

# DELIVERING AS ONE

## 2007 STOCKTAKING EXERCISE

### Key Points from the Delivering as One Pilot Initiative Emerging from Reports by Governments, UN Country Teams and UN Agencies

#### Annex 3: UN Agencies' Reports<sup>1</sup>

#### I. OVERALL COMMENTS BY AGENCIES

**UNDG TASK TEAM ON NRAs:** The overall preliminary assessment of the NRAs' involvement with the 'Delivering as One' pilots is generally positive, but not without important challenges as we move forward. Positive aspects of NRAs involvement was felt particularly true in terms of:

- Providing increased visibility and exposure to NRAs at country level;
- Making the RCs more sensitive to the need to be more inclusive and to fully explore the potentials of NRAs;
- Creating momentum for setting internal and external mechanisms to ensure effective involvement of the NRAs in the pilot countries;
- Offering some NRAs with opportunities for enhanced policy dialogue at the country level which resulted in increased programmatic collaboration and strengthening the linkages between normative and operational work, including through a clusters' approach and/or the dispatch of task forces/advisers from NRAs' HQs and regional offices.

This brought focus, for instance, on productive sectors and other generators of economic growth, as well as on certain thematic and cross-cutting issues, in response to national priorities.

Notwithstanding this positive overall assessment, important challenges were identified by the NRAs which need to be addressed as part of the lessons learned from the pilots and to maintain active and sustained mutual engagement between the NRAs and the UNCTs.

**FAO:** During 2007 the focus of the activities of the "Delivering as One" pilot process was on setting up the system, defining roles and responsibilities, as well as preparing the substantive programme. The real challenge will be in 2008, when the effectiveness of the system will be tested, namely the capacity of the new system to mobilize resources to fund the "GAP" as well as the effectiveness of the resource allocation mechanisms in case additional funding will not fully fund the gap.

From FAO's perspective the experience with the DaO process is so far positive, as it recalled to the UN system agencies on the ground that they have been created to work for a common purpose and not to work in isolation from each other and in a competitive manner. Moreover, the DaO process permitted FAO's to promote its mandate, as Specialized Agency, within the framework of UN agency cooperation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Annex 3 is developed based on the reports prepared by a number of UN Agencies and available on the UNDG website. Key points raised during a number of inter-agency meetings, where a wider group of UN Agencies have participated, are included in the Report "2007 Stocktaking Exercise: Key Points Emerging from Reports by Governments, UNCTs and UN Agencies"

FAO's technical coordination and advisory role in the areas of food security and agriculture/rural development were reconfirmed, accepted and strengthened. Most important, there is a general acknowledgement that economic sector priorities must be part of the One Programme if the common country programming (UNDAF/One Programme) is to be the strategic response of the UN system to national priorities.

This increased involvement is confirmed through FAO's intensive and active involvement in thematic groups related to food security and economic growth. The DaO also created a general acceptance of the necessity to ensure that the Non-Resident Agencies (for example FAO is a NRA in Albania) are associated to the process. Therefore, the DaO has enhanced the inclusiveness of the common country programming process. Cooperation with other UN agencies intensified, and agencies have gained a better understanding of each other's mandates. Also, the acknowledgement of the different business models of Specialized Agencies and Funds and Programmes has been achieved. From FAO's perspective, working with other agencies within the framework of the One Programme/One Budgetary Framework is to the advantage of the Organization as this allows to perform advocacy role directly and also through other agencies, and provides access to more resources (programming for a gap).

At the same time, the need for dual funding sources has been acknowledged: local resource mobilization on one side and resource mobilization at HQ level on the other side (for normative activities and the delivery of global public goods).

The application of Joint Programming ("thinking together") at country level has been coupled with the acknowledgement of the flexible use of different options based on effectiveness principles when it comes to implementation: a) joint programmes; b) stand-alone project approach as appropriate.

Overall it would seem that most of the features of the DaO were already embedded in the TCPR 2004 and it is not clear why a DaO process was necessary to generate good teamwork among the UN agencies at the country level. Teamwork and cooperation should have been assumed as a standard, rather than something that requires a special effort. In fact, most of the instruments actually used for the One Programme, the One Budgetary Framework etc already existed and have only been adapted. The only real challenge will be in the harmonization of business practices which is more complex.

**UNCTAD:** The reform of the country-level development assistance (One-UN Pilots) developed in the context of the UN reform has been accelerated and deepened during the year 2007 with good results in terms of visibility and cohesion of the UN System ("Delivering as One" process).

At the Country level, an increasing number of Governments are asking that the Pilot mechanism become the natural one for the future. In that context, many countries are already joining the process of merging UN agencies programmes and resources in view of a common technical assistance process, budgetary mechanism and joint fund raising. All the UN entities are introducing adjustments to adapt to the changes stemming from this process. Even the main specialized agencies that were sceptical and reluctant to be involved are now setting new mechanisms and allocating human resources to the monitoring of the UN country-level plans, in light of the political and financial opportunities emerging from this process. The major donors including the European Commission, Germany, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden etc. are currently aligning their mechanisms to allocate important financial resources through the One-UN process.

The overall preliminary assessment of UNCTAD involvement within the "Delivering as One" pilots is generally positive. That was felt to be particularly true in terms of:

- Providing increased visibility and exposure at the country level;
- Increasing the potential for inclusion of UNCTAD mandates into the national programming processes and programme documents;
- Increasing actual and potential collaboration through partnerships between UNCTAD, other NRAs and RAs;
- Offering opportunities for enhanced policy dialogue at the country level which resulted in increased programmatic collaboration and renewed focus on additional thematic areas such as on the productive sectors and other generators of economic growth, e. g, the "CEB Inter-Agency cluster on Trade and Productive Capacity.

**UNIDO:** Almost a year into the implementation of the "Delivering as One" initiative, the process has moved rapidly but at a different pace in each of the pilot countries.

In general, progress is evident in the following areas:

- There is stronger Government ownership and leadership of the development process and in driving the "Delivering as One" initiative forward.
- Donor countries are increasingly joining together to work with their national counterparts and with United Nations country teams in the pilot countries towards a more strategically focused and programmatically coherent response by the United Nations system to the development priorities of the pilot countries.

The increased frequency and intensity of interactions among United Nations organizations in the pilot countries are helping bring about a better understanding and awareness of their diverse mandates, capacities and business practices. This in turn is encouraging them to seek new ways to work together and to find common ground in moving towards a common approach to the four Ones.

**UNESCO:** Unequivocal commitment to the Delivering as One agenda, piloted in eight countries and operationalized through the four "Ones" at the country level – with One Plan/Programme being the pivot in view of specialised agencies. Pilots allow to explore, test and learn about various dimensions and constellations, while recognizing that not all "Ones" lend themselves for implementation at the same time. Form should follow function.

UNESCO non-resident in three countries (Albania, Cape Verde, Rwanda). Yet, UNESCO has actively participated in all countries and endorsed all One Plans.

Delivering as One will affect content of and approaches to operational activities for development in future. It has already changed the thinking, approaches and practices of specialized agencies both at Headquarters and between HQ and field offices.

