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TIME     SESSION
09:30 a.m. Welcome remarks
         Yvonne Lodico, Head, UNITAR New York Office
         H.E. Paul Seger, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations
09:40 a.m. The QCPR process
         Nadia Isler or Pio Wennubst, Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN
         Navid Hanif, Acting Director, Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, UNDESA
10:00 a.m. UNICEF’s Funding Architecture: key trends and challenges
         Afshan Khan, Director, Public-Sector Alliances and Resource Mobilization Office (PARMO), UNICEF
         o Structure of funding contributions and expenditures
         o Overview of key funding trends

Questions and answers/discussion
10:45 a.m.  **UNDP’s Funding Architecture: key trends and challenges**

*Romesh Muttukumaru, Deputy Assistant Administrator and Deputy Director, Partnerships Bureau, UNDP*

- Structure of funding contributions and expenditures
- Overview of key funding trends

Questions and answers/discussion

11:30 a.m.  Coffee break

11:45 a.m.  **Overview of Funding Architecture of UN Operational Activities for Development**

*Kristinn Sv. Helgason, Deputy Chief, Development Cooperation Policy Branch, DESA*

- Volume, sources and destination of funding
- Trends in contributions and predictability of resource flows

Questions and answers/discussion

12:30 p.m.  **Closing remarks and evaluation**

*Yvonne Lodico, UNITAR*
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Information Note

Background

Operational activities for development of the UN system are defined as those activities of the funds, programmes and specialized agencies which have the specific objective of promoting economic and social development in programme countries. In 2010, nearly two-thirds of all UN system-wide activities were operational activities for development.

The Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) is the mechanism through which the General Assembly assesses the effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and impact of UN operational activities for development and establishes system-wide policy orientations for the development cooperation and country-level modalities of the UN system.

The 2012 QCPR process presents an important opportunity for Member States to engage in a dialogue on how to adapt UN operational activities for development to the changing global development cooperation context. To facilitate the QCPR process, the Secretary-General undertakes in-depth analytical work in a number of areas including: funding, UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) process, UN Resident Coordinator system, harmonization of business practices, results-based strategic planning and management, gender equality and women’s empowerment, support to countries in transition from relief to development and emerging issues likely to affect the role of the UN development system in the near future.
The six-module course series, conducted in cooperation with UNDESA, is intended to provide delegates in Permanent Missions of Member States in New York with an opportunity to examine in greater depth a number of technical issues central to the QCPR, as part of the preparations for the upcoming intergovernmental negotiation process.

At the end of the course series, participants will better understand:

- The key policy issues in the area of funding of UN operational activities for development;
- The role of coordination in enhancing country-level performance of the UN development system;
- The emerging issues/global challenges likely to significantly impact the future role of the UN development system in international cooperation for development;
- The perspectives of key stakeholders at the country-level on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UN operational activities for development.

The course will be organized into six half-day sessions, led by experts and practitioners in their respective fields. Participants are encouraged to attend all the sessions.

**Module 1 (1 February 2012):** Funding for UN operational activities for development: key trends and issues (UNDESA in cooperation with UNDP and UNICEF)

**Module 2 (22 February 2012):** Functioning of the UN development system: (a) UNDAF process, (b) UN Resident Coordinator system and (c) harmonization of business practices: challenges and opportunities

**Module 3 (13 March 2012):** Positioning of the UN system in a changing development landscape

**Module 4 (27 April 2012):** Perspectives from the field: findings of surveys of programme country governments, UN Resident Coordinators and UN country teams and civil society organizations working with the UN system at the country-level

**Module 5 (22 June 2012):** Briefing prior to the Operational Activities Segment of the Economic and Social Council: Designed for diplomats coming to New York for the substantive session of the Economic and Social Council, this intensive module will explain the QCPR process and summarize the key messages of the first four sessions.

**Module 6 (28 September 2012):** Briefing prior to General Assembly deliberations on QCPR: Designed for diplomats who arrived during the summer and were unable to attend the other briefings, this last module will present/explain the QCPR process and all the materials produced in the previous sessions.

