

## **Survey of UN Resident Coordinators and UN Country Team members**

---

### **Annex with statistical data and respondents' comments reproduced verbatim**

Notes:

1. The data in this document is organized according to the questions in the survey, in the order that they appeared. Where respondents have made comments in French or Spanish, an informal translation has been provided, shown in bold type.
2. Country or agency names have been removed where they might have revealed the identity of a respondent or affected UN relations with the country.

United Nations

15/6/2012

## Table of Contents

1. Please check your agency or function below? .....	4
2. Are you serving in a DaO pilot or self-starter country?.....	5
3. Please select your duty station: .....	7
4. Income group of countries .....	10
5. Is the country classed as an Least-Developed Country (LDC)? .....	10
6. Is the country classed as a Small Island Developing country (SIDS)?.....	11
7. Integrated Mission (IM) in the country .....	11
8. Humanitarian Coordinator in the country .....	11
9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? .....	12
9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -Only RCs responses.....	12
9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries .....	12
9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -Ranked by top entities .....	13
9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -RCs responses by Country Income groups .....	14
10. If the UN development system has become more coherent in the past four years, to which factors do you attribute this improvement?.....	19
11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately:.....	26
11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. -Ranked by top UN entities .....	27
11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. -RCs responses by Country Income groups .....	28
11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. -DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries .....	28
12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country? .....	33
12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country? -RCs responses by Country Income groups .....	34
12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country? -DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries .....	34
13. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to strengthen the government's role in the overall coordination of UN activities in the country: .....	38

13. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to strengthen the government's role in the overall coordination of UN activities in the country. –DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries .....	38
14. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to increase the participation of civil society in the work of the UN in the country: .....	43
15. UN agencies receive contributions from donors for specific programmes and projects in addition to their regular (core) funds. In general, such additional donor-funded activities are less relevant to the country's needs and priorities: .....	46
15. UN agencies receive contributions from donors for specific programmes and projects in addition to their regular (core) funds. In general, such additional donor-funded activities are less relevant to the country's needs and priorities. –RCs responses by Country Income group .....	47
16. From your observations, the growth in non-core/extrabudgetary/earmarked resources available to UN agencies has lessened the UN's ability to strategically plan its support: .....	51
17. Do the UN agencies sometimes compete with each other for donor funding for projects? .....	55
17. Do the UN agencies sometimes compete with each other for donor funding for projects? –DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries .....	55
18. If the answer to the question above was Yes, please check any of the following statements that apply: .....	60
19. Have any programme related measures been taken by the UNCT over the last four years that reduced the burden on the government when dealing with the UN system? ...	65
20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level: .....	72
20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –Only RCs responses .....	72
20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –RCs response by Country Income group .....	73
21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level: .....	76
21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –Only RCs responses .....	76
21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –RCs responses by Country Income group .....	76
20. and 21 compined. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level.....	79
22. Looking to the future, how effective would the following measures be in improving UN coherence at the country-level? .....	80
22. Looking to the future, how effective would the following measures be in improving UN coherence at the country-level? RCs responses by Country Income group .....	81

23. From your observations, please rate the willingness of key external development partners to collaborate with each other and with the UN at the country level.....	90
24. How would you assess the cooperation between the UNCT and the World Bank at the country-level? .....	92
25. How would you assess the cooperation between the UNCT and the regional banks at the country-level?.....	97
26. Taking all factors into consideration, particularly the UN's effectiveness, efficiency and coherence, greater efforts should be made to involve non-resident UN agencies in the activities of the UNCT: .....	99
26. Taking all factors into consideration, particularly the UN's effectiveness, efficiency and coherence, greater efforts should be made to involve non-resident UN agencies in the activities of the UNCT. Only RCs responses.....	99
27. Are there any additional comments or suggestions you would like to make?.....	103

## UNCT survey

<b>1. Please check your agency or function below?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
RC (accredited to Government)	15.1%	78
UNDP other than RC	7.9%	41
WFP	4.6%	24
UNICEF	8.1%	42
WHO	13.1%	68
UNHCR	3.3%	17
FAO	5.2%	27
UNFPA	6.8%	35
UNRWA	0.4%	2
ILO	2.3%	12
IFAD	0.4%	2
UNESCO	3.9%	20
UNAIDS	5.4%	28
UNODC	1.2%	6
UNIDO	3.1%	16
UNEP	0.4%	2
UN-OCHA	0.8%	4
IAEA	0.0%	0
UN-HABITAT	1.5%	8
UNIFEM/UNWOMEN	3.1%	16
ICAO	0.2%	1
OHCHR	1.7%	9
UN-DESA	0.4%	2
ITC	0.0%	0
UNOPS	2.5%	13
UNCDF	0.0%	0
UNCTAD	0.0%	0
UNV	1.7%	9
WMO	0.6%	3
ECLAC	0.2%	1
ESCAP	0.6%	3
WIPO	0.0%	0
ECE	0.0%	0
IMO	0.2%	1
ITU	0.2%	1
ECA	0.0%	0

