

## **Review of recommendations & administrative decisions deriving from the meetings of National Recruitment Services and UN Organizations on the Associate Expert/JPO/APO Programmes from 2005 to 2013**

Based on the historical review on administrative decisions taken by the UN System/ Donor Meeting on the Associate Expert/JPO/APO Programmes 1972 – 2005, the present paper will look into the recommendations and administrative decisions of the last 5 meetings, aiming to give a comprehensive review of the administrative decisions and recommendations of the meetings of National Recruitment Services and UN Organizations on the Associate Expert/JPO/APO Programmes from 2005 to 2013 sorted in four main categories:

1. Terms of service [page 1 -3]
2. Qualitative aspects of the Programmes [page 4-7]
3. Financial aspects [page 8-9]
4. Other aspects [page 9-14]

### **1. Terms of service**

- Entry level
- Duration of assignment
- Marital status
- Hardship duty stations
- Pension Fund
- Annual leave

#### **➤ Entry level**

##### **2005:**

Recalling the Bangkok 1990 recommendation, which indicated that AEs/JPOs/APOs are expected to reach the P/L2 level in the natural course of their assignment, it is recommended that Donors recruiting at P/L1 consider all possible ways to grant the P/L2 level in the second year and no later than in the last year of assignment.

#### **➤ Duration of assignment**

##### **2005:**

In view of the positive correlation between the duration of assignment and the career development of AEs/JPOs/APOs, it is recommended that all Donors consider assigning AEs/JPOs/APOs for a period of 3 years.

➤ **Marital status**

**2005:**

All agencies are encouraged to make all possible efforts to recognize different types of partnerships (i.e. common-law marriages and heterosexual/same sex marriage/partnerships) according to existing laws in the country of nationality of the AE/JPO/APO, and in line with the policy established by the UN Secretariat (reference: SGB/2004/13). Possibly the agencies will submit a final draft to the relevant legislative bodies by the end of 2005.

➤ **Hardship duty stations / Minimum Operational Security Standards**

*[Remark: During the Programme's early stages, candidates were placed exclusively in field positions and their presence provided technical assistance for developing countries in which they were deployed while nowadays candidates are also placed in headquarters.]*

**2005:**

It is recommended that appointments of AEs/JPOs/APOs to hardship/hazardous duty stations be considered exceptional. The meeting noting the unsuccessful attempt to standardize the entitlements package for hardship/hazardous duty stations recommends that further efforts be deployed to solve the discrepancies (Special Operation Approach (SOA) vs. non-SOA approach).

**2007:**

Considering the necessary and complex system established under the Minimum Operational Security Standards (MOSS) and its complementary Minimum Operational Residential Security Standards (MORSS) the meeting recognized the importance of security measures for all Associate Experts/JPOs/APOs assigned throughout the UN system. In further effort to harmonize UN system practices, the donors request all agencies to apply the security measures in a standardized way across the entire UN system. Additionally, the donors request that this item be reflected in a clear and transparent manner in the cost estimates as of May 2007.

*[Current status: Following discussions in 2009 & 2011 and upon request from donor side it is possible to place Associate Experts/JPO/APO in hardship duty stations such as peace keeping missions. Appointing AEs/JPOs/APOs to hardship duty stations is therefore not being considered exceptional anymore.*

*Cost estimates have been modified and security expenses are included when applicable. ]*

➤ **Pension fund**

**2005:**

The Donors:

- Considering the present situation regarding the contribution to the UN Pension Fund on the basis of which the quota of contribution paid by the Organization (financed by the Donors) is lost if the staff member is definitely separated before reaching five years of contributory service
- Noting that this situation is not acceptable in their opinion

- Request UN/DESA to consult with UN Pension Fund representatives in view of exploring suitable solutions and to present the findings to the Donors before 15 September 2005.
- Will take up this issue at the ministerial level if necessary.

