**

- **UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, and UN-Women have developed a common chapter for their Strategic Plans which identify and elaborate on specific areas of collaborative advantage.**
- **Several entities have not reported to their governing body on recent actions to identify and address institutional bottlenecks**

During the pilot stages of Delivering as One (DaO) which was launched in 2007 in eight countries<sup>20</sup>, the Chief Executives Board (CEB) identified a number of “bottlenecks” at headquarters level that were impeding the effective implementation of DaO. Since 2013, the CEB, through UNDG and HLCM, has been addressing these bottlenecks, and reported in 2016 that 30 out of 49 planned actions had been completed by the end of 2015.

In 2016, the UNDG announced that it would adopt a follow-up Headquarters Plan of Action to help the UN development system meet the demands of the 2030 Agenda. The key objectives of the Plan would include:

- Harmonize entity systems and processes for programme and project management and reporting, to avoid duplicate requirements and to reduce transaction costs;
- Ensure appropriate delegation of authority from headquarters to country-level representatives for taking decisions on programmatic and financial matters as agreed with national authorities;
- Increase the number of entities reporting financial data through IATI standards; and
- Ensure recognition and incentives for staff members leading Operations Management Teams/ Business Operations Strategies/ Results Groups within their entity by incorporating these functions into both their job descriptions and their regular performance reviews.”

Responses to the question asking entities if they had reported to their governing bodies on actions taken to address institutional bottlenecks were evenly divided between “yes” and “no”. Among entities with a substantial field presence (representatives in at least 50 countries), eight out of eleven answered “yes”. The three that said No were UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF. UNDP and UNICEF explained (question 72) that their Boards had not requested such a report, while UNDP added that increasing coherence, as a system-wide objective, is the subject of ad hoc updates at all Executive Board sessions. Similarly, UNESCO explained that it would inform its General Conference at its fall session in 2017 of the work done to revise its UNESCO Country Strategy Guidelines so that they are in line with the new UNDAF guidelines and its 8 companion documents.

The entities that gave a “yes” response mentioned a variety of relevant measures they have taken, including among others, application of the new UNDAF guidelines, increasing the number of joint programmes, giving stronger support to results groups at country level, and promoting a better integration between humanitarian and development interventions. ECA highlighted its efforts to strengthen the focus of the RCM and SRCM as a process to enhance how UN entities at sub regional level can work in a more coordinated, coherent and complementary way on development issues of priority to Eastern and Southern Africa.

---

<sup>20</sup> The pilot phase concluded in 2012

In the context of bottlenecks, the HQ survey has for several years explored the extent to which entities have delegated authority to their country level representatives in areas that include some of the topics mentioned above. The results for 2015 and 2017 are presented under Q80-82 below.

*Integrated package of support in programme countries*

Eighteen entities indicated that they offered at least one of the suggested types of integrated packages of support as outlined in OP 61 of the QCPR resolution.<sup>21</sup> Entities with substantial field presence tended to select multiple types of support. This applied equally to the Funds and Programmes, along with UNAIDS, UNODC and UNOPS, and to the specialized agencies.

**Table 10 – Entities’ responses on offering “integrated packages” of support**

Type of support:	Programme support	Monitoring and evaluation	Reporting	Pooled and/or flexible funding	Simplification of business practices
Yes	16	17	16	14	14
No	6	5	5	7	7
% Yes	73%	77%	73%	67%	67%

The diversity of responses under the optional comment box in question 73 suggests that entities did not find it easy to respond to the question, partly as there could be different interpretations of “integrated package of support.” To address this concern, some entities clarified their responses.

UNICEF explained that it actively participates in the integrated packages of support offered by many UNCTs through the SOPs or other mechanisms. Specifically:

- Programme Support – yes, UNICEF continues to expand its participation in Joint Programming modalities at all levels
- M&E – yes, UNICEF participates in a number of joint evaluations every year, and contributes to guidance provided to UNCTs via UNEG
- Reporting – yes, UNICEF contributes actively to UNDAF reporting
- Pooled funding – yes, UNICEF frequently participates in pooled funding as Administrative Agent, Convening Agent, and/or Participating UN Organization. We participated, most recently, in the formation of the undg Joint Fund on SDG Policy Support.
- Simplified Business Practices – yes, UNICEF is participating in an increasing number of Business Operations Strategies and LTAs globally.

UNDP highlighted the integrated policy support missions using the Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS)<sup>22</sup> system carried out since 2016, drawing on expertise across the UN system. Collaboration with other UN entities and external partners is guided by country priorities and needs. Once an area of support is identified at the country level in consultation with the government and the Resident Coordinator, relevant UN entities and external partners are requested to take part in the mission.

<sup>21</sup> OP61 of the QCPR resolution requested the UNDS to continue to deepen its approach in programme countries by offering an integrated package of support that includes specific programmatic support, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, pooled and flexible financing, support for the RC system and simplification and harmonization of business practices.