UPU	0.0%	0
UNWTO	0.0%	0
ESCWA	0.0%	0
IOM	3.5%	18
DPI	1.4%	7
IFC	0.4%	2
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>518</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

<b>2. Are you serving in a DaO pilot or self-starter country?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes-146 responses	28.2%	146
No-372 responses	71.8%	372
Please provide any comments		48
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>518</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

Pioneering a new Programming and partnership Framework to position UN system in MICs
One of the 10 countries covered is a self starter
Self-starter
We however make a note that the government of [country] wrote to the UNDG chair requesting to be considered as a DaO Country
However, [country] Trust Fund meant that the UNCT worked in a DaO manner without declaring itself as a self-starter.
Whilst the [country] Government does not as yet wish to be branded "self-starter" country for political strategic reasons, it has agreed with our UNCT to develop and implement common programming tools that bear the hallmark of DaO: Light UNDAF, Common Action Plan, and potentially One Fund.
We have volunteered to be self-starter.
[Country] is implementing UN Reform however does not meet the narrow definition of DAO as determined for access to the expanded window. Perhaps this definition will now be adjusted given the window is now no longer accessible. This could perhaps be given some priority to ensure continued momentum with UN reform and a continued appetite and recognition for the same.
It is unclear what is meant by a 'self-starter' any more. There is no official list of such countries and virtually any size can fit. We are taking actions on coherence learning from DaO experience and hopefully improving on it but labelling as a 'self-starter' is not essential unless there are some clear coherence and financial benefits from such

labelling.
I assumed the RC position a week ago thus the following responses will reflect my limited knowledge of the country and UN activities.
DaO self-starter country signed in 2009, implementation started in 2010
I am also serving as accredited UNICEF, UNFPA, and UNDP Rep in the only Joint Office in the World.
Representative for 10 countries in the sub region
DaO pilot
Not applicable to our country
n/a
Don't know the answer
Proposal for self starter is planning
We have prepared jointly a framework of strategic cooperation
Viet Nam is one of eight pilot countries on DaO
Uruguay is a pilot country since the inception of the DaO, being the only one in LAC
Not fully but experimenting with some joint activities in some states, described as UNDAF states
Question not clear
Have not gotten to agreeing with Government over commencing as self-starter, although Government requested same.
Theoretically a self-starter. Not in practice.
L'accent est en train d'être mis sur les initiatives conjointes en vue d'une progression vers un DaO
<b>The emphasis is being put on joint initiatives towards DaO</b>
Government has expressed the desire for the country to be a self starter, and steps will likely be made to fulfil this.
Self starter
Moving towards self-starter but not officially declared
Self starter to end 2011
Self-starter
Self starter country
Ghana is officially accepted as self starter by UNDG
Not very clear if we are considered a self starter or not...
Self starter
Self-starter
Not yet! New 2013-2017 UNDAF is DaO oriented.
We are a self-starter sub-region with Kiribati operationalizing One UN Fund
Self-starting in 2012 a pr the Government request in Nov 2011
Self-starter Country
About to start
Suriname
The government is currently asking the UNS to become a self-starter country.
As far as I know we are not a DaO pilot or self-starter, but others may think differently
On ne comprend pas le DaO pilot
<b>We do not understand the pilot DaO.</b>

It cannot be answered with yes or no
A self -starter country
Yes and no, Sub-Regional assistance to PNG/DAO and Fiji & Samoa MCOs