[2007 & 2009:

*No recommendation derived from discussions on this topic in 2007 and 2009. UN/DESA had followed up with UNJSPF to explore alternative solutions and donors had been informed by a letter, dated 5 July 2005 of the results obtained at those consultations:*

- *Restoration Possibility: Pension Fund participants were able to restore former contributory service, provided that an application was filed within one year following the date of commencement of the new Fund participation and under the condition that previous contributory service had been less than five years, a condition fulfilled by AE/JPO/APOs by definition.*
- *Insurance coverage: UNJSPF was not only a facility for retirement pension benefits. Equally important was the social security nature of the Fund which provided cover for participants in the event of disability as well as coverage to survivors in the case of a participant's death.*
- *Transfer Agreement: Transfer Agreements between Member States and UNJSPF were possible, as evidenced by the Transfer Agreement which existed between the Canadian Government and UNJSPF]*

**2011:**

The Meeting decides to examine the different bilateral agreements concerning the Pension Fund contributions. Options will be presented by donors at the next Meeting in 2013

➤ **Annual leave**

**2005:**

The meeting takes note of the importance of balanced work/private life and recommends that AE/JPO/APO be encouraged to use all their entitlement of annual leave during their assignment.

In order to facilitate this process, the Donors request that the HR-offices in charge of the AE/JPO/APO programmes urge supervisors to allow the AEs/JPOs/APO, in the maximum extent possible, to take their annual (/home) leave. This will be in the best interest of all parties concerned.

(In addition, the Donors recommend that UN agencies request additional funds if the overall fund balance is not sufficient, when and if necessary, to cover for accrued annual leave entitlement. The Donors will promptly deposit the corresponding amount. Therefore there will be no need to mention the accrued annual leave in the initial cost-estimates).

## 2. Qualitative aspects of the programmes

- Selection process
- Induction training
- Duty Travel and training budget
- Supervision
- Transfer upon completion of two years of assignment
- Talent and Career Management

### ➤ Selection Processes

#### 2013:

Recalling recommendation No. 4 from the 8th Meeting held in Madrid in 2011 and recommendation No. 3 from the 7th Meeting held in Brussels in 2009 underlining the importance of visibility as a key aspect to attract the largest possible pool of suitable candidates, the Meeting encourages donors and organizations to further promote visibility of the Programmes.

Emphasizing the essential importance of a well tuned selection process as the key factor for retention, the Meeting takes note of the best practices put in place by several donor countries in order to identify the most suitable short-list of candidates for each specific position. The Meeting appreciates the common practice of open, transparent and competitive selection to attract and identify the best pool of candidates. The participants were interested in the practice of including psychological and behavioural testing in the selection process.

The Meeting recognizes the importance of objective and competency based selection practices put into place by organizations for the final selection of candidates, to determine the degree to which a candidate possesses the key competencies that are considered by the receiving organization as most essential for the specific position (as indicated in the relevant job description), and encourages every organization to use competency based interviews in order to select the most suitable candidates.

The Meeting concluded that a fully successful selection process shall be based on a shared responsibility between donors and receiving organizations in the spirit of partnership.

### ➤ Induction training

#### 2007:

In light of the Secretary General's Report "Investing in People" the meeting underlines once again the importance of the learning/training aspect in the Associate Expert/JPO/APO schemes. Therefore, the meeting encourages the donors that are not providing induction training to explore the possibility of doing so, in line with the best practices put in place by some donors on a national level (e.g. Sweden, Germany) or on a multinational level (Italy, The Netherlands) through courses such as those organized by the United Nations System Staff College. In order to facilitate the implementation of this recommendation the meeting suggests the establishment of a task force comprising both donors as well as UN agencies to coordinate the above-mentioned training activities. It is agreed that initially the United Nations System Staff College will serve as focal point for the task force.

#### 2009:

The Meeting encourages the donors that are not providing induction training yet to explore the possibility of doing so, in line with the best practices put in place by some donors and UN agencies. Due

consideration should be given to courses such as those organized by the United Nations System Staff College that would respond to the needs of the clients.

UNSSC will set up a Community of Practice (CoP) as a web platform for the JPO Induction Training Task Force.