<sup>22</sup> <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/MAPS-Concept-Note-Oct-2015-ENDORSED-BY-UNDG-on-26.10.15.pdf>

### *Common chapter in strategic plans*

In response to their governing bodies' requests to work in a more integrated and coherent manner, **UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, and UN-Women have developed a common chapter for their Strategic Plans which identify and elaborate on specific areas of collaborative advantage.** The entities propose to use the Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS) system as a key entry point to build the case for prioritization of and investment in activities to ensure no-one is left behind. This approach is a notable step towards creating a more collective approach to the strategic planning of the UNDS.

Besides those four Funds and Programmes, and while not appearing to constitute exactly a “common chapter”, IFAD noted that under its Strategic Framework (2016-2025), collaboration with Rome-based entities (WFP, FAO and IFAD) is recognized to be of strategic priority. The partnership between the Rome-based entities would leverage IFAD's own comparative advantage in providing long-term financial investment for smallholder agriculture and rural transformation, the unique strength of FAO in technical and global policy issues for food and agriculture, and the unmatched capabilities of WFP in providing timely support to countries during acute humanitarian disasters.

Other entities also noted that while there was no ‘common chapter’, their strategic plans did address collaboration with other entities. UNOPS was one such entity, explaining that due to its unique business model the Executive Board did not decide, at the first regular session in 2017, that UNOPS should participate in the development of or include a ‘common chapter’ developed by UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN-Women in its strategic plan. However, the UNOPS strategic plan, 2018-2021 takes note of the ‘common approach’ agreed between the four entities.

### *Regional knowledge products*

Concrete information on the production of regional knowledge products came from the regional commissions. The quantitative data provided by the regional commissions, as included in the QCPR Monitoring Framework, is as shown in Table 11 below. Several other entities explained that they had supported the regional commissions in developing knowledge products in their field of competence.

**Table 11- Number of regional knowledge products produced as part of the Regional Forums on Sustainable Development**

<b>Regional commission:</b>	<b>Number of knowledge products</b>
ECA	127
ECE	36
ECLAC	3
ESCAP	18
ESCWA	N/A

### *Statement of collaboration*

Focused responses to this question asking entities the steps they've taken to ensure implementation of the Statement of collaboration came largely from the regional commissions themselves. The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) explained that the biannual meetings of the Regional Coordination Mechanism and the Regional UN Development Group for Europe and Central Asia (R-UNDG), which previously had been held back-to-back, were merged into one Regional UN System Meeting with one agenda and one set of conclusions. The first unified Regional UN System Meeting

was held in Vienna in December 2016. ECE added that in view of the integrated nature of the SDGs, the regional UN system has committed to work together more closely, to act jointly and to seek synergies across different UN entities and themes. This is a noteworthy model for other regions.

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) commented that joint representation and One Voice of 22 UN entities were highly appreciated by Member States at the Regional Forum on Sustainable Development in 2016 and 2017. Analytical capacities, data wealth and substantive expertise of all UN entities were also put together in the development of the 2017 Regional Advocacy Paper (RAP) launched in Geneva. Cooperation at expert level has also been brought to a new quality level. Regional Working Groups were transformed into the Issue-Based Coalitions (IBCs): to avoid siloed approaches following the SDG indivisibility nature; to focus the UN system support and engagement on development challenges and issues, not on UN agencies' mandates; to expand UN partnerships beyond the UN system in view of the growing demands of the 2030 Agenda. Currently, there are five well-functioning Issue-Based Coalitions focusing on Gender, Health, Youth and Adolescents, Migration and Resilience, and Social Protection. Creation of a new IBC on Data was approved at the latest Regional UN system meeting in May 2017. All IBCs are co-chaired by the Regional Directors of the UN entities and jointly report to the ECA R-UNDG and the RCM.

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) noted that they took part in four MAPS missions, led by UNDP, in the LAC region in 2017. In one instance, ECLAC led the data and analysis part of the mission and will be accompanying the statistic mechanisms and data availability sections identified in the road map.

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) mentioned that under the RCM thematic working groups have been reconstituted in seven areas, to correspond to the relevant clusters of the Sustainable Development Goals. Although statistics is recognized as a cross cutting issue, one of the thematic working groups is specifically on statistics. This working group helps coordinate support to countries for data collection related to the SDGs, while also improving data literacy of UNCTs in the region.

Other provided complementary information, such as identifying one or more regional inter-agency working groups that they co-lead. UN-Women, for example, mentioned this in regard to several regions. UNFPA and WHO also mentioned groups that they co-lead. UNDP mentioned MAPS missions that they were supporting or leading in several regions.

## C. Physical Presence

### Questions 75 to 76

**75. Please briefly describe the current principles or guidelines that your entity has with regard to its physical presence in programme countries. Kindly include reference documents and page numbers where these principles and/or guidelines are described.**

**76. Please explain briefly any actions your organization plans to take, with timelines if possible, with a view to increasing the co-location of the regional technical support structures with other UN entities**

### **Key findings**

- **For several entities the basic concept is to be present nearly everywhere**
- **Many entities indicated that they were awaiting clarity in the SG's repositioning report on the review of regional functions and capacities before taking action on co-location of regional structures.**

While a number of entities pointed out that this question did not apply to them, as they do not have country offices, seventeen entities explained how they approach the issue of physical presence in programme countries.