<b>3. Please select your duty station:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Afghanistan	0.2%	1
Albania	1.2%	6
Algeria	0.8%	4
Angola	0.8%	4
Argentina	0.4%	2
Armenia	1.7%	9
Azerbaijan	0.8%	4
Bahrain	0.6%	3
Bangladesh	1.7%	9
Barbados & OECS	0.2%	1
Belarus	1.0%	5
Belize	1.0%	5
Benin	0.4%	2
Bhutan	0.8%	4
Bolivia	0.4%	2
Bosnia & Herzegovina	0.4%	2
Botswana	0.4%	2
Burkina Faso	1.2%	6
Brazil	0.6%	3
Burundi	0.6%	3
Cambodia	1.2%	6
Cameroon	1.4%	7
Cape Verde	0.2%	1
Central African Republic	1.2%	6
Chad	0.0%	0
Chile	0.4%	2
China	1.2%	6
Colombia	1.9%	10
Comoros	0.0%	0
Cook Islands	0.0%	0
Costa Rica	0.2%	1
Cote d'Ivoire	0.2%	1
Croatia	0.6%	3
Cuba	0.0%	0
Democratic Republic of Congo	1.2%	6



Djibouti	0.0%	0
Dominican Republic	0.4%	2
DPR Korea	0.6%	3
Ecuador	1.9%	10
Egypt	1.0%	5
El Salvador	0.2%	1
Equatorial Guinea	1.0%	5
Eritrea	0.0%	0
Ethiopia	1.9%	10
Fiji	1.0%	5
Gabon	1.0%	5
Federated States of Micronesia	0.2%	1
Gambia	0.4%	2
Georgia	1.4%	7
Ghana	1.4%	7
Guatemala	0.4%	2
Guinea	0.4%	2
Guinea-Bissau	0.8%	4
Guyana	1.4%	7
Haiti	0.8%	4
Honduras	1.2%	6
India	1.0%	5
Indonesia	1.4%	7
Iran	1.5%	8
Iraq	1.4%	7
Jamaica	0.2%	1
Jordan	1.5%	8
Kazakhstan	0.4%	2
Kenya	0.4%	2
Kiribati	0.0%	0
Kosovo	0.8%	4
Kuwait	0.4%	2
Kyrgyzstan	1.0%	5
Lao PDR	1.0%	5
Lebanon	1.2%	6
Lesotho	0.4%	2
Liberia	0.6%	3
Libya	0.6%	3
Macedonia	0.8%	4
Madagascar	1.2%	6
Malawi	0.6%	3
Malaysia	0.2%	1
Maldives	0.0%	0
Mali	0.6%	3
Mauritania	0.0%	0

Mauritius	0.2%	1
Mexico	1.0%	5
Moldova	1.2%	6
Mongolia	0.6%	3
Montenegro	1.5%	8
Morocco	0.2%	1
Mozambique	1.2%	6
Myanmar	0.6%	3
Namibia	1.5%	8
Nauru	0.0%	0
Nepal	0.2%	1
Nicaragua	1.2%	6
Niger	0.6%	3
Nigeria	0.8%	4
Niue	0.0%	0
Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)	1.4%	7
Pakistan	1.2%	6
Palau	0.0%	0
Panama	0.0%	0
Papua New Guinea	0.2%	1
Paraguay	1.7%	9
Peru	1.0%	5
Philippines	0.8%	4
Republic of Congo	1.5%	8
Republic of Marshall Islands	0.0%	0
Rwanda	0.6%	3
Samoa	0.0%	0
Sao Tome and Principe	0.2%	1
Saudi Arabia	0.4%	2
Senegal	0.2%	1
Serbia	1.2%	6
Seychelles	0.2%	1
Sierra Leone	0.0%	0
Solomon Islands	0.0%	0
Somalia	0.6%	3
South Africa	0.0%	0
South Sudan	0.0%	0
Sri Lanka	2.7%	14
Sudan	1.4%	7
Suriname	0.0%	0
Swaziland	0.2%	1
Syria	0.0%	0
Tajikistan	0.8%	4
Tanzania	0.6%	3
Thailand	2.1%	11

Timor Leste	0.0%	0
Togo	0.4%	2
Tokelau	0.0%	0
Tonga	0.0%	0
Trinidad & Tobago	0.4%	2
Tunisia	1.0%	5
Turkey	1.2%	6
Turkmenistan	0.0%	0
Tuvalu	0.0%	0
UAE	0.0%	0
Uganda	0.4%	2
Ukraine	1.2%	6
Uruguay	1.4%	7
Uzbekistan	0.6%	3
Vanuatu	0.2%	1
Venezuela	1.5%	8
Vietnam	2.1%	11
Yemen	1.0%	5
Zambia	0.6%	3
Zimbabwe	0.8%	4
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>518</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

<b>4. Income group of countries (RCs only)<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Low income country (19 LIC)	24.4%	19
Lower Middle income country ( 32 LMIC)	41.0%	32
Upper Middle income country (22 UMIC)	28.2%	22
High Income Country (5 countries)	6.4%	5
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>78</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

<b>5. Is the country classed as a Least-Developed Country (LDC)? – RCs only</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>

<sup>1</sup> The respondents were not asked questions 4 to 8; this data was generated separately.

Yes (23 countries)	29.5%	23
No (55 countries)	70.5%	55
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>78</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

## 6. Is the country classed as a Small Island Developing Country (SIDS)? – RCs only

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes (4 countries)	5.1%	4
No (74 countries)	94.9%	74
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>78</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

## 7. Integrated Mission (IM) in the country

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes (5 countries)	6.4%	5
No (73 countries)	93.6%	73
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>78</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

## 8. Humanitarian Coordinator in the country

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes (20 countries)	25.6%	20
No (58 countries)	74.4%	58
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>78</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>0</b>

**9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Much more coherent	25.7%	131
Somewhat more coherent	44.7%	228
About the same	11.2%	57
Somewhat less coherent	2.0%	10
Much less coherent	0.8%	4
Don't know	15.7%	80
Please provide any additional comments		119
<i>answered question</i>		<b>510</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>8</b>

**9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -Only RCs responses**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Much more coherent	45.3%	34
Somewhat more coherent	44.0%	33
About the same	4.0%	3
Somewhat less coherent	1.3%	1
Much less coherent	0.0%	0
Don't know	5.3%	4
Please provide any additional comments		15
<i>answered question</i>		<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>3</b>

**9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries**

	DaO pilot or self-	Not a DaO pilot or self-starter
--	--------------------	---------------------------------

	<b>starter</b>	
Much more coherent	61	70
Somewhat more coherent	51	177
About the same	12	45
Somewhat less coherent	2	8
Much less coherent	3	1
Don't know	16	64
Please provide any additional comments		119
<i>answered question</i>		<b>510</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>8</b>

**9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? – by entities**

	Much more coherent	Somewhat more coherent	About the same	Somewhat less coherent	Much less coherent	Total
<b>RC, accredited to Government (71)</b>	34	33	3	1	0	71
<b>UNDP other than RC (38)</b>	8	27	2	1	0	38
<b>UNICEF (35)</b>	8	15	9	1	2	35
<b>WHO (59)</b>	21	28	8	2	0	59
<b>UNFPA (29)</b>	10	16	3	0	0	29
<b>FAO (19)</b>	3	9	7	0	0	19
<b>UNESCO (18)</b>	4	11	3	0	0	18
<b>UNHCR (12)</b>	0	8	3	1	0	12
<b>UNAIDS (24)</b>	8	12	3	0	1	24
<b>ILO (11)</b>	8	2	1	0	0	11
<b>WFP (15)</b>	3	9	2	1	0	15
<b>UNIFEM/UN WOMEN (14)</b>	5	9	0	0	0	14
<b>IOM (14)</b>	6	6	2	0	0	14
<b>UNIDO (11)</b>	2	9	0	0	0	11
<b>UNODC (5)</b>	1	3	1	0	0	5
<b>OHCHR (8)</b>	0	6	2	0	0	8
<b>UN-HABITAT (6)</b>	2	2	0	1	1	6
<b>UNEP (2)</b>	1	1	0	0	0	2

<b>IFAD (1)</b>	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>UN-OCHA (3)</b>	1	2	0	0	0	3
						395

**9. In your country of assignment, how coherent would you say the UN development system is now compared to four years ago? -RCs responses by Country Income groups**

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>Much more coherent</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>45.3%</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Somewhat more coherent</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>44.0%</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>About the same</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Somewhat less coherent</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Much less coherent</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Don't know</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Please provide any additional comments</b>						<b>15</b>
<i>answered question</i>						<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>						<b>3</b>

**Comments:**

Indicators for greater coherence include: Well functioning UNDAF Theme Groups, a unified reporting system to the government, a unified system for M&E and results reporting
The first UNDAF Action Plan will be implemented from 2012 on wards and will provide a great opportunity to test the ability and commitment of the UN development system to work more coherently and will replace CPAPs of UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA
[Country] did not have a Resident Coordinator until July 2010, so UN agencies have been accustomed to working independently. My arrival as RC has helped to bring the team together, but a stronger Government commitment would also help.
The UNDAF exercise of 2010-2011 contributed to enhance UN coherence
Lack of full ownership and commitment by the participating agencies in terms of rigidly maintaining their vertical structural, procedural, programming and reporting requirements aggravated lack of coherence among the agencies at HQ level
The strategic direction of the UNPDF serves as a guide to most agencies.

The humanitarian