Lead: UNSSC; First milestone: May 2010

*[Remark: From 2003 – 2007 a total of 192 AE/JPO/APOs, sponsored by Italy and the Netherlands, had participated in the joint induction training programme organized by UNSSC. The average costs were 3,500 USD per participant. This amount included training fees covering UNSSC administration, resource persons, travel and DSA, training components (books, CD-ROM, equipment, classrooms and office supplies, training material, etc.) as well as full board and lodging, transfer from and to the airport and miscellaneous cost such as coffee breaks.*

*In the following years other donor countries decided to send candidates to the joint induction training in Turin as well. In 2012, the group of participants included candidates sponsored by Italy, Netherlands, France, Luxembourg and Switzerland.]*

## ➤ Duty Travel and training budget

### 2005:

In view of existing differences in Donor policies regarding the amounts and purpose of the budget reserved for learning activities provided to AEs/JPOs/APOs, it is recommended that special efforts be made to standardize the purpose and the amount. This budget should include both training and official travel/missions providing learning opportunities. It is suggested that the Donors consider the possibility to set the minimum amount allocated for assignments at the country level at 3,000 USD per annum and possibly 5,000 USD per annum for assignments, where duties involve activities in several countries and/or at Headquarter locations.

### 2013:

Recalling recommendation No. 11 from the 5th Meeting held in Copenhagen in 2005, the Meeting reiterates that the budget reserved for learning activities, also known as Duty Travel Training Allowance (DTTA), shall be used for learning purposes only. The AE/JPO/APO focal points in the administering organization are encouraged to closely monitor the learning element of each activity sponsored with this budget and the total amount spent.

## ➤ Supervision

### 2005:

Based on discussions of supervision procedures, monitoring and coaching methods/tools, all agencies are encouraged to analyze best practices in order to present a set of supervision guidelines to the donors by May 2006. Mechanisms should be in place, which ensure that problems are properly addressed, when they occur.

### **2007:**

Taking note of recommendation 2 in Bonn and recommendation 3 in Copenhagen, the meeting further calls for all UN agencies to put in place guidelines for supervision of their respective Associate Experts/JPOs/APOs by December 2007. The best practice should include particular emphasis on job descriptions, learning objectives, and performance appraisal mechanisms.

### **2009:**

The meeting noted with satisfaction that guidelines for supervision have been developed and are being used by most of the UN agencies, following prior recommendations. Those UN agencies that have not yet implemented supervision guidelines are urged to comply with this request. The meeting recommends that these guidelines should be shared among UN agencies in order to promote best practices. Donors insisted again that these guidelines should be harmonized to the extent possible.

Lead: Working group; First milestone: December 2009

### **2011:**

The Meeting took note of the further increase in the use of supervision guidelines. It welcomes the development of the concept of compacts with the supervisor. It is expected that the guidelines and the compacts will more clearly define the role and responsibilities of the supervisor, including the updating and fine-tuning of the job description and the preparation of the work plan for the newly assigned AE/JPO/APO.

The remaining UN agencies that have not yet implemented supervision guidelines and/or compacts are urged to do so by 31 December 2012. The Meeting supports UN/DESA efforts to share all received supervision guidelines and compacts with UN agencies in order to promote best practices.

## **➤ Transfer only upon completion of two years of assignment**

### **2011:**

The meeting notes the increasing trend of AE/JPO/APOs requesting re-assignment between different offices and transfers between different agencies during the course of their first two years of appointment. Given the fact that AE/JPO/APO are UN staff members, the selection of the position by the donor country, and its political implications both for the donor and the organizations concerned and in view of career development, training-on-the-job, cost containment, administrative burden (incl. transfer of entitlements, pensions etc.), the Meeting decides that re-assignments within the same agency are not supported during the first two years. The Meeting underlines the importance of maintaining the contact between the donor country and the Agency administering the AE/JPO/APO in order to ensure a clear and transparent communication process given as well due consideration to this Meeting's Recommendations on supervision and the accuracy of Job Descriptions. Re-assignments are possible when the rotation is already mentioned in the Job Description.