Despite the fact that UNESCO does not operate on the basis of allocation of resources through country programmes, it has now begun to prepare UNESCO country programming documents (UCPD).

**UNIFEM:** The establishment of "Delivering as One" Pilot Countries offers an unparalleled opportunity to explore how the UN development cooperation system can in fact deliver as one. In the context of the ongoing Member State debates on system-wide coherence in the work on gender equality, the recent TCPR reemphasizing the importance of gender equality and calling upon the UN system to avail itself of

the technical expertise of UNIFEM, as well as in light of the MDGs and the wide ranging international and domestic commitments to gender equality, the “Delivering as One” Pilots challenge the UN System to match rhetoric with action.

For UNIFEM, the opportunity to contribute to UN Country Team (UNCT) efforts to develop joint programming and strengthen coordinated work on gender equality can be a source of critical learning.

More importantly, the “One UN” approach, with “One Programme”, “One Budgetary Framework” and “One Leader”, facilitates promising modalities for system-wide support to national priorities and to strengthened implementation of gender equality commitments. This approach is well aligned with the UNIFEM mandate to assist countries to realize national gender equality priorities, while providing the UN System with technical expertise on gender equality and women’s empowerment. UNIFEM is now engaging in all eight “Delivering as One” Pilots (Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam), often in response to UN Resident Coordinator or Country Team requests.

As a non-resident agency (NRA), in some countries UNIFEM was required to either establish or strengthen its programme work. UNIFEM’s experience to date has been positive, with gender firmly on the agenda. However since most of the One Programmes are sub-sets of the UNDAFs with the UNDAFs developed before the One Programmes, prioritizing and developing holistic joint programming to address key gender equality priorities has often posed challenges. An overall review of “Delivering as One” Programmes has shown that in general, the commitment to gender equality is strong. Ensuring resource allocations to match commitment is one of the major challenges that now must be tackled.

**WHO:** Work on the pilot programmes is still in a learning phase, but it is becoming clear that certain factors contribute significantly to successful implementation.

- *National ownership and leadership.* In the context of the eight pilot programmes, national ownership provides the foundation for United Nations reform efforts, enabling them to be targeted to individual country situations. The approach needs to be anchored in a set of objectives elaborated by the country concerned. Clear articulation of the objectives being pursued on the part of Member States volunteering to pilot the One UN Country Programme is a prerequisite for appropriate United Nations system action.
- *The critical importance of having a United Nations programme at country level.* As a programme of joint United Nations operational activities, the One UN Country Programme represents the central element of the reform agenda at country level. Of the four key features mentioned above, the last three directly serve the One UN Country Programme. Addressing sector-specific and cross-cutting issues in concert in the Programme means that the collective capacity of the United Nations system can be brought to bear in support of specific country needs. This approach has also been shown to enable the United Nations system at country level to take collective responsibility for programme implementation, on the basis of a lead agency approach.
- *The Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country team working as one.* The One United Nations approach at country level has proven to be particularly effective when it is inclusive. Including, from the outset, all United Nations funds, programmes and agencies operating in a given country is essential for enabling the Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country teams to move forward expeditiously and focus on producing results. Further improving the coherence of the United Nations system’s country operations will require consideration to be given by intergovernmental bodies to the recommendations of the High-level Panel.

Recommendations thus examined are expected to include the proposal of the High-level Panel for some reform of UNDP, including its management of the United Nations Resident Coordinator system. In addition, the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, to be conducted later this year, is expected to consider a number of the substantive issues resulting from the recommendations contained in the report of the High-level Panel.

## II. WHAT HAS BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?

### a. Government Leadership

**UNEP:** There is stronger Government ownership and leadership of the development process and in driving the “Delivering as One” initiative forward.

From the perspective of UNIDO, the “Delivering as One” initiative is proceeding in a generally positive way. With Government leadership and United Nations country team support, progress is being made on various aspects of the Initiative.

**UNIDO:** Almost a year into the implementation of the “Delivering as One” initiative, the process has moved rapidly but at a different pace in each of the pilot countries. In general, progress is evident in the following areas: There is stronger Government ownership and leadership of the development process and in driving the “Delivering as One” initiative forward.

**WHO:** National ownership and leadership in the context of the eight pilot programmes, provide the foundation for United Nations reform efforts.

**UNAIDS:** Active engagement and participation of government at early stage

**UNESCO:** Governments - ownership secured, more effective delivery process prepared, quest for higher quality of development results.

### b. Agencies Involvement/Teamwork and Leadership

#### **UNDG TASK TEAM ON NRAs:**

- Providing increased visibility and exposure to NRAs at country level.
- Making the RCs more sensitive to the need to be more inclusive and to fully explore the potentials of NRAs.
- Creating momentum for setting internal and external mechanisms to ensure effective involvement of the NRAs in the pilot countries.
- Offering some NRAs with opportunities for enhanced policy dialogue at the country level which resulted in increased programmatic collaboration and strengthening the linkages between normative and operational work, including through a clusters’ approach and/or the dispatch of task forces/advisers from NRAs’ HQs and regional offices. This brought focus, for instance, on productive sectors and other generators of economic growth, as well as on certain thematic and cross-cutting issues, in response to national priorities.

**UNEP:**

*UNEP involvement and support to the UNCT in the 8 pilot countries:* UNEP staff have participated in One UN planning processes in all eight pilot countries, raising the profile of UNEP and helping to incorporate or strengthen the environmental components of the UN country programmes. Rwanda is the country where UNEP advanced most both in terms of cooperation within UNEP and within the UNCT.

*Inter-Divisional Collaboration and Division of Labour:* Inter-Divisional collaboration and the commitment of Divisional time and financial resources is a key element of successful engagement with the pilots. While achieving such collaboration and securing the commitment has not been easy, some positive changes can already be seen. In Rwanda, Mozambique, and Tanzania, DRC (PEI) and DEWA (AEIN) are coordinating activities, combining national stakeholder meetings, and planning to work through one single project document. In Albania, ROE is coordinating a UNEP virtual "Country Team". In Uruguay, ROLAC in coordination with DEWA, DTIE, DGEF and DELC have contributed to the development of the One Programme. The experience of the Delivering as One is making the case for internal cooperation and increased country level coherence. Different projects and divisions are able to know other UNEP activities in the same countries, revealing opportunities for joint work.

*Network of Divisional Focal Points:* In the initial stages of the Delivering as One pilots the Divisional focal points (established in March 2007) played a key role in matching country requirements reflected in the UNDAFs with what Divisions (and UNEP as a whole) could provide to support the national processes (or activities already underway that matched the country needs).

*Regional Office Coordination and UNEP virtual Country Teams:* In a second phase, the work proceeded with direct involvement of UNEP substantive teams with the UN Country Teams under the Regional Office coordination (UNDAF development and review, formulation of UN operational documents, and joint programming). This second phase involves what could be called the UNEP virtual Country Teams (group of substantive staff from different divisions and areas of expertise working from different locations in the same pilot country).