**For several entities the basic principle is to be present everywhere with the exception of very small states such as islands with very small populations, which tend to be covered from a neighbouring larger country.**

Reference in this connection was made to the 'joint presence' arrangement in some Pacific islands, whereby several entities jointly sponsor a modest presence in each island state.

Some entities also have policies on closing offices. An interesting example is UNAIDS, who carried out a repositioning exercise in 2016 to better align its country focus and presence with an emphasis placed among other things on where UNAIDS can add value, national staff capacity, and greatest attention on "Fast-Track" countries as defined in the UNAIDS Strategy. This requires a differentiated footprint at country level, with alternative modalities such as providing support from a neighbouring country or a Regional Support Team. Regarding staff profiles, roles where UNAIDS continues to add value have been retained, such as Strategic Information Advisors, while potentially duplicative roles have been removed where other organizations have a specific mandate or may be better placed to cover these issues. UNAIDS also emphasised that it always seeks to share office space with UN sister entities.

IFAD, which originally had an HQ-centric business model, has been opening field offices, recognizing among other things the benefits in terms of efficiency and effectiveness of delegating authority to the country level. Some countries are now served from sub-regional hubs, while others from country level offices, depending on their 'strategic importance', among other factors.

Several entities mentioned cost-effectiveness, the merits of delegating authority, and the option of country presences other than through a full-fledged representative. However, apart from UNAIDS, there was practically no mention of sharing capacities with another UN entity.

### *Regional structures*

**Asked about their readiness to increase co-location of regional structures, many entities explained that they were awaiting the SG's report on the review of regional functions and capacities before taking action on the issue.** Some entities explained that their regional presence was already fully co-located, while others indicated that they had no plans to relocate regional structures. UNESCO and WHO noted that sometimes premises are provided by the government, which is a cheaper option for them, and therefore could be an obstacle to relocation. ILO, UNFPA, UN-Habitat, and WFP explicitly indicated readiness to look at alternatives.

## D. Joint Programming

### Questions 79 to 82

**79. Please estimate the proportion of your entity's total programme expenditure in 2016 that was spent on activities that constituted part of a joint programme:**

**80. Do your country-level representatives have authority to commit funding as part of a joint programme with other UN entities at the country level?**

**81. Do your country-level representatives have authority to substitute a multi-entity programme/project work plan for your entity's programme/project work plan?**

**82. Do your country-level representatives have authority to substitute a Country Annual UN Report for your entity's individual Country Annual Report**

#### Key findings

- **Most entities have delegated responsibility at country level to commit funding as part of a joint programme, but very few field representatives have authority to substitute a UN-wide annual country report for the entity's individual report**

Entities were asked to estimate the proportion of their total programme expenditure in 2016 that was spent on activities that constituted part of a joint programme<sup>23</sup>. Six entities reported that their joint programmes accounted for at least 20% of their programme expenditures. These entities are shown in the table below. The remaining 18 entities responding to the question reported that less than 20 per cent of expenditures were spent on joint programmes. At this point, however, it is not possible to quality-check the feedback received on this question since there exists no system-wide database on annual expenditures deployed through joint programmes.

**Table 12 – Proportion of programme expenditures in 2016 accounted for by joint programmes**

Entity	Over 50%	40-50%	30-40%	20-30%	< 20%
UNAIDS	X				
UNCTAD	X				
UNOPS	X				
WHO		X			
ESCAP			X		
UN Women				X	
All other entities					X

UNAIDS (over 50%) explained that through its Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) for 2016-21, which encompasses both core and non-core resources, it seeks to enhance coherence and reduce duplication of efforts. UNAIDS added: "all UBRAF expenditure (that means all UN expenditure related to AIDS) is part of a Joint Programme and contributes to the achievement of commonly agreed milestones and targets." UNOPS (also over 50%) explained that by

<sup>23</sup> A joint programme (as defined by UNDG) is a set of activities contained in a common work plan and related budget, involving two or more UN organizations and (sub-) national partners.

virtue of its demand-driven, self-financed business model, they always work jointly with or directly on behalf of its partners.

#### *Authority of country-level representatives*

As noted under Q70-72 above, achieving compatible levels of delegated authority is deemed by the CEB to be an important aspect of facilitating improved inter-agency collaboration at country level.

**Table 13 – Number of entities whose country-level representatives have the specified delegated authorities – in 2015 and 2017 (among fifteen entities present in over 50 countries)**

Type of authority delegated	Number of entities reporting that the specified authority is delegated to their field representatives							
	Delegated to all field representatives <sup>24</sup>		Delegated on country-by-country basis		Never yet delegated		Total	
	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017	2015	2017
<b>Commit funding as part of a joint programme</b>	9	9	4	4	2	2	15	15
<b>Use joint UN work plan instead of separate agency work plan</b>	3	5	5	3	7	7	15	15
<b>Substitute joint UN report for annual agency country report</b>	1	3	2	1	12	11	15	15

The overall picture is that **most of the fifteen entities that are present in over 50 programme countries have delegated responsibility to commit funding as part of a joint programme, some have delegated authority to substitute a multi-entity work plan for the entity's own work plan, while very few field representatives have authority to substitute a UN-wide annual country report for the entity's individual report.** Under optional comments, UNAIDS mentioned that their country representatives not only have the authority to engage with other entities in these ways, they are encouraged to do so. FAO explained that their representatives cannot avoid preparing the FAO annual report, but for the programmatic (results-based) part, they are encouraged to report the same information for the Country Programming Framework and the UNDAF (therefore the same reporting basis).