- During the first two years of appointment, re-assignments within the agency will be considered only in specific situations deserving the attention of the donor and the Agency.
- Transfers between agencies will be considered only on exceptional basis

## ➤ Talent and Career Management

### 2009:

The meeting underlined the importance of supporting highly qualified AE/JPO/APO in their career opportunities and appreciated the new initiatives in place that were presented. The participants therefore recommend that these career management practices be shared. Joint initiatives such as those developed by ITC, ILO, WHO in Geneva should be further promoted.

Lead: Working group; First milestone: December 2009

### 2011:

The Meeting appreciates the analytical studies concerning career development opportunities. It takes note with satisfaction of the increased gender balance of the Programmes and encourages the continuous common monitoring effort among all Agencies. Agencies supported the idea of forwarding all relevant vacancy sites to UNDESA in order to create a list of links to vacancies which will be posted as well on the UNDP JPO Service Center website, facilitating career development opportunities across the board.

### 3. Financial aspects

- Cost estimates
- Provision of financial data
- Miscellaneous financial aspects

#### ➤ **Cost estimates**

##### 2009:

Taking note of the notable differences in the way cost estimates are prepared and due to the large number of new focal points at the donor and UN agencies level, the meeting reminds the UN agencies to apply as far as possible the standard cost estimate that was approved at the 3rd National Recruitment Services and UN Organizations meeting on the AE/JPO/APO Programmes which took place in Paris in March 2001.

The meeting recommends to:

- identify measures to improve harmonization, transparency and accuracy of costs estimates.

##### 2011:

The Meeting takes note that some Agencies have not yet acted upon the previous Recommendations concerning the use of a standard cost estimate and urges all Agencies to implement the cost estimate as per the format agreed at the 3rd Meeting in Paris as soon as possible but not later than 31 December 2012.

#### ➤ **Provision of financial data**

##### 2005:

The Donors wish to receive the final settlement of AE/JPO/APO accounts within two, maximum three years, after the end of the AE/JPO/APO assignment.

##### 2009:

The meeting recommends to:

- improve the accountability of expenditures, unspent balances and to the extent possible interests accrued
- present annual financial statements according to the MoUs
- mandate the Working Group to continue to reflect on the overhead costs issue with a view to reduce administration costs in line with One UN reform.

Lead: Working group; First milestone: May 2010

##### 2011:

The Meeting notes the challenges faced by some Agencies in providing timely financial reports. It recommends continued efforts towards establishing reliable mechanisms to provide timely financial data.

##### 2013:

Recalling recommendation No. 10 from the 8th Meeting held in Madrid in 2011 and taking note of the best practice concerning financial reporting established by WFP, who was the first to implement International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) in 2008, the Meeting decides that efforts

should be deployed to standardize the financial reporting to the donors. Such standardization should be able to raise accuracy, enhance the clarity and comparability of the report for the recipient and allow a more timely delivery of the report. In view of the positive experience accrued by WFP, the Meeting recommends that the template of the WFP report be shared among all participating organizations and that each organization does its utmost to produce financial reports as close as technically possible to the WFP template.

➤ **Miscellaneous financial aspects**

**2005:**

The Donors consider that, as a principle, the interest accrued on the average balance of funds of a specific Donor should be either refunded by the relevant agency to the same Donor or credited to that Donor's AE/JPO/APO programme account. Therefore, the agencies are requested to contact their financial authorities in order to do so.

**2007:**

The donors, analyzing the cost structure of the Associate Expert/JPO/APO schemes in an effort to better evaluate it, request the agencies to submit to them through UN/DESA, by December 2007, clarification on how the applicable provision of 12 percent related to administrative costs has been initially and is presently calculated (i.e. which elements of the direct and indirect costs related to the administration of extra-budgetary personnel/resources are considered under this cost-recovery mechanism).