*UNEP National Staff:* Model ToRs have been drafted for UNEP staff working in countries. The ToRs combine functions related to the management of substantive programmes (such as PEI or Post Conflict), with support to the Delivering as One process and the UNCTs, as well as coordinating of UNEP national operations. This means that staff already being recruited for the implementation of specific UNEP project in countries will now also have UNEP wide responsibilities. Staff with Delivering as One/UNEP national programme coordination responsibilities are being recruited for Rwanda (Post-Conflict) and Mozambique (PEI).

*Staff Training:* Some 90 UNEP staff have been trained in UN common country programming processes and methodologies including Human Rights Based Approach/Results Based Management (HRBA/RBM, coordinated by the SIT). This will enable their active engagement in national UN planning processes. The first training workshop was held in July 2007 in Nairobi by the Strategic Implementation Team (SIT) and DRC.

*Information exchange:* A section of the new UNEP intranet is dedicated to information on the Delivering as One pilot countries.

**UNIDO:** The increased frequency and intensity of interactions among United Nations organizations in the pilot countries are helping bring about a better understanding and awareness of their diverse mandates, capacities and business practices. This in turn is encouraging them to seek new ways to work together and to find common ground in moving towards a common approach to the four Ones. UNIDO participates actively in the eight countries.

**WHO:** Reaffirmed WHO's role as a positive and active partner in all eight programmes and established mechanisms for providing guidance and support to the country offices concerned. A WHO support team and dedicated instrument for electronic information sharing are fully operational on behalf of the eight countries piloting the programmes, thus ensuring real time information exchange, communication and collective learning for HQ, regional offices and relevant country offices.

**ILO:** The use of Decent Work Country programme within a wider forum of discussion helps agencies better understand the concepts and outputs. Thematic working groups have helped focus divergent approaches. Communications to stakeholders and civil society has been beneficial.

**UNAIDS:**

- Joint collaborative efforts in planning and programming.
- Moving from an approach relying on multiple agency specific projects to a programme and sector wide approach.

**UNICEF:** One communication team and much more improved internal communication.

**UNIFEM:** UNIFEM is now engaging in all eight "Delivering as One" Pilots (Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam), often in response to UN Resident Coordinator or Country Team requests. As a non-resident agency (NRA), in some countries UNIFEM was required to either establish or strengthen its programme work. UNIFEM's experience to date has been positive, with gender firmly on the agenda. However since most of the One Programmes are sub-sets of the UNDAFs with the UNDAFs developed before the One Programmes, prioritizing and developing holistic joint programming to address key gender equality priorities has often posed challenges.

At an organizational level UNIFEM continues to play an important role in supporting UN reform and the "Delivering as One" agenda within the UNDG in a variety of ways. UNIFEM chairs the UNDG Task Team on Gender Equality and is the co-chair, with UNDP, of the UNDG Working Group on Programming Policy, as well as a member of a wide range of UNDG groups, including the Country Programme Support Group (CPSG), Working Group on Capacity Development, among others. UNIFEM contributed jointly with other UN organizations to the following system-wide efforts toward greater coherence:

The Gender Equality Task Team undertook three initiatives to strengthen understanding of the potential and constraints to more consistent and coherent action on gender equality. Initiatives were in the form of the following: a) From Checklists to Scorecards (a review of accountability for gender equality in the policy frameworks of ExCom agencies and ILO); b) Gender Equality in Common Country Programming (a desk review of the last generation of UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) and 3 country-based reviews; c) A gender analysis of the 2004, 2005, and 2006 Resident Coordinator annual reports. An important result of the Task Team's work has been the development of UNCT Performance Indicators for gender equality and women's empowerment and a plan for Action Learning on holistic common

country programming for gender equality in selected countries, both of which are expected to be rolled out in 2008.

Since 2006, UNIFEM has co-chaired and actively participated in the UNDG Working Group on Programmes and Policies, which during this period led the processes of updating guidelines on Common Country Assessment (CCA)/UNDAF in which achieving gender equality is now listed as one of the five key interrelated principles of common country programming; the UNDG Programming and Reference Guide and ongoing support to the pilots.

UNIFEM, as a member of the CPSG, along with UNICEF led a UNDG sub-group in the updating of existing training modules and the development of a set of new module including one on gender equality all of which are expected to be rolled out soon.

The following is an account of UNIFEM's support to the eight "Delivering as One" pilots: The "One UN" includes a gender equality Joint Programme in Albania and Vietnam, planned for Mozambique, Pakistan and Rwanda, proposed for Phase 2 for Tanzania and not yet included in Uruguay, Cape Verde. UNIFEM plays a role in UNCT coordination mechanisms on gender equality in all countries and in CV as an NRA.

**UNESCO:** Appointment of UNDP country directors and opening RC recruitment process to other agencies are steps in the right direction.

UN system – greater appreciation of need to work together effectively as a system, including at highest levels – arguably the recent reform of CEB and UNDG has been influenced if not triggered by the pilot needs.

Individual UN organization - adjustments in decentralization approaches, in decentralization of programme resources and in country-level focus; better concentration on core responsibilities; need to adjust to regional structures and mechanisms

Delivering as One has brought specialized agencies closer together with more frequent meetings of Executive Heads to coordinate positions, exchange experience and strengthen collaboration at country and regional levels

Delivering as One has engendered a better mutual understanding among agencies and funds and programmes

Better understanding of HQs as knowledge hub, backstopper and global monitor

### **c. Programme**

**UNDG TASK TEAM ON NRAs:** Offering some NRAs with opportunities for enhanced policy dialogue at the country level which resulted in increased programmatic collaboration and strengthening the linkages between normative and operational work, including through a clusters' approach and/or the dispatch of task forces/advisers from NRAs' HQs and regional offices. This brought focus, for instance, on productive sectors and other generators of economic growth, as well as on certain thematic and cross-cutting issues, in response to national.

**UNEP:** The environment is a key result area of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Rwanda and UNEP has taken on the role of co-Chair of the Environment Thematic Group in support of the entire UNCT. In Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, and Uruguay, UNEP worked with the UNCTs on the development of One UN programme documents ranging from the UNDAF plus, to the UNDAF results matrix, and was able to bolster the environmental components of these programmes.

**UNIDO:** Donor countries are increasingly joining together to work with their national counterparts and with United Nations country teams in the pilot countries towards a more strategically focused and programmatically coherent response by the United Nations system to the development priorities of the pilot countries.

UNIDO participates actively in the eight countries leading working groups and participating and leading the preparations of key joint programmes.

**WHO:** It is of critical importance to have a UN programme at country level. As a programme of joint UN operational activities, the One UN Country programmer represents the central element of the reform agenda at country level.

**ILO:** Greater coordination and cooperation among agencies. Thematic approaches are giving rise to new synergies.

**UNAIDS:** Inclusiveness of all agencies including non-resident and specialized agencies. Marked improvement in inter-agency communications particularly from the various working groups of the UN.

**UNICEF:** The UNCT is doing what the guidelines have asked. 'One Programmes' are broader and perhaps closer aligned to national development plans.

**FAO:** The DaO process is so far positive, as it recalled to the UN system agencies on the ground that they have been created to work for a common purpose and not to work in isolation from each other and in a competitive manner.