The full responses from the entities is shown in the table below:

<sup>24</sup> In 2017, as regards committing funding, this category includes entities that stated they delegated authority up to a fixed amount.

**Table 14 – Delegation of authority to field representatives – Comparative data from 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2017 surveys (Agencies with representatives in at least 50 countries)**

Colour coding:

**Green:** All country representatives have this authority<sup>25</sup>

**Yellow:** This authority is delegated on a country-by-country basis

**Blue:** This authority has never yet been delegated

x = Question not answered, or agency did not complete the survey in this year

Agency <sup>26</sup>	To commit funds to a joint programme				To use a joint work plan instead of separate agency workplans				To substitute a joint UN report for annual agency country report			
	2013 <sup>27</sup>	2014	2015	2017	2013	2014	2015	2017	2013	2014	2015	2017
FAO									x			
ILO					x				x			
OHCHR					x				x			
UNAIDS										x		
UNDP												
UNESCO		x								X		
UNFPA												
UNHCR					x				x	x		
UN-Habitat		x			x	x			x	x		
UNICEF												
UNIDO					x				x			
UNODC		x			x	x			x	x		
UN-Women					x				x			
WFP					x				x			
WHO					x				x			

## E. Harmonization and simplification of business practices

### Questions 83 to 97

**83: Has your entity submitted a plan to its governing body for consolidated common support services at country level, including in the areas of financial management, human resources, procurement, ICT and other services in accordance with OP50d?**

**84. Please explain briefly the action your organization plans to take, with timelines if possible, in relation to this plan:**

**85. Please briefly explain why a plan has not been submitted:**

**86. Has your organization developed plans for further investing in intra-agency rationalization of business operations?**

**87. Have such plans been presented to the governing body?**

**88. Please explain why no plans in this regard have been developed:**

**89. Has your entity reported to its governing body on efficiencies achieved through collaborative procurement?**

<sup>25</sup> In 2017, in regard to committing funding to a joint programme, this category includes the entities that replied: 'This authority is delegated up to a pre-defined amount', which was added to the answer options.

<sup>26</sup> ILO, OHCHR, UNODC, WFP and WHO did not complete the survey in 2013; UNESCO did not complete the survey in 2014

<sup>27</sup> This question was not asked in 2013



90. Does this reporting include estimate amounts of global savings (financial, time and/or other) achieved through collaborative procurement?

91. Please indicate the amounts of savings reported to the governing body, if applicable:

92. Please briefly explain why savings through collaborative procurement have not been reported to your entity's governing body and if there are any plans to do so in the future:

93. Has your agency established or is planning to establish regional or global service centres? (Please indicate the number of each that apply):

94. If applicable, please briefly explain the role of the service centres your agency has established or plans to establish:

95. If applicable, how does the establishment of your agency's service centres impact the implementation of Common Un Service Centres at the country level?

96. Does your entity use an established global or regional service centre of other UN entities?

97. Please specify which such global or regional centres your entity uses.

#### **Key findings**

- **Over three-quarters of entities have not submitted a plan to their governing body for consolidated common support services at country level;**
- **There is no agreed methodology within the UN system on how to quantify procurement savings. As such, only 43 per cent of entities indicated that they report on efficiencies through collaborative procurement;**
- **One in three entities use an established global or regional service centre of other UN entities.**

**22 out of 27 of those responding indicated that their entity has not submitted a plan to its governing body for consolidated common support services at country level.** The fact that only 21% of the responding OMTs (through the DESA survey of OMTs) reported to have a fully implemented BOS, corroborates the inference that there is a lot of room for growth in this regard.

As to why no such plan has been submitted, many states that this is not applicable or relevant to their situation (i.e. they do not provide common services at the country level with other entities). Other reasons include governing bodies not having oversight over entity's operations at country level. FAO noted that they already have global service centres and feel that they cannot justify creating country based joint services if they lead to increased operational and administrative costs.

#### *Intra-agency rationalization of business operations*

Just over half (15/28) of entities have developed plans for further investing in intra-agency rationalization of business operations. Although only about half of those that developed such plans have presented them to its governing body.

Those entities that confirmed to have plans for further intra-agency rationalization of business operations, referred to their global shared service centers, or participation in the UNDG BOS, or are actively involved with HLCM and UNDG in the harmonization at corporate level. More specifically, UNODC indicated it developed common programme development, planning, monitoring and reporting processes, and intra-organization rationalization of business operations are being reviewed on a continuing basis. UNCTAD highlighted that a global service delivery management (GSDM) initiative is under discussion at the UN Secretariat-wide level.

Many organizations that have no plans for further investing in intra-agency rationalization of business operations indicated that it is not applicable to their situation, in that they don't have an UNDAF or country presence, or are not part of the UNDG, or are referring to active participating in the BOS and other harmonization efforts with UNDG and HLCM.