**2009:**

Efforts for a further harmonization and streamlining of processes and effective communication among donor governments and UN agencies should be exerted.

Donors encourage agencies to continue to harmonize business practices in the management of the Programme, through the Chief Executive Board, in line with the ONE UN reform agenda and the Aid Effectiveness agenda.

While Donors expressed their wish to find a new arrangement to lower the administrative costs of the Programme, Agencies could not take any commitments on this issue and reiterated that a 12% overhead share is covering real management costs of the Programme while improving the service over the years.

Donors reiterate their confidence in the JPO Programme and will continue to invest in it despite serious budgetary constraints. They also insist on the necessity to further enhance and harmonize the Programme as recommended above. Increased transparency will serve the ultimate objectives of the Programme.

#### **4. Other aspects**

- Name of the Programmes
- Visibility of the Programmes
- Future of the Programmes
- UN Human Resources Reform and potential impacts on the Programmes
- Evaluation
- Sponsorship of candidates from developing countries
- Monitoring the implementation of recommendations

##### **➤ Name of the Programmes**

###### **2013:**

The Meeting, taking note of the historical different names of the Programmes in various organizations, in order to enhance the visibility of the Programmes, its branding and clarity for applicants, recommends that the names Associate Expert/ JPO/ APO be standardized and merged into the unique name JPO (Junior Professional Officer). Therefore, the Meeting recommends UN and receiving organizations (organizations) not using the term JPO as yet, to consult internally, in order to align the terminology to the recommended JPO title as soon as possible.

##### **➤ Visibility of the Programmes**

###### **2009:**

Donors reiterate their confidence in the JPO Programmes and will continue to invest in it despite serious budgetary constraints. They also insist on the necessity to further enhance and harmonize the Programmes as recommended above. Increased transparency will serve the ultimate objectives of the Programme.

###### **2011:**

The Meeting, recalling the recommendation number 3 of the 7th Meeting, on visibility of the AE/JPO/APO Programmes, taking note of the elements highlighted by the presentations during the course of the Meeting, encourages donors and UN Agencies to adopt best practices reinforcing the outreach efforts.

##### **➤ Future of the Programmes**

###### **2013:**

The Meeting takes note of the potential future impact of the current global financial situation on the UN System, particularly in terms of budgetary and extra-budgetary resources. The Meeting also takes note of the possible future implication with regards on the share of some direct costs.

At the same time, the Meeting acknowledges the continued success and growing importance of the AE/JPO/APO Programmes (Programmes) and strongly recommends that both the donor countries and the receiving organizations support the Programmes with the maximum resources possible. The Meeting and in particular the donors that recently joined the Programmes encourages other member states, particularly middle income countries and countries from the South to participate in the Programmes as donors.

## ➤ **UN Human Resources Reform and potential impacts on the Programmes**

### **2013:**

The Meeting takes note of the progress in implementation of human resources reforms that are on-going in the United Nations, in particular the recent resolutions of the General Assembly on human resources matters, and their potential impact on selection of future staff. The Meeting recommends donors to share relevant evolving developments with their governments in order to prevent any potential negative impacts on the Programmes.

## ➤ **Evaluation**

### **2007:**

The meeting in line of the recommendation expressed by the High-level Panel on UN system-wide coherence and considering the recommendation number 2 already issued in Bonn concerning a standardized statistical and qualitative report recommend the establishment of a task force with representatives from donors and UN agencies in order to elaborate a proposal for a common and standardized evaluation methodology to be presented at the next meeting in 2009. It is agreed that initially UN/DESA will serve as focal point for the task force.

### **2009:**

The Meeting reiterated recommendation 2 made in Bern concerning the establishment of a task force with representatives from Donors and UN agencies in order to elaborate a proposal for a common and standardized evaluation methodology. The following donors and UN agencies have volunteered as members of the task force: Italy, Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands, European Commission, UNDESA, UNDP, FAO, ITC, UNRWA, WHO.

The meeting invites Italy as the focal point to support the first steps of the Evaluation Task Force.