Moreover, the DaO process permitted FAO's to promote its mandate, as Specialized Agency, within the framework of UN agency cooperation. FAO's technical coordination and advisory role in the areas of food security and agriculture/rural development were reconfirmed, accepted and strengthened. Most important, there is a general acknowledgement that economic sector priorities must be part of the One Programme if the common country programming (UNDAF/One Programme) is to be the strategic response of the UN system to national priorities.

This increased involvement is confirmed through FAO's intensive and active involvement in thematic groups related to food security and economic growth.

The DaO also created a general acceptance of the necessity to ensure that the Non-Resident Agencies (for example FAO is a NRA in Albania) are associated to the process. Therefore, the DaO has enhanced the inclusiveness of the common country programming process.

Cooperation with other UN agencies intensified, and agencies have gained a better understanding of each other's mandates. Also, the acknowledgement of the different business models of Specialized Agencies and Funds and Programmes has been achieved.

From FAO's perspective, working with other agencies within the framework of the One Programme/One Budgetary Framework is to the advantage of the Organization as this allows to perform advocacy role directly and also through other agencies, and provides access to more resources (programming for a gap). At the same time, the need for dual funding sources has been acknowledged: local resource mobilization on one side and resource mobilization at HQ level on the other side (for normative activities and the delivery of global public goods).

The application of Joint Programming ("thinking together") at country level has been coupled with the acknowledgement of the flexible use of different options based on effectiveness principles when it comes to implementation: a) joint programmes; b) stand-alone project approach as appropriate.

**UNIFEM:** An overall review of "Delivering as One" Programmes has shown that in general, the commitment to gender equality is strong. Ensuring resource allocations to match commitment is one of the major challenges that now must be tackled. It is worth noting that UNIFEM's attempt to accurately assess the degree to which gender has been mainstreamed in the Budget Frameworks has been a challenging exercise. This is largely due to the frequent way in which the category "women" or "gender" appears included as an add-on rather than an integral part of particular outcomes. Nevertheless, the "Delivering as One" pilots offer an important opportunity to generate lessons and knowledge on how the UN System can better deliver on gender equality commitments.

**UNESCO:** All pilots have produced or are finalizing a One Plan, including Viet Nam where all specialized agencies have entered the One Plan 2 version about to be signed with refined deliverables;

Quality and inclusiveness of drafting process has been different in different pilots;  
Countries now ready to make plans operational;

Most pilots have opted for joint programmes and clusters (including cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights) as main modality: need for close programmatic integration;

Shift from service delivery function to policy advisory function;

In most pilot countries UNESCO's redlined competences (in Education: coordinating Education for All (EFA) partners and maintaining their collaborative momentum in the pursuit of all six EFA goals, natural Sciences, Social and Human Sciences, culture and in communication and Information) were respected and the Organization was invited, wherever applicable, to take lead roles of working groups and similar mechanisms. Nevertheless the programmatic coverage of One Plans extended more often than not only to limited areas, mostly of very specific aspects of education, rarely to EFA;

Despite coverage in national development documents, science and information and communication aspects were seldom prioritized for One Plans; likewise, culture was often also neglected

#### **d. Funding**

**UNEP:** *Fundraising:* US\$ 600,000 has been raised by ED to ensure UNEP's initial engagement with the Delivering as One. This is the "One UN Project". Other "One UN projects" were developed and are under consideration of donors (Norway, EC).

**UNIDO:** UNIDO participated in preparing joint proposal for Spanish MDG Fund and others and contributed in the development of the One Fund and One Budgetary Framework in several countries.

#### **UNESCO:**

- Rigorous strategic selection of programme components and expected results;
- Equally rigorous costing of expected results on a scaled-up version;
- Determine funding gap for scaled up programme, taking into account available resources, bilateral contributions;
- Pass-through fund management procedures;
- Factor in complementary additional resources, e.g. Spanish MDG Fund.

#### **e. Common Premises and Shared Services**

**ILO:** Common premises facilitated better interaction among agencies, reduced suspicion among the agencies and reduced time to organize and hold meetings.

## **II. WHAT ARE THE KEY OBSTACLES/CHALLENGES?**

**UNDG TASK TEAM ON NRAs:** The NRAs, with a business model largely relying on technical capacities and expertise residing outside the country level, may be in an inherent disadvantage vis a vis the proposed funding mechanisms for the 'Delivering as One' pilots. A change of mind set and exploration of other funding mechanisms will be essential to address this strategic gap for NRAs.

The measures and mechanisms put in place by the UN system, including through the NRAs Plan, were not fully and effectively functional, as they were hoped to be during 2007. Positive experiences and successful examples for NRAs involvement in the 'Delivering as One' pilots could be largely attributed to individual agency initiatives and commitment of the NRAs to the process, as well as to the RCs acquired sensitivity through the process, rather than to the institutional mechanisms put in place. There is a strong necessity to further deepen and promote those measures and mechanisms so as to establish reliable institutional mechanisms for NRAs sustained involvement at the country level.

The information sharing between the pilot countries and the NRAs, notably relating to decision-making processes and timing, remained a challenge. The delays in recruiting the NRAs coordination officers (as agreed by the UNDG) may have partially contributed to this gap in communication.

Flexibility given to the RCs in experimenting with the pilots should not be interpreted as "discretionary powers" to decide on what, when and how agencies should be involved in the One UN Programme and Budgetary Framework. Transparency and objective criteria based on identified national priorities and national authorities' needs should instead govern such decisions.

Engagement and commitment at the level of NRA-HQs, including through dedicated focal points and dispatch of supporting missions to the pilot countries proved essential in bringing the NRAs cause and knowledge to the country level. Keeping this level of commitment at NRA-HQs will require perseverance at the policy level but also important resources.

The role of RDTs, particularly through openness to participation and inclusion of some NRA regional directors and representatives, proved critical in bringing some NRAs to the country level in a number of pilots. There is a need to further strengthen these and other regional mechanisms in support of country development work.

UNDGO organized meetings with the RCs of the eight pilots throughout the process proved useful for the NRAs and showed the importance of regular inclusion of NRAs in future RCs' Inductions.

**UNEP:**

*Knowledge of and experience with UN country planning and tools:* UNEP has not had the experience of having the country as a platform for planning nor familiarity with the UN planning tools at country level. As such, UNEP staff have found it challenging to engage with UN Country Teams in the One UN programme planning process.

*UNEP operates outside the UNDAF framework:* The UNDAF is the most important UN planning process at country level (although still an imperfect process). UNEP has rarely participated in the development of the UNDAFs. UNEP activities at the country level are undertaken separately and parallel to the UN's operations. Environmental priorities have not been well reflected within the UNDAFs and UNEP's activities are not part of the framework of the UN's operations at country level.

*In-house coordination mechanisms and programmatic focus:* There is no over arching UNEP "country programme" to ensure separate Divisional activities (in many cases related to regional projects) form a coherent UNEP presence at country level. As such, UNEP country activities are wide-ranging, small scale, geographically spread, overlapping and have limited impact. Delivering as One poses first and foremost a challenge of coherence to UNEP itself (One UNEP).