#### *Collaborative procurement*

**Only 43% of the entities responded positively to the question on whether they report on efficiencies through collaborative procurement.** Interestingly, many of the respondents found that there is no need to report as “their procurement function is outsourced to a different entity, or are leveraging another entity’s LTAs.” **Currently there is no agreed methodology within the UN system on how to quantify savings.** It therefore makes it difficult to obtain accurate numbers on collaborative procurement. This difficulty was highlighted by entities as a reason why they do not systematically recording and quantifying savings in either cash or labour terms.

#### *Global and regional service centres*

Almost every entity has established a global service centre and about three-quarters of entities have established regional service centres (see Table 15 below).

**Table 15 – Entities with established or planning regional and/or global service centres**

Type of support:	Established global service center	Established regional service center(s)	Planned global service center	Planned regional service center(s)
Yes	19	17	14	16
No	3	5	8	6
% Yes	86%	77%	64%	73%

The regional and global service centres serve a wide-range of purposes ranging from global contractual administration; management of personnel benefits, entitlements and allowances, including staff compensation and claims; coordination with external partners and suppliers; reconciliation of specific financial transactions; support to business processes in the areas of HR, Consultants, Travel, Payments and Asset Management to employees and offices worldwide; etc.

**Only one-third (8/24) of entities use an established global or regional service centre of other UN entities.** For example, UN Women staff members receive payroll, benefits, and entitlements services through the UNDP global HR service centre in Copenhagen, Denmark. UNFPA outsources a number of its back-office services to UNDP (e.g., payroll, treasury, etc.), meaning UNFPA is, by default, a client of UNDP's current service centre infrastructure.

## V. MONITORING AND REPORTING

### A. Managing for results

#### Questions 68-69 and 98 to 107

**98. Your entity uses the results-based management (RBM) tools and principles as identified in the UNDG RBM handbook in the following respects (select all that apply):**

**99. Has your agency taken steps to support the development of common (system-wide) approaches and definitions with regard to measuring results and harmonizing indicators.**

100. Please briefly specify the steps taken in this regard.
101. Please mention if there are plans to do so in the future.
102. Does the strategic plan of your entity include provisions for knowledge management strategies?
103. Does your entity use a common authentication system that allows for seamless secure access (e.g. Common Connect)?
104. Has your entity taken steps towards sharing its knowledge management strategies with other UN entities?
105. Please outline briefly the steps that have been taken in this regard.
106. Please briefly explain why no steps in this regard have been taken.
68. Does your entity have a risk management assessment policy?
69. Please indicate which types of risks are included in the policy?
107. Is it a requirement that your agency's country programme documents (or equivalent) demonstrate complete results chains down from the UNDAF (or equivalent document)?
108. Does your agency place all audit and evaluation reports on the public website?
109. Does your entity also post management responses?

#### **Key findings**

- While most entities have a formal knowledge management strategy, others have a variety of knowledge management policies in place;
- Several entities use the One UN Knowledge Exchange Network on Yammer, which hosts inter-agency communities of practice under the UNDG.

In recent surveys, UN entities were asked about the extent they used the results-based management (RBM) tools and principles as identified in the UNDG RBM handbook. In earlier surveys, they were simply asked if the tools and principles were being applied fully, partially or not at all. In the 2017 survey, information was sought on several more specific aspects of RBM. The results are shown below.

The survey asked entities which RBM tools and principles from the UNDG RBM handbook that it applies. Answers are provided in the table below.

**Table 16 – Use of RBM tools and principles by UN entities**  
(respondents selected all that apply)

Aspect of results-based management	Yes	No	% Yes
Concepts and terms (eg outcomes, outputs) are used by your entity in the way defined in the Handbook (pages 7-8)	26	3	90%
Results-based planning	28	0	100%
Results-based reporting	28	0	100%
Managing for long-term outcomes	25	3	89%

Some UN Secretariat departments mentioned that, while they used RBM tools and principles in general terms as identified in the UNDG RBM Handbook, they have to follow the terminology of the UN regular budget processes, which is slightly different from that of the UNDG (e.g. expected accomplishment versus outcome). Some specialized agencies used the comments box to qualify their responses too, suggesting that concepts and terms may not be quite as well harmonised as the above table suggests.

UN entities were also asked if they had taken steps to support the development of common (system-wide) approaches and definitions with regard to measuring results and harmonizing indicators. All but six entities answered “yes”. Those that answered “no” included two regional commissions and two other entities with very limited field programmes. The remaining entities were UNIDO and IFAD. It would seem desirable that all entities with significant field activities engage in this exercise to develop system-wide approaches and definitions.