**Participants:** The Series is open to delegates of permanent missions to the United Nations in New York who are involved or interested in UN operational activities for development, and other representatives of international, intergovernmental, and non-governmental organizations.

**Registration:** If you wish to participate in the modules, please register online at [http://www.unitar.org/event/new-york](http://www.unitar.org/event/new-york).

Mr. Felix Haass  
United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)  
One United Nations Plaza, DC1-603  
New York, NY 10017  
Email: felix.haass@unitar.org  
Phone: (212) 963-3021  
Fax: (212) 963-9686/ 0995
Preparations for the 2012 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of the General Assembly of UN operational activities for development

Six module course series organized jointly with the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Sponsored by the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN

Selected Funding Terms

Agency-specific thematic funds
These are funds which generally allow UN agencies to programme more responsively, based on country and global priorities, without having to negotiate project agreements and conditions. Thematic funds are pooled and designed to have fewer restrictions on their use than traditional non-core resources. Examples include UNFPA’s Maternal Health Thematic Fund and UNICEF’s Thematic Fund for Basic Education and Gender Equality.

Core and non-core resources
Operational activities for development are funded by a combination of so-called core and non-core resources. Core resources are those that are commingled without restrictions and whose use and application are directly linked to the strategic mandates, guidelines, priorities and goals established by the respective intergovernmental governing bodies. Non-core resources are resources that are generally restricted with regard to their use and application as determined by the contributor. The degree to which the use and application of non-core resources are subject to and aligned with the mandates, guidelines, priorities, and goals established by intergovernmental governing bodies is at best indirect. Core resources are generally preferred by UN agencies since they are required to preserve the UN’s multilateral, impartial and universal character. Core resources also tend to provide more flexibility to spend on the priorities of programme countries.
**Multi-partner trust funds (MPTFs)**
These funds are a type of joint programme which uses the pass-through fund management model. Donors agree to channel the funds through one UN agency (the “Administrative Agent”) which distributes the funds to multiple UN participating organizations. MPTFs are designed to enhance coherence and provide more flexible funding than traditional non-core resources. **One UN Country Funds** are a type of MPTF. For example, the Mozambique One UN Fund receives contributions from 6 countries and engages 18 UN funds, programmes and agencies to deliver results in support of the national development objectives and priorities.

**Nominal versus real terms**
Comparisons and trend analyses in “real terms” are based on nominal amounts expressed in constant United States dollars which take into account the combined effect of inflation and exchange rate movements. This is done to make data comparable across different time periods.

**Operational activities for development**
These are activities of UN funds, programmes and agencies which have the specific objective of promoting development. Most United Nations entities have specific mandates in this regard. Thirty-six UN entities received contributions for operational activities for development in 2009. Operational activities for development cover both longer-term development-related activities as well as activities with a humanitarian assistance focus. Humanitarian assistance refers to activities that respond to an immediate crisis, such as the emergency operations put in place following the 2010 earthquake in Haiti.
UNICEF’s Funding Architecture: Key Trends and Challenges

Afshan Khan  
Director  
Public Alliances and Resource Mobilization Office  
(check against delivery)

Presentation Outline

A. Review of key funding trends

B. Predictability of core resources for UNICEF’s mandate

C. Multiplicity of funding sources for a broad donor base

D. Quality non-core resources: UNICEF thematic funds

E. Non-core emergency funding: underfunded crises

F. Programme expenditures

G. Narrowing the gaps in achieving MDGs with equity
(USD millions)

- UNICEF is 100% voluntarily funded

Total UNICEF Income by Funding Type: 2011*
(USD)

Regular Resources (RR)
Un-earmarked, core resources that help sustain UNICEF assisted programmes and enable UNICEF to carry out its mission to improve the lives of children and women.