*Engagement in the Delivering as One is time and resource intensive:* The Divisional focal points had a key role in UNEP's involvement in the pilot countries. However, they had the Delivering as One as an additional task on top of many others and haven't been able to allocate the necessary time for the tasks, particularly if we consider the need to respond to the fast pace of activities in the pilot countries.

*Ensuring Divisional collaboration and commitment:* Divisional activities are confined to the Programme of Work and redirecting staff and financial resources for One UN activities or to finance national priorities captured in the UNDAFs has been difficult.

*UNEP has had little involvement in developing the tools of UN country programming:* In general, UNEP has not been involved in important spheres that shape the tools, the processes and staff practices of the UN teams at country level. For example, the main training package offered by the UN System Staff College for UN country programming is the Human Rights Based Approach/Results Based Management (HRBA/RBM). Although environment is one of key principles for the development of the UNDAF, environment is not incorporated in the training. Developing a training module on environmental

sustainability and incorporating it into the UN country programming training would help mainstream environment in UN planning beyond UNEP's direct engagement in country level processes.

*Ensuring direct contact with RCs:* The RCs have a central role in facilitating the participation of Non-Resident Agencies. UNEP senior management had limited contact with the RCs in some of the pilots.

*UNEP and UNDP at Country level:* In most pilot countries UNDP has been the leading agency in the area of environment. In some cases, this seemed to be a barrier to UNEP's initial engagement as UNEP may be perceived as a threat. In countries where there is a strong UNDP unit working on Environment, it is difficult for UNEP as a NRA to find its space and role. In cases like in Tanzania, Vietnam and Pakistan, UNEP has been unable to agree on a more positive cooperation with UNDP. This is not only an issue at UNCT level. The UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-11 is clear in its proposed role for UNDP as leading agency for environment at country level. How this influences UNEP and UNDP cooperation is unclear.

*Environment and Development in the UNCTs:* Although environment is a concern to the UNCTs, their capacity to incorporate environment into their planning seems to be limited in most cases. Therefore, UNEP has been welcomed in the UNCTs. However, articulating environment and development is a challenge to UNEP itself. Engagement with the UNCTs relies very much in being able to craft environment in the broader picture of development, particularly within the context of so many competing agendas and priorities.

*Rhythm of national operations:* National UN processes have a faster rhythm, as in the last six months as UNEP engaged in ongoing processes of UNDAF finalization and review, and One Programme definitions. UNEP will have to change the way it works to cope with the pace of programming and action at the country level and respond adequately to the need for a presence in the country during the key moments of UNDAF development/implementation processes.

*Involvement of line ministries responsible for the environment:* In many cases the line ministries responsible for the environment have not been involved in the UNDAF processes. Therefore, contributions and priorities from the part of overnments did not incorporate the environmental dimension in a number of cases.

#### **UNIDO:**

*Ensuring a comprehensive United Nations system response to national priorities:* A key challenge ahead is how to ensure that the UNDAFs and "One Programmes" are responsive to government priorities, as defined in national development plans, and that the mandates and expertise of the specialized agencies, including UNIDO, remain part of the United Nations system's response to those priorities. The problem arises when the One Programme is built on a few priorities that do not fully reflect the national development priorities and the capacities that United Nations specialized agencies can bring to bear on those priorities. Despite the fact that economic development lies at the heart of sustainable development, and is a primary component of virtually all developing countries' national development strategies, the UNDAFs and One Programmes have historically given less importance to the governments' economic priorities, with a clear bias towards socially oriented interventions that reflect the mandates and priorities of the funds and programmes of the undg Executive Committee (ExCom). UNIDO finds that its contributions are less likely to be included in the UNDAFs and One Programmes in countries where it has no field representation. One step now underway to increase the involvement of non-resident agencies (NRAs) in UNDAFs and One Programmes in the pilot countries is to appoint

experts in each Resident Coordinator's office to look after the needs of NRAs, but implementation of this plan is still incomplete. Access to country-level donor funding for these issues also becomes more problematic if these are not part of the UNDAF/One Programme.

*Funding of the pilots:* Local coherence funds ("One Fund") are envisaged in the eight pilot countries to be managed by the United Nations Resident Coordinators in consultation with the country team as a funding mechanism for the unfunded results in the One Programme. In most cases, the overall One Programme focuses mainly on locally available funds that may be channelled through the One Fund. This leaves out considerable resources that could be available through other channels for activities that fit perfectly with national priorities, and may offer synergy with projects that are included. Related issues include how to prioritize and allocate the unearmarked funds, and what the respective roles of the Resident Coordinator and the country teams are in the resource allocation process.

*Minimizing transaction costs in joint programmes/projects:* In a number of pilot countries, in an attempt to achieve increased coordination of programme activities and integration through the One Programme and the One Fund, there is an insistence that the components of the One Programme be joint programmes themselves, each of which would involve several or many agencies working closely together covering a wide range of activities. In principle, this programme-level integration is expected to bring about increased synergies but in practice, it is likely to lead to greater complexity in programme delivery and to higher coordination and transaction costs. In addition, such joint programmes, unless they are entirely funded through the local One Fund, may have more difficulty in attracting special purpose funding, since their broad coverage and the different mandates of the organizations involved may make funding of individual components less attractive.

*Enhancing regional and country-level coherence:* The High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence recommended that all United Nations development activities be consolidated at the country level. However, the coordination in the eight pilot countries generally does not include regional or regionally funded activities. This is unfortunate since regional projects usually have considerable in-country activities and potential links to other country-level projects, and since regional projects are growing in importance for UNIDO as well as for other United Nations agencies. For instance, UNIDO's regional trade capacity building programmes for the African regional economic communities should be linked with complementary country level activities. Similarly, UNIDO's intercountry projects funded by the Global Environment Fund should be part of the One Programme in the pilot countries. The question is how to integrate these into the One Programme and achieve the intended improved coordination.

*Harmonizing business practices:* A related challenge is to ensure that the business practices of the funds and programmes are harmonized with those of the specialized agencies, including UNIDO. Quite often, the funds and programmes have business practices that are suited to their specific circumstances and operating modalities that they expect the specialized agencies to adopt automatically. These business practices cover a wide range of management-related issues, including programming cycles (although this is an issue not relevant to the Specialized Agencies), programme and project management guidelines, procurement, support cost recovery, monitoring and evaluation frameworks, auditing arrangements and others. In some pilot countries there is also an unwarranted link between the capacity to deliver and the number of in-country staff. "In-country capacity assessments" are being carried out on the assumption that programme implementation and funding from the One Fund should depend on the numbers of locally available staff. This, however, would seem to ignore the different ways in which the funds and

programmes on the one hand, and the specialized agencies on the other hand, operate. In many countries, UNDP and UNICEF have large numbers of programme staff in their offices (paid for by programme resources). This may be appropriate for temporary activities such as electoral support or crisis situations where national capacities do not exist. However in most cases, specialized agencies work differently. UNIDO, for instance, has the core of its technical capabilities at its headquarters, and sometimes regional offices, and only rarely uses long-term international or national staff funded from specific projects. Most national staff working in UNIDO-implemented or executed projects/programmes are on national counterpart agency payrolls. This is in line with the view of the High-level Panel that national counterparts should increasingly take ownership of their development activities.