UN Secretariat departments expressed their readiness to participate, while again pointing out their distinctive situation. UNCTAD pointed out that they participate in efforts to harmonize indicators and ways of measuring results through the biennial programme planning process led by the Department of Management. UNCTAD also participates in the annual meeting of the UN Strategic Planning Network, where good practices in results-based management are shared and discussed. UNCTAD added that they would be happy to be part of any future initiative of the UN development system to develop common system-wide approaches and definitions for measuring results and harmonizing indicators. UNESCO also mentioned their willingness to work with the UN System to “enhance conceptual coherence and collective impact consistent with the imperatives for integrated approaches and interdependence set by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”

#### *Knowledge management*

A recent JIU report<sup>28</sup> stated: “Knowledge management remains a challenge for the United Nations system organizations in their attempt to systematically and efficiently develop, organize, share and integrate knowledge to achieve their cross-cutting goals”. The JIU added that “knowledge management is not yet a strategic priority in all United Nations system organizations and there are no common practices that are accepted or shared system-wide.” The JIU judged that although there is extensive knowledge management experience in the UN system, it tends to be confined within individual organisations and even within different parts of a single organisation. Among the recommendations, the JIU proposed that all entities develop knowledge management strategies and policies by the end of 2018, and that the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) should be used to share relevant experiences, at a strategic level, “with a view to gradually developing a common, system-wide knowledge management culture.”

For the first time, the survey included several questions on knowledge management, tabulated below:

**Table 17 – UN entity responses on knowledge management**

Aspects of knowledge management	Yes	No	Skipped question	Total
<b>Does the strategic plan of your entity include provisions for knowledge management strategies?</b>	22	6	1	29
<b>Does your entity use a common authentication system that allows for seamless secure access (e.g. Common Connect)?</b>	15	12	2	29
<b>Has your entity taken steps towards sharing its knowledge management strategies with other UN entities?</b>	22	7	0	29

<sup>28</sup> Knowledge management in the United Nations System JIU/REP/2016/10

**While most entities have a formal knowledge management strategy, others have a variety of knowledge management policies in place.** UNICEF explained that while they have a variety of knowledge management (KM) policies, they do not have a full KM strategy as advocated by the JIU; however they plan to do so in light of the JIU's recommendations. UNDP outlined its considerable experience in this area, while several major entities mentioned their support for the JIU evaluation in 2016.

ECA outlined a variety of relevant initiatives and reported that it has already developed a knowledge hub (<http://knowledge.uneca.org>) to act as a "one-stop shop" for all ECA knowledge including the dissemination of KM toolkits produced by ECA and will strive to integrate these with other UN entities.

On common authentication systems, UNDP and UNFPA mentioned that they are members of the UN Common Connect system. Also, **UNFPA co-manages with UN DOCO the One UN Knowledge Exchange Network on Yammer which hosts inter-agency communities of practice.** Sources & hyperlinks: One UN Knowledge Exchange Network: <https://www.yammer.com/one-un/>. UNICEF is also an active participant in the Yammer network and shared its experience of managing Yammer networks with the other entities.

UNICEF explained that they do authenticate some users across security domains and collaborate with other organizations using their identities, noting that they use the Microsoft Office 365 platform rather than Common Connect. UNESCO also mentioned that their authentication system allows it to provide secure access to external parties. Regional commissions mentioned using common platforms for specific issues. WHO does not currently subscribe to Common Connect service as there has not been demand identified for sharing information systems with other agencies subscribing to the service. Also ITC has a similar common authentication system to Common Connect, but it is not integrated with other UN entities.

On whether steps have been taken to share knowledge management strategies with other entities, although UNICEF is still in the early stages of defining its knowledge management strategy it actively contributed to the recent JIU review and participated in the JIU organized conference on "Knowledge for Development" in Geneva earlier in 2017 where lessons were shared on developing and implementing knowledge management. UNAIDS explained that all of its major data and information systems and tools, including AIDSinfo, key populations atlas, etc. are open source and available free. These platforms have supported and informed numerous UN organisations. UNISDR actively participates in the UN Knowledge Management fora including the Geneva UN Knowledge Management community of practice and the global Knowledge for Development Partnership.

UNHCR is involved in several knowledge sharing activities such as collaboration with other UN agencies and inter-agency co-operation on learning, including the undg Results Group on Leadership, OCHA Women in Humanitarian Leadership Program, and the UN Security Training Working Group.

ITU noted that their Regional Offices participate on a regular basis in the meetings of the UN Regional Coordination Mechanisms and the UN Regional Development Group, contributing to the agendas with ICT centric strategies and policies.

UN-Habitat has shared its knowledge management strategy with the Joint Inspection Unit and with other UNLINKS (UN Library and Information Network for Knowledge Sharing), including inter alia, ECLAC, UNEP, WIPO, IFAD, UNFCCC, World Bank, UNIDO, UNECA and UNESCO.

ESCAP mentioned the Network on Trade (ARTNeT), which is an open regional network composed of leading trade research institutions and think-tanks across the Asia-Pacific region.

*Risk management assessment policies*

26 entities indicated they have a risk management assessment policy, one (UNEP) indicated they do not, while two entities (OHCHR and ESCAP) skipped the question. Other UN Secretariat entities referred to wider UN policies: thus, UNISDR, as a Secretariat entity based in Geneva, explained that it is “covered under the relevant UN Crisis Management policies and plans.”

A few entities provided details of the plans and policies they have adopted. FAO notably explained that it has “committed to embedding risk management into existing practices and business processes so that it becomes part of FAO culture and not viewed as an independent activity. It is a requirement in FAO’s major processes (the strategic framework, the extra-budgetary project cycle, country planning frameworks, and capital expenditure projects).”