Other Resources (OR)
Earmarked contributions for programmes that are supplementary to the contributions to Regular Resources and are restricted to a particular programme, geographic area, or strategic priority, or (ORE) an emergency response.
Un-earmarked regular resources – highest quality funding to UNICEF

• Regular resources:

➢ Provide the highest quality and flexibility of funding and help ensure the organization’s independence, neutrality and role as a trusted partner, with adequate highly-skilled capacity at country level, for country-driven, innovative, and efficient programme activities

➢ Enable quick and flexible responses to changing circumstances – allowing the channeling of resources to programme areas where most needed and to new emerging challenges, exploration of innovative approaches, and new partnerships

Total regular resources expenditure, 2010

UNICEF allocates 90% of its regular resources to developing and implementing programmes
Regular resources narrow the gaps in MDGs achievement by investing in the most vulnerable

- UNICEF utilizes a formula approved by its Executive Board that ensures LDCs receive at least 60% of core resources and countries in Sub-Saharan Africa receive at least 50%.

- In 2010, UNICEF allocated 90% of core programme assistance to priority countries based on under-5 child mortality rates, GNI per capita, and size of the child population.

### 2010: Core resource programme assistance expenditure: Top 10 Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount in USD (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>57.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>54.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>42.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>42.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>39.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>22.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>20.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income by Funding Type: 2007-2011

UNICEF’s share of core resources has followed an overall trend of decline

*2011 figures are preliminary
The risk to UNICEF of declining regular resources

- A reduced regular resource base:
  - Decreases the proportion directly regulated by UNICEF’s Executive Board
  - Compromises UNICEF’s ability to deliver on its mandate and complete the plan of work outlined by its Board and UN General Assembly
  - Risks curtailing UNICEF’s global presence
  - Reduces the organization’s capacity to provide continued leadership and innovation on child-related priorities, including during emergencies
  - Increases fragmentation and programmatic gaps
  - Risks changing the very character of UNICEF

Strong contribution from the private sector

National Committees contributed 29% of UNICEF resources in 2010 (included in private sector contributions)


*2011 figures are preliminary
Regular resources: Public vs. Private, 2007-11
(USD millions)

*2011 figures are preliminary

Total Income: Public Sector, 2011*
(USD millions)

- UNICEF explores multiple funding modalities constituting the new aid architecture in order to secure adequate, predictable and quality funding to fulfil its mandate and achieve the targets of its Medium-Term Strategic Plan

*2011 figures are preliminary
Overall Income - Public Sector, 2007-11
(USD millions)

DAC vs. Non-DAC donors, 2011*

- A broad donor base helps ensure impartial, neutral assistance, and decreases dependencies to implement UNICEF’s mandate
- UNICEF is committed to supporting South-South cooperation, through which developing countries are becoming supporters and contributors to other countries’ development, particularly in capacity building

*2011 figures are preliminary
### Top 10 Government Donors, 2011*

(USD millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Regular Resources</th>
<th>Other Resources</th>
<th>Other Resources - Supplementary</th>
<th>Other Resources - Emergency</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>132.3</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>345.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>291.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>224.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>219.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011 figures are preliminary

### Top 10 Non-DAC Donors, 2011*

(USD thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Regular Resources</th>
<th>Other Resources</th>
<th>Other Resources - Supplementary</th>
<th>Other Resources - Emergency</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11,410</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,086</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011 figures are preliminary
Quality other resource thematic funds

• UNICEF thematic funds are the best alternative to regular resources:

  ➢ Pooled contributions from all donors

  ➢ Earmarked only up to Medium-Term Strategic Programme focus area:
    Young Child Survival & Development; Basic Education and Gender Equality;
    HIV/AIDS; Child Protection; Policy & Practice; plus Humanitarian Action

  ➢ Funding at either Global, Regional or Country level

  ➢ Expenditure tracked for overall pooled contributions

  ➢ Consolidated annual narrative report / financial statement per focus area

  ➢ Lower recovery rate (5% vs. 7%) accounting for reduced transaction costs

Thematic Contributions, 2007-11

• Reversals in 2011 still showing the 2nd best annual performance overall.
  Thematic funding has a narrow funding base; one donor cut contributions in
  2011 following the economic downturn. Humanitarian surge in 2010 is largely
  private sector income for the Haiti earthquake.