*Ensuring an independent and impartial Resident Coordinator:* The High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence recommended that UNDP should establish an institutional firewall between the management of its programmatic role and management of the Resident Coordinator system in order to ensure that there is no potential for, or perception of, a conflict of interest. Although UNDP has indicated its intention to eliminate such conflicts of interest, actual change is occurring rather slowly. In most cases, the United Nations Resident Coordinator continues to act as the UNDP Resident Representative and despite efforts by UNDP to separate its coordinating role from its programme implementation function, there is little evidence that UNDP is withdrawing from areas where specialized agencies have the mandate and the substantive capacity to provide support to countries. Concern remains high that UNDP would continue to implement programmes or projects in the sectoral areas covered by the specialized agencies. For UNIDO, this concern is most evident in the areas of industrial energy efficiency, cleaner production, private sector development, trade capacity building, and support for the implementation of international environmental agreements, e.g. Montreal Protocol and Stockholm Convention. UNIDO will continue to work closely with UNDP as well as with other organizations of the system to address these issues in the context of efforts to enhance system-wide coherence and deliver as one. 26. UNIDO remains firmly committed to system-wide coherence and the “Delivering as One” initiative.

#### **ILO:**

- Ensuring NRAs participate in the joint programming possibly through the interaction of regional offices;
- Decent Work Country Programme must be better understood as the way the ILO engages at the national level and delivers its services and policy advice;
- Dispute resolution requires objectivity, transparency and clear guidelines;
- ILO’s Social Partners, workers’ and employers’ association, are a part of the UN system and must be given the same status when joint programming is being conducted;
- One Ministry (either Foreign Affairs or Finance) seems to take the lead in the “Delivering as One” process however while line Ministries are seemingly included in the meetings it is uncertain if these Ministries are truly engaged;
- Cost recovery needs to set across the board at 7% to avoid undercutting by other actors;
- Agency mandates must be agreed upon and respected to help resolve over-laps and maintain equity in distributing funds;
- Lines of reporting needs to be further reviewed and settled so managing project and programmes does not require multiple reporting requirements;
- Decent Work Country Programmes are developed in a collaborative manner with national partners and should not be diluted by selecting appealing elements and not enacting other elements;
- A need to deepen results-based management across the system and with national counterparts;

Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work must be respected across the system in policy advice and programme delivery;

- Ensuring a robust and workable firewall exists between UNDP and an impartial Resident Coordinator;
- Not all funds available in country are being deposited into the One Fund, objective and clearly defined criteria needs to be developed;
- Great deal of discussion about how successful One Communications has been but little guidance and examples of how this is worked on a practical level (is it one approach or one voice);

**FAO:** Real challenge will be in 2008, when the effectiveness of the system will be tested, namely the capacity of the new system to mobilize resources to fund the “GAP” as well as the effectiveness of the resource allocation mechanisms in case additional funding will not fully fund the gap.

The issue of *firewall, conflict of interest, arbitration and dispute resolution* still need to be addressed as they are essential components of the UNRC system architecture - and in particular for the One Programme and One Budgetary Framework to function effectively, equitably and fairly. After the initial allocation of responsibilities, the next necessary step is putting in place an equitable system of checks and balances that will allow for the resolution of disputes in a collegial manner.

*The development of joint resource mobilization strategies* is still at an early stage in almost all pilots. Putting in place the above-mentioned dispute resolution mechanism is essential when it comes to allocating resources to specific activities in a situation where local resource mobilization efforts do not succeed in funding the entire gap.

*The system has allowed for consultation*, but this was not always automatic. The development of joint communication packages is still an open challenge, and will need to be pursued with an inclusive process, respecting the identity of the different agencies and their accountabilities to their constituencies.

*Government Leadership/Involvement* is and has always been the fundamental precondition for UN involvement in countries. Therefore – in the agency stocktaking exercises – the focus should be on assessing the quality of government involvement and on the issue of UN assistance alignment with national development priorities/strategies. The issue of involvement of line ministries is still an open challenge.

*One Office* related consultations among the UN agencies are still at an early stage and will need to be further pursued.

With respect to *common premises*, cost-effectiveness is a key factor.

The issue of *consolidated and common reporting* on the One Programme is still an open challenge, and an essential condition for “Delivering as One”.

**UNIFEM:** There is a need to assess how gender is fairing in the “Delivering as One” pilots. With an eye to identifying ways forward, UNIFEM, with sister agencies, is planning the process of an assessment of the programmatic, procedural and political opportunities and challenges in relation to the actions of the pilots on gender equality.

As the data on resource allocations for specific gender equality actions indicate, the “Delivering as One” Programme Frameworks must go beyond treating gender as a cross-cutting issue and undertake to implement specific gender equality programmes.

**UNESCO:** One Plan must be coherent programme of action, negotiated with government representatives, and respectful of responsibilities of line ministries - the principal interlocutors of specialized agencies, often not fully included by lead government ministries;

Issue: to what extent can operational support and resources provided for pilots also be extended to other countries pursuing coherence agenda? Will learning lessons be sufficient for scaling up?

Need to integrate existing joint programmes with non-UN organizations (Bretton Woods institutions, regional development banks, foundations and global non-UN institutions and funds) - e.g. also in EFA FTI

How to integrate regional and interregional programmes (AU, Mercosur) or new programmatic challenges/climate change?

How to better synchronize timetables for national plans with national cycles and with those of the UN system programming cycles and the timing inherent in other decisions/targets (e.g. Millennium Declaration-2015)

Beyond the One Plan, there are still bound to be sectoral, single-agency activities in various countries, which may well be also of strategic nature (implemented in line with existing agreements), responding to national priorities;

Continuity of such action must be ensured to support relevant national priorities, where applicable, but also with a view to working towards a later inclusion of such activities into a revised One Plan;

Question remains how donors can be induced to provide funds to such stand-alone items.

One test of reform will be whether donors will be ready to fill funding gap in pilots - if they have been developed in accordance with reform.

Accountability and transparency secured: once funds have been assigned to a lead agency, the concerned Organization's accountability framework will apply;

If shortfall of funds, how will distribution of available resources be decided? Need for arbitration mechanism;

Overhead costs - 7% - a precedent for other extrabudgetary funds?

Need to integrate civil society, NGOs and - for UNESCO - National Commissions

### **Actions by UNESCO**

UNESCO has progressively strengthened its contribution to joint UN programming processes. Director-General Matsuura decided to set aside 2% of the regular programme resources (approximately US\$ 3.6 million for the biennium 2006/2007) to reinforce UNESCO participation including in the pilots and UNDAF rollout countries;

Use of such funds is restricted to preparation of common country programming exercises – including missions to provide backstopping, missions by field staff, in particular for non-resident country programming and temporary reinforcement of Field Office capacities -, but not for the implementation of programme documents. This exercise will be repeated in 2008/2009 biennium.

These funds are complemented by corporate training funds to strengthen capacities and build skills of field office staff and headquarters staff for common country programming exercises.