The entities with relevant policies were asked about the types of risk that they address:

**Table 18 – Types of risk covered by entities’ risk management assessment policies**

Type of risk:	Security	Medical	IT Disaster Recovery	Business Continuity	Other
Yes	24	20	23	23	16
No	1	5	2	2	3
Total	25	25	25	25	19

With reference to the category of ‘other’ several entities referred to the UN Secretariat’s Enterprise Risk Management policy, which identifies seven risk categories: Social and Environmental, Financial, Operational, Organizational, Political, Regulatory, and Strategic), and six categories of consequence that covers several risk types (Financial, Development results, Safety and security, operational, compliance and reputational). Other entities also mentioned one or more of these categories.

UNRWA provided a detailed response, including the following: UNRWA adopts a three-lines-of-defence approach to risk management and accountability: a. The first line of defence lies with operational management – the establishment of the rules, regulations, standards, systems, procedures etc. to govern the implementation of operations; b. The second line of defence lies in control and compliance systems – the establishment of frameworks to either: (i) check decisions before they are made when risks of delegating authorities are considered sufficiently high to warrant independent checking before the decision is taken, or (ii) monitor and report on compliance with and effectiveness of management systems; and c. The third line of defence lies in internal audit which provides UNRWA’s governing body and senior management with comprehensive assurance based on the highest level of independence and objectivity within the organization.

UNHCR noted that its policy on risk management (UNHCR/HCP/2014/7) requires risk identification at country operation, HQ entity and at strategic level. The policy unifies existing topic-specific risk management frameworks and ensures structured, systematic risk management at all areas. The framework is based on ISO 31000. Where relevant, UNHCR offices also collaborate with other UN entities on risk management (e.g. security and others).

### *Harmonizing and streamlining country programming and reporting*

A meaningful step towards streamlining the UNDAF and country programming processes would be to ensure that the respective instruments incorporate the same planned outcomes. In this regard, **the survey included this question, that is, whether it a requirement that the entity's country programme documents (or equivalent) demonstrate complete results chains down from the UNDAF. Encouragingly, 14 entities responded in the affirmative, including almost all the entities that use country programmes or engage in substantial country level programming.**

Resident Coordinators pointed out through their survey that UN entities are currently inconsistent in the matter of copying outcomes verbatim from the UNDAF to their CPDs. Although this is deemed a best practice and some entities require it, there appears to be a lack of clear guidance about it. UNDP mentioned that not only are the UNDAF outcomes copied verbatim into their CPDs, but also their CPD outcome indicators are the UNDAF indicators that UNDP is accountable for monitoring.

### *System-wide evaluation*

Entities were asked whether or not they place all audit and evaluation reports online. This question was asked in the 2014 and 2015 surveys as well, although for 2017 the answer options were broadened to 'all, most, some or none'. Thus, a one-to-one comparison cannot be made with the previous years' data, but an approximate comparison can be made as shown in the table below. It would appear that some of the entities that previously replied 'no' have said 'most' in 2017, and/or some entities are now posting publicly more such reports.

**Table 19 – Audit and evaluation reports posted online**

Report Placed on Public Website:	2014	2015	2017	
	#	#	#	
Yes	15	18	27	All or most
No	7	6	2	Some or none
Skipped question	-	1	0	
<b>Total</b>	22	25	29	

As in previous years, the Funds and Programmes tended to answer affirmatively while there were mixed responses from Departments of the UN Secretariat and the Specialized Agencies. UNICEF which answered 'most' rather than 'all' noted that "all evaluations are publicly available and the Executive Board policy is for all audits to be made available with few exceptions in special cases, whereby internal audits may be redacted or withheld due to sensitivities." Some other entities also referred to restrictions on availability in certain cases.

ITU, which answered 'no', explained: "A list of all internal audit reports is available on the Council web site and Member States delegates can request access to the internal audit reports. When Member States delegates are given access to the internal audit reports, the management comments (and update with respect to the implementation of the recommendations on that date) are also provided.

Some entities made a distinction between evaluations and audits, although fewer than in previous years.

Entities were also asked if they post management responses online. The below table suggests that a trend towards posting management responses is increasingly becoming a practice. Many entities noted that management responses are mandatory components of the final evaluation or audit report.

Some entities added that while evaluations and audits arranged centrally must adhere to this requirement, it does not always happen in decentralised units, such as at country level.

**Table 20 – Management responses posted online**

Management Responses Posted:	2017	2015	2014
	#	#	#
<b>Always</b>	19	12	8
<b>Sometimes</b>	6	6	8
<b>Never</b>	0	0	2
<b>Skipped question</b>	4	7	4
<b>Total</b>	29	25	22

## B. Evaluation

**110. Does the evaluation unit of your organization meet UNEG standards for independence?**  
**111. Does your organization have an evaluation tracking system that includes the status of evaluations and management responses?**

### Key findings

- **There is a growing compliance for evaluation units of entities meeting UNEG standards for independence;**
- **Almost every entity now has an evaluation tracking system that includes the status of evaluations and management responses.**

The last three surveys asked if the evaluation unit of entities have met the UNEG standards for independence. The below table suggests continued progress in this regard. The optional comments confirm this impression; for example, WHO mentioned that “some key elements for independent evaluation in place but others yet to be realized. In developing the new evaluation policy, careful consideration needs to be given to clarifying terms and achieving closer alignment with the relevant UNEG norms and standards”. A small number of entities qualified an affirmative response by explaining that their evaluation offices did not fully meet the UNEG standards of independence while noting that the matter was under review.