*2011 figures are preliminary
Thematic Contributions, 2011
by MTSP Focus Areas & Humanitarian

Thematic Contributions 2011*: US$373 million

*2011 figures are preliminary

Other Resources – Emergency, 2002-2011
(USD millions)

- Highly volatile income trend dependent on major global emergencies, e.g.
  a) 2004/05: East Asia Tsunami; b) 2010: Haiti earthquake and Pakistan floods;
  c) 2011: Horn of Africa crisis

*2011 figures are preliminary
Funding Gaps by
Types of Emergency Appeals, 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal Type</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Funding Gap</th>
<th>% UnFunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>995,984,775</td>
<td>406,277,311</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>462,509,939</td>
<td>236,155,248</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLASH</td>
<td>142,593,863</td>
<td>65,351,333</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4,965,555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,608,054,132</td>
<td>707,783,892</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011 figures are preliminary

- Significant underfunded rates for emergencies included:
  - **CAP**: Zimbabwe (85% unfunded); Afghanistan (69%)
  - **HAC**: Haiti (100%); CEE/CIS (100%); Eritrea (94%); Uganda (93%)
  - **Flash Appeals**: Pakistan Floods (63%); Cote d’Ivoire (57%)

Programme assistance expenditure
by MTSP focus area, 2010 (USD millions)
Narrowing the gaps in MDGs achievement with equity

- UNICEF questioned the conventional wisdom:
  - If the needs are greatest among the most disadvantaged ... and new, more efficient strategies and tools exist to reach them ... might the benefits of concentrating on them outweigh the additional costs of reaching them?

- With partners, UNICEF examined data, literature and country experience on equity approaches to young child survival and development; HIV/AIDS; basic education and gender equality; and child protection

- The outcome: an equity-focused approach is more cost-effective in moving the world towards the MDGs. In low-income, high mortality countries, every additional US$1 million invested in an equity approach can save up to 60 percent more lives than was possible in the past

- Implementing the equity approach and reaching the most vulnerable is UNICEF’s core work. Core regular resources are essential for this core mandate
Thank you!
OVERVIEW OF UNDP INCOME

REGULAR AND OTHER RESOURCES

Orientation session for Member States

Romesh Muttukumaru
Deputy Assistant Administrator

1 February 2012

Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy

SOME BASIC FACTS ABOUT UNDP

• UNDP is a voluntary funded organization

• UNDP is the United Nations' global development network and fulfills two roles: as manager of the UN resident coordinator system; and as a development agency working to achieve sustainable development

• UNDP has a universal presence working in 177 countries; with representational country offices in 127 countries in the world
Some key definitions

- Core or regular resources
- Non core or other resources
- Third party Cost-sharing and (vertical) Trust Funds
- Multi Partner Trust Funds
- Government cost-sharing

UNDP resources and ODA estimates: 1992-2011
### Top donors (contributing $1 million and more) to regular resources: 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>% share</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>% share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>133,222,959</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>23,707,774</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>105,144,287</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>22,643,646</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>93,829,607</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>12,652,137</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>89,708,041</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>6,244,146</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>84,060,360</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>5,660,911</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>82,144,552</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>61,924,298</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>58,133,276</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>4,174,922</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>51,145,663</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>4,147,590</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>38,211,152</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,122,842</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>29,719,785</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>28,304,557</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>25,884,517</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top OECD/DAC Donors Other Resources

**In 2010 (US$ million)**

- Japan
- USA
- UK
- Norway
- Canada
- Germany
- Netherlands
- Sweden
- Denmark
- Spain
Top 10 recipients of other resources: 2010

Any questions?
Overview of the Funding Architecture of UN Operational Activities for Development

New York, 1 February 2012

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA

Presentation outline

A. Volume, sources and destination of funding
B. Key funding trends
C. Non-core funding modalities
D. Predictability of funding
E. Importance of UN operational activities
A. UN system-wide activities (2009)

- Humanitarian Assistance: 22%
- Peacekeeping: 21%
- Norm-setting & other: 16%
- Development-related activities: 41%
- Operational activities for development: (Based on 2009 contributions to UN system-wide activities ($34.3 billion))