Participation in various UNDGO-fielded missions on programme preparation and financial accountabilities to pilot countries and several staff have been trained by UNDGO and UN Staff College as trainers

Creation of standing working group of senior staff on UN reform to review policy implications and identify adaptations required such as Task Force on Decentralization and the creation of dedicated UN reform “knowledge broker” and resource website

Delivering as One has brought specialized agencies closer together with more frequent meetings of Executive Heads to coordinate positions, exchange experience and strengthen collaboration at country and regional levels

Delivering as One has engendered a better mutual understanding among agencies and funds and programmes

Better understanding of HQs as knowledge hub, backstopper and global monitor

### **III. WHAT ARE THE KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS?**

**UNDG TASK FORCE ON NRAs:** The NRAs, with a business model largely relying on technical capacities and expertise residing outside the country level, may be in an inherent disadvantage vis-à-vis the proposed funding mechanisms for the ‘Delivering as One’ pilots. A change of mind set and exploration of other funding mechanisms will be essential to address this strategic gap for NRAs.

The measures and mechanisms put in place by the UN system, including through the NRAs Plan, were not fully and effectively functional, as they were hoped to be during 2007. Positive experiences and successful examples for NRAs involvement in the ‘Delivering as One’ pilots could be largely attributed to individual agency initiatives and commitment of the NRAs to the process, as well as to the RCs acquired sensitivity through the process, rather than to the institutional mechanisms put in place. There is a strong necessity to further deepen and promote those measures and mechanisms so as to establish reliable institutional mechanisms for NRAs sustained involvement at the country level.

The information sharing between the pilot countries and the NRAs, notably relating to decision- making processes and timing, remained a challenge. The delays in recruiting the NRAs coordination officers (as agreed by the UNDG) may have partially contributed to this gap in communication.

Flexibility given to the RCs in experimenting with the pilots should not be interpreted as “discretionary powers” to decide on what, when and how agencies should be involved in the One UN Programme and Budgetary Framework. Transparency and objective criteria based on identified national priorities and national authorities’ needs should instead govern such decisions.

Engagement and commitment at the level of NRA-HQs, including through dedicated focal points and dispatch of supporting missions to the pilot countries proved essential in bringing the NRAs cause and knowledge to the country level. Keeping this level of commitment at NRA-HQs will require perseverance at the policy level but also important resources.

The role of RDTs, particularly through openness to participation and inclusion of some NRA regional directors and representatives, proved critical in bringing some NRAs to the country level in a number of pilots. There is a need to further strengthen these and other regional mechanisms in support of country development work.

UNDGO organized meetings with the RCs of the eight pilots throughout the process proved useful for the NRAs and showed the importance of regular inclusion of NRAs in future RCs' Inductions.

**UNEP:**

- a. Programme coordination, in-house division of labour and UNEP country presence:

*Increase the commitment and involvement of Divisions:* Without the full commitment of Divisions, including financial commitment, UNEP's involvement in country processes will remain ad hoc and limited. UNEP operational activities need to be reflected in the PoW and funds set aside to work with the UNCT during the development of the UNDAFs as well as for the subsequent implementation of specific activities. These funds will have to be loosely earmarked under Technical Cooperation as they will need to be tailored to country needs and each UNDAF.

*Strengthen the coordination role of Regional Offices:* The current system of all Divisions and Regional Offices implementing activities separately in countries leads to confusion, duplication and gives UNEP a bad image in the country. For the Delivering as One pilot countries the Regional Offices have been considered as the one UNEP channel for engagement. This should now be extended for all national activities of UNEP and Regional Offices provided with the capacity to manage this core responsibility.

*Increase UNEP division of labour at country level:* Where a Division/programme has a substantial level of activities in a given country (multi annual projects with major funding, resident staff, etc.) it can undertake the role of coordinating UNEP's activities in that country in collaboration with the Regional Office. These arrangements would vary according to countries specific contexts. For example, in Botswana where the Common Country Assessment is about to be developed and DEWA is already engaged through the AEIN it could lead UNEP's participation in the CCA/UNDAF development in coordination with ROA.

*UNEP virtual Country Teams and "national programmes":* The Delivering as One exercise provides one platform for common planning and coherence at UNEP. Programmatic coherence should be developed for each country and reflect all UNEP activities in that country. The responsibility for this would lie primarily with the Regional Offices and the substantive areas involved in the country (virtual Country Teams. Importantly, as many of the members of UNEP CTs will be related to projects that operate at the regional scale, this would also help:

- Incorporating a regional perspective into National UN planning;
- Facilitating the development of other CTs and "country programmes" in the same region.

- b. In-house capacity building and guidance:

*Undertake Periodic and Ongoing Training:* Training on RBM/HRBA has been fundamental to help UNEP staff understand UN common country programming processes, language and tools. The training also helps to build a UNEP team with shared values and a common view of the importance of the CCA/UNDAF process.

*Develop internal guidance on country level engagement:* There is an urgent need for development of administrative guidelines on how to work with other UN organizations at the national level in areas such as fund management and hiring of staff. A “*UNEP Manual for National Operations and Activities*” needs to be developed urgently to guide UNEP staff in their national operational activities.

*Incorporate country disaggregated information in UNEP’s information systems:* UN Country Teams demand information at country level. Many UNEP projects are of regional scale and it has been extremely difficult and time consuming to gather country level information (e.g. allocation of funds per country).

c. Working with UN Country Teams and other UN spheres:

*Link UNEP approaches at Global, Regional and Country levels:* Improve involvement at regional and global spheres that influence processes at country level, and increase internal coordination of action between global, regional and country level initiatives.

*Develop tools and training on environmental sustainability for the UN System:* There are virtually no tools, guidance or training to UN staff on how to incorporate environment in the UN planning process at country level. UNEP could develop such tools and work with the UN System Staff College and the UN Development Group to ensure these materials are incorporated into the ongoing programme training (alongside RBM/HRBA) and programming guidelines (CCA/UNDAF Guidelines).

*Fully participate in the CCA/UNDAF process:* The CCA/UNDAF is the core of the UN programme in a country. UNEP’s presence at key moments in the UNCT is critical to make sure environment is considered as a relevant dimension of development and as part of the UN’s development assistance. On another hand, UNEP should take the UNDAFs into consideration in the development of any activity at country level.

d. Working with line ministries responsible for the Environment:

*Support Environmental Authorities to ensure their priorities also reflected in UN programming:* In addition to the common UN work with Governments in the development of the CCA/UNDAFs, UNEP should support line ministries responsible for the environment to participate in or influence the UNDAF processes. Supporting the line ministries and their participation in the process is a potential role for UNEP.

**UNIDO:** With Government leadership and United Nations country team support, progress is being made on various aspects of the initiative. There is increased awareness of the need to work better together if the United Nations system is to remain relevant at the country level.

**WHO:**

*National ownership and leadership.* In the context of the eight pilot programmes, national ownership provides the foundation for United Nations reform efforts, enabling them to be targeted to individual country situations. The approach needs to be anchored in a set of objectives elaborated by the country concerned. Clear articulation of the objectives being pursued on the part of Member States volunteering to pilot the One UN Country Programme is a prerequisite for appropriate United Nations system action.