**Table 21 – Evaluation units of entities meet UNEG standards for independence?**

Responses:	2017	2015	2014
	#	#	#
<b>Yes</b>	25	20	16
<b>No</b>	3	4	4
<b>Skipped question</b>	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>	29	25	22

**Almost every entity now has an evaluation tracking system that includes the status of evaluations and management responses** (see Table 22 below). The only entity that responded ‘No’ in 2017 was ITU; they explained that an evaluation function was “yet to be set up but the



evaluation policy and procedures have already been agreed by Senior Management”. WHO, having previously explained that a system was under development, is now implementing the policy.

**Table 22 – Entities with an evaluation tracking system on status of evaluations and management responses?**

Responses:	2017	2015	2014
	#	#	#
<b>Yes</b>	27	20	18
<b>No</b>	1	4	1
<b>Skipped question</b>	1	1	3
<b>Total</b>	29	25	22

### C. QCPR Follow-up and Reporting

#### Questions 112 to 115

**112. Has your entity reported to its governing body on actions taken to implement the 2016 QCPR resolution (A/RES/71/243/)?**

**113. Please provide a link to the report that the entity provided to its governing body on implementation of the present QCPR resolution.**

**114. Please describe any measures your entity has taken to incentivise staff to work towards system-wide goals.**

The QCPR mandated that all entities report to their governing bodies on actions taken to implement the 2016 QCPR resolution. While overall there is not an overwhelming affirmative response to the survey question asking if entities had done this, among the entities with a large field presence (having a representative in at least 50 countries) the response is very clear. All but one said “yes”; the only entity not to do so was UNHCR.

**Table 23 – Reporting to governing bodies on actions taken to implement the QCPR resolution**

Responses:	All entities	Entities with large field presence
	#	#
<b>Yes</b>	17	10
<b>No</b>	11	1
<b>Skipped question</b>	1	0
<b>Total</b>	29	11

Among the entities that said ‘no’ or skipped the question, one mentioned that a report would be provided at the upcoming governing body meeting, another said it was under consideration, while two Secretariat Departments said that the question was not applicable to them, noting that they provide information to the Secretary-General on the actions taken to implement the resolution.

### *Incentivizing staff to work towards system-wide goals*

The survey asked which entities have taken measures to incentivise staff to work towards system-wide goals. While many entities skipped the question, almost all the entities with a large field presence provided a response (see table below). Several entities referred specifically to staff performance management. UNICEF explained that: "... the contribution of individual staff from Country Reps, to Deputy reps and Operations Officers to technical staff engaged in inter-agency work and system-wide collaborations is measured and acknowledged.

**Table 24- Responses on actions taken to incentivise staff to work towards system-wide goals**

Responses:	All entities	Entities with large field presence
	#	#
<b>Response provided</b>	20	10
<b>No response provided</b>	9	1
<b>Total</b>	29	11

UNAIDS commented that their "performance management system is set up in such way that all staff members link their individual work objectives to their office's Top Tasks which are directly linked to organizational priorities. Through this alignment, each individual staff member is made aware of their contribution to wider goals, both at annual planning and evaluation phases."

WFP noted that: "For staff at all levels next to the objectives derived from the Country Programme and Annual Performance Plans, there is a strong focus on delivering in the "Partnership" component. This element is one of the current core capabilities expected from all staff members since 2016." WFP also referenced its participation in the Management and Accountability System, addressed in questions 61 to 64 above.

IFAD also commented that it "has signalled clearly to its staff as well as its Member States and partners that its work is and should be entirely nested into this UN system-wide effort [Agenda 2030]. Everything that derives and builds upon [IFAD's] Strategic Framework, including our results monitoring system and the corporate objectives that each individual staff performance has to be explicitly linked to, are informed by this understanding."

Also on raising staff awareness, WHO explained that: "Inductions for new Head of country offices and Global Head of country offices meetings have a dedicated session on collaboration with the UN system aimed at strengthening WHO collaboration with the system towards system wide goals. Once per month meetings with WHO Regional UN focal points is organized to share information on the process taking place at the UN and to ensure full involvement of the staff in the processes. Internal guidance has been developed to ensure WHO participation in the DaO approach and SOPs."

UNFPA underlined its commitment to UN system-wide "results, coordination and coherence through: (a) scaled-up "Delivering as one" and joint programming; (b) improved coordination in addressing gender-based violence and reproductive health in humanitarian settings; and (c) increased collaboration to attain the Sustainable Development Goals. UNFPA noted its strong support for the use of common services and common premises, and seeks to increase the number of country offices with joint business operations.

Many entities that responded alluded more broadly to their strategic plans, their commitment to Agenda 2030, and to the fact that the work of all staff is linked to the goals of the organization, some noting that performance assessments highlight the relationship between staff's work and the achievement of organizational goals.

DRAFT