Lead: Italy; First milestone: December 2009

### **2011:**

The Meeting decided to rename the Task Force formerly known as the Evaluation Task Force into Assessment Task Force (ATF). The members of the Evaluation Task Force were Italy, Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands, the European Commission, UNDESA, UNDP, FAO, ITC, UNRWA, WHO. The following Donors and UN Agencies have volunteered as members of the ATF: Italy (leader), Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands, FAO, UNDESA Rome (co-leader), UNDP, WHO, European Commission/European External Action Service.

The Meeting welcomed the work done by the Assessment Task Force in order to develop a common and standardized assessment methodology. In particular, the Meeting took note of the format of the proposed standard questionnaires which in their revised format will be submitted to the participants for final comments.

The result of the assessment should be ready according to the following schedule:

30 April 2011: finalization of questionnaires

31 May 2011: distribution of questionnaires by the different stakeholders

31 December 2011: distribution of the results

The Meeting participants committed to the success of this common initiative and will provide the necessary support to the UN/DESA Office in Rome as coordinating entity of this activity.

### **2013:**

The Meeting highly appreciates the preliminary results of the overall assessment of the AE/JPO/APO Programmes, presented by Italy on behalf of the Assessment Task Force. Therefore the Meeting suggests that appropriate measures be taken to establish recurrent periodic donors' and agencies' surveys. The Meeting suggests scheduling the survey every two years in order to share the results with all concerned parties before each biennial meeting. Switzerland volunteered to carry out the first donors' survey and UNDP volunteered to carry out the first agencies' survey before the 2015 Meeting.

### **➤ Sponsorship of candidates from developing countries**

Background:

The NRS Meeting held in Bangkok in 1990 (24-28 Sept. 1990) endorsed recommendation No. 10 of 1989 that an increased number of Associate Experts/ JPOs/ APOs from developing countries be included in the national scheme of donor countries. This was reiterated at the following NRS Meetings:

- ✓ Cairo 29 March – 2 April 1993
- ✓ Turin 5-6 December 1996
- ✓ The Hague 23-25 February 1999
- ✓ Paris 27 February -1 March 2001)
- ✓ Bonn 2003

### **Recommendations 2005 - 2013:**

#### **2005:**

Taking note of the efforts already being made by some donors, the recommendation to extend the support to developing country candidates is reiterated.

#### **2007:**

Sponsoring of developing countries candidates (DCC) is a political decision for each donor country. However, it is recognized that developing countries Associate Experts/JPOs/APOs show a high motivation for the given opportunity and greatly benefit from their assignments.

In light of the above, coupled with reiterated recommendations (mentioned since 1972 and recommended since 1990) in support of this item, the meeting considers possible alternative financing for sponsorship of DCC and suggests to explore all possible avenues to mobilize additional resources for this specific objective.

With the aforementioned in view, therefore:

- Invites UN/DESA to explore the possibility of establishing a technical cooperation trust fund, to which donors may contribute on a voluntary basis toward the sponsorship of DCC, UN system-wide. In order to do so UN/DESA in consultation with the UN agencies and in line with the aforementioned will submit a proposal, including detailed mechanisms, to the donors by end of June 2007;
- Encourages the agencies to seek financing from regional organizations and development banks for the above-mentioned purpose, in coordination and with the full support of the donor countries;

- Requests the donors (particularly those that do not yet sponsor DCC), in collaboration with the UN agencies, to verify the feasibility of establishing a scheme of co-sponsorship with developing countries, in the framework of triangular cooperation;
- Requests the donors (particularly those that do not yet sponsor DCC) to consider the possibility of securing additional funding for DCC, at least on a limited basis such as, one candidate annually or biennially.