*The critical importance of having a United Nations programme at country level.* As a programme of joint United Nations operational activities, the One UN Country Programme represents the central element of the reform agenda at country level. Of the four key features mentioned above, the last three directly serve the One UN Country Programme. Addressing sector-specific and cross-cutting issues in concert in the Programme means that the collective capacity of the United Nations system can be brought to bear in support of specific country needs. This approach has also been shown to enable the United Nations system at country level to take collective responsibility for programme implementation, on the basis of a lead agency approach.

*The Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country team working as one.* The One United Nations approach at country level has proven to be particularly effective when it is inclusive. Including, from the outset, all United Nations funds, programmes and agencies operating in a given country is essential for enabling the Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country teams to move forward expeditiously and focus on producing results.

Further improving the coherence of the United Nations system's country operations will require consideration to be given by intergovernmental bodies to the recommendations of the High-level Panel. Recommendations thus examined are expected to include the proposal of the High-level Panel for some reform of UNDP, including its management of the United Nations Resident Coordinator system. In addition, the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, to be conducted later this year, is expected to consider a number of the substantive issues resulting from the recommendations contained in the report of the High-level Panel.

**ILO:**

- Business models are different in most agencies. Agencies with a normative role have a different process of interaction than those focused on service delivery.
- Weak field structures have resulted in higher transaction costs.
- Timing is essential in the programming process to developing effective programming(should coincide with national development cycles).
- Governments are also learning how to act and negotiate as one in this new paradigm.
- Current DAO maybe unsustainable personnel wise unless funding or personnel are made available to strengthen the role of agencies that have a central role in the UNDAF for specific countries.
- Funding seems to drive programming with some partners chasing fund at the expense of collaboration.
- Premises or space provided by Governments sometimes are hard to return or decline.

**UNICEF:**

- The natural starting point for increased coherence is during the UNDAF preparation phase although it is possible at any time.

- Being strongly required to work together fosters understanding which ends up leading to better working together.

**FAO:** Overall it would seem that most of the features of the DaO were already embedded in the TCPR 2004 and it is not clear why a DaO process was necessary to generate good teamwork among the UN agencies at the country level. Teamwork and cooperation should have been assumed as a standard, rather than something that requires a special effort. In fact, most of the instruments actually used for the One Programme, the One Budgetary Framework etc already existed and have only been adapted. The only real challenge will be in the harmonization of business practices which is more complex.

**UNESCO:**

- Reform process must observe and uphold certain principles, which UNESCO regards as prerequisites for coherence and “delivery as one”.
- UN system activities to be nationally led and owned and in response to national development priorities; need to build on national capacities is critical;
- Collective aim of UN system is to help countries pursue and realize all internationally agreed development goals (IADG) and related covenants and commitments, including but not only MDGs, and to promote human rights-based approaches;
- Recognition of diversity of UN System as a source of strength and relevance for benefit of Member States to address multidisciplinary challenges.
- Respect for mandates, thematic leadership, sectoral expertise and competences of Specialized Agencies, avoiding creation of parallel or competing capacities;
- “One size doesn’t fit all”: UN system will have to preserve flexibility to devise different solutions and modalities for action, be it for LDCs, middle-income countries or yet other circumstances;
- Coherence must be ensured at all levels: country, intergovernmental and inter-agency levels and within each organization globally, regionally and nationally as well as vertically among donors.
- Strategic focus: selecting strategically important objectives and approaches, in line with national development priorities and reflecting the UN’s comparative advantages
- Inclusiveness: all agencies, resident and non-resident alike, must be able to bring their relevant programmatic contribution to bear - otherwise danger of “false pilots” as in cases where joint office pilots morphed into one plan exercises without opening Considering both mutually exclusive would be a false dichotomy. Rather: aim at strategic inclusiveness
- Coherence of plan exercise - avoidance of any kind of hierarchical two-track processes (e.g. UNDAF and UNDAF Plus);
- Coherence in results orientation: to determine impact, there must be effective and harmonized approach to measurement of outcomes and results.
- “Redlining”: respect for competences of the various agencies in policy advice and capacity-building – applies to areas and themes which are germane to an agency’s mandate and core responsibilities/competences and for which it seeks to secure acknowledgement for primary responsibility;
- “Firewalling”: avoiding duplication and competition among agencies, stemming from a coordinating and implementing UNDP;

- Each organization must be enabled to contribute technical advice in its domains to One Programme/Plan, irrespective of how much funds it will be able to commit for a particular deliverable.
- The Resident Coordinator (RC) needs to serve as impartial guardian of UN diversity. Hence the need for a strong firewall between RC and UNDP to avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest, to be complemented by a code of conduct, delinking the coordinating role of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) from the programme function of the Resident Representative of UNDP.
- More systematic exchange of experience needed among pilot countries to document and act on lessons learned

#### **IV. TRANSACTION COSTS**

**UNIDO:** In a number of pilot countries, in an attempt to achieve increased coordination of programme activities and integration through the One Programme and the One Fund, there is an insistence that the components of the One Programme be joint programmes themselves, each of which would involve several or many agencies working closely together covering a wide range of activities. In principle, this programme-level integration is expected to bring about increased synergies but in practice, it is likely to lead to greater complexity in programme delivery and to higher coordination and transaction costs. In addition, such joint programmes, unless they are entirely funded through the local One Fund, may have more difficulty in attracting special purpose funding, since their broad coverage.

**UNAIDS:** Difficult to determine whether there has been efficiency gains. Most pilots complain of increased workload and transaction costs. Some pilots note that the current initiatives are time consuming and situation is worsened by a lack of capacity. Limited progress has been achieved in improving and harmonizing business practices and procedures.

Transaction costs may be reduced after the initial demands of establishment. There is a need to extensively define the scope and magnitude of the transaction costs. This will assist in defining better, how if at all, they can be reduced.

**FAO:** While Rwanda, Mozambique, Tanzania, seem to follow more or less the agreed patterns within the framework of the undg discussions and agreements, ensuring full involvement of FAO as full partner has proven very cost-intensive in another . In Viet Nam and in Cape Verde the double track approach is a concern for SAs and NRAs.

**UNESCO:** Delivering as one does entail, at least initially, additional transaction costs and workload for inter-agency coordination:

- myriad of global (UNDG) WGs, and coordination meetings, including HoA;
- regional director meetings; umerous meetings at country level, posing a particular challenge for NRAs;
- HQ resources dedicated to backstop and support;
- for UN agencies: human and financial resources to provide backstopping and support, training, mission costs, review of decentralization policies and field structure;

- for Governments: meetings of Steering Committee and sub-bodies.

Other costs include capacity building:

- Technical backstopping and capacities;
- Change management;
- Capacity assessment of UNCT and individual agencies (caution that it does not constrain inclusiveness);
- Results-based management;
- NRA Officers (funded through UNDP);
- Extrabudgetary funding for managing pilots provided by some donors, partly to UNDGO and partly to select country teams - not destined for programme implementation.