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA

A. Operational activities for development (DEV & HA, 2009)

- Non-core (DEV): 43%
- Core (DEV): 22%
- Humanitarian Assistance (HA): 5%
- Development-related activities (DEV): 30%
- Non-core (HA): 30%
- Core (HA): 5%

(Based on 2009 contributions which totalled $21.9 billion)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA
A. **Largest UN entities (DEV & HA, 2009)**

![Graph showing core and non-core contributions of various UN entities.](image)

(Millions of current United States dollars)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA

A. **Sources of funding (DEV & HA, major groups, 2009)**

![Pie chart showing sources of funding.](image)

(Total funding in 2009: $21.9 billion)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA
A. Destination of funding (DEV & HA, 2009)

(Total expenditures in 2009: $22.1 billion)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA

B. Trends in the sources of total funding (DEV & HA, major groups, 1995-2009)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA
B. Multilateral aid flows as share of total ODA (2006-2009)

![Bar chart showing multilateral aid flows as share of total ODA from 2006 to 2009.](chart)

(Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System and DAC Table 1)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA

B. Core funding ratios (1994 and 2009)

![Bar chart showing core funding ratios for total contributions, development-related activities, all governments (DEV), and DAC governments (DEV) in 1994 and 2009.](chart)

Kristinn Sv. Helgason and Andrew MacPherson, OESC, UNDESA
B. Trends in contributions (DEV, 1994-2009)
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C. Non-core funding modalities (DEV only, 2009)
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### C. One UN Funds (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient country</th>
<th>Total ODA (millions of United States dollars)</th>
<th>Total UN expenditure</th>
<th>One UN Fund expenditure</th>
<th>Share of Total ODA (percentage)</th>
<th>Share of total UN expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Rep. of Tanzania</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>13784</strong></td>
<td><strong>1262</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source of ODA data: OECD/DAC statistics, DAC Table 2a)
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### D. Currency exchange rate movements (major currencies, 2005-2009)

![Graph showing currency exchange rate movements](chart.png)
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D. Change in donor currency and US$ equivalent (UNICEF, core contributions, 2008-2009)
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E. United Nations share of ODA in programme countries (2009)

United Nations data excludes local resources. Information on ODA obtained from OECD DAC Statistics, DAC Table 2a
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Overview of preparations for 2012 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of the General Assembly
Assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UN operational activities for development

**Key resolutions**
- GA 62/208 on the triennial comprehensive policy review
- GA 64/289 on system-wide coherence
- ECOSOC 2011/7

**QCP R focus areas**
A. Funding for operational activities of UN development system
B. National capacity development & development effectiveness
   - Capacity-building and development
   - South-South cooperation
   - Gender equality and women's empowerment
   - Transition from relief to development
C. Functioning of UN development system
   - Relevance, coherence, and effectiveness
   - Regional dimensions
   - Transaction cost and efficiency
   - Country-level capacity
   - Evaluation

**Other areas**
A. Review of existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation
B. Independent evaluation of DaO initiative

**Surveys/desk review**
- Survey of programme countries on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UN OAD
- Desk review of key documents in all substantive areas
- UN system survey

**Analytical studies**
- Funding
- Gender equality
- UNDAF
- RC system
- Results-based strategic planning & management
- Harmonization of business practices
- Emerging issues

**Consultations**
- Member States: analytical papers, 'client satisfaction survey', SWE review, DaO briefings, other
- RCs & UN country and regional teams
- QCPR focal points
- UNG, HLCM, HLCP
- Country visits

**A. Independent evaluation of DaO**

**B. Review of institutional framework for system-wide evaluation**

---

**Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**April-May 2012**
- SG analytical report on funding
- SG analytical report on TCPR implementation

**July 2012**
- ECOSOC Operational Activities Segment

**September 2012**
- SG reports
  - QCPR
  - Funding
  - SWE review
- Other reports
  - Summary EGM report to PGA on DaO independent evaluation

**October 2012**
- GA discussion on QCPR
- Draft QCPR resolution circulated to Member States

**October – November 2012**
- QCPR negotiations by Member States

**November – December 2012**
- QCPR resolution adopted

---