### **2009:**

The Meeting taking note of the JIU recommendation underlined once again the importance of enhancing the sponsorship of DCCs and therefore:

- Welcomes the Spanish initiative to sponsor a large number of DCCs and invites other donor countries to initiate, maintain and increase their support for DCCs
- Invites all donors to review UNDESA's proposed terms of references for a technical cooperation trust fund
- Invites UN/DESA to further explore the details for the establishment of the technical cooperation trust fund in collaboration with interested donors including the European Commission
- Once more encourages the agencies to seek financing from regional organizations and development banks and foundations for the above-mentioned purpose

Lead: UNDESA; First milestone: September 2009

### **2011:**

All donors expressed their appreciation for the creative approach contained in the latest Trust Fund proposal and support the concept of increasing the participation of DCCs into the AE/JPO/APO Programmes. The Meeting notes the high retention rate of DCCs in the past.

In addition to the donor countries already sponsoring DCCs, several countries confirmed their active interest in the most recent Trust Fund proposal submitted to the attention of the participants. Other representatives expressed the need to further consult with their respective authorities.

All interested parties are invited to submit comments to UNDESA in order to facilitate the finalizing of the Trust Fund proposal by 30 June 2011.

The Meeting encourages the countries already sponsoring DCCs and receiving Agencies to share their comments and positive experiences with all interested parties to support the initiative.

### **2013:**

Sponsorship of Developing Country Candidates (DCC); Launch of a Voluntary Trust Fund:

Taking note of the efforts already deployed by donors such as The Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and Spain in sponsoring Developing Country Candidates (DCC),

The Meeting recalls the recommendations in support of sponsoring DCC (mentioned first in 1972 and reconfirmed at each meeting since 1990) and reiterates that sponsoring DCC:

- a) supports capacity building in developing countries;
- b) contributes to a greater North-South balance;
- c) improves the geographical distribution of the workforce of the United Nations System.

Having reviewed the finalized proposal for the establishment of a Trust Fund dedicated to the sponsorship of DCC (the Trust Fund), the Meeting welcomes the proposal and recommends the establishment of this voluntary Trust Fund.

The Meeting takes note with great satisfaction that two representatives, notably the representatives from Denmark and Switzerland, committed themselves to make serious efforts to secure the sponsorship of one DCC position each for two years.

Furthermore the Meeting decides that UN/DESA will be the Administrative Agent (AA) of the Trust Fund.

As outlined in the Trust Fund proposal, the Meeting decides that UNDP, UNESCO and ILO are the members of the Steering Committee for the initial two years.

The Meeting agrees that the Steering Committee shall be responsible to identify positions and endorse the candidates to be funded by the DCC Trust Fund taking into account the conditionality expressed by the contributing donors.

### ➤ **Monitoring the implementation of recommendations**

#### **2009:**

The participants, while acknowledging the value of the biennial meetings, recommend the institution of an informal monitoring mechanism in-between meetings to allow a more systematic follow up of the implementation of the recommendations. For this purpose the establishment on a pilot basis of a working group consisting of three agencies and three donors is suggested. The suggested term for the Working Group is for 2 years on a rotating basis. The following donors and UN agencies have volunteered as members of the task force: Belgium, France, Sweden, FAO, UNDESA, UNDP.

Lead: Belgium; First milestone: December 2009

#### **2011:**

The Meeting reiterates the Recommendation made in Brussels concerning the institution of an informal monitoring mechanism to allow a systematic follow up of the implementation of the recommendations. The Meeting welcomes the work done so far by the Task Forces, in particular the Assessment Task Force (ATF), and encourages strengthening the monitoring of the implementation of the meeting recommendations. The following donors and UN agencies have volunteered as members of the Monitoring Task Force: Spain (leader), Norway, Finland, Sweden, UNDESA, UNESCO, UNDP, WHO, one Rome-based agency.

### ➤ **Facilitating ongoing communication**

#### **2013:**

Taking note of the opportunities offered by social media to enhance with minimum cost implications ongoing exchanges between donors and UN organizations participating in the Programmes, the Meeting recommends creating a dedicated on-line forum. The forum will be initially created and moderated by UNDP, with the support of donor countries such as France and The Netherlands. The results of this initiative will be presented at the next biennial meeting and the possibility of further development will be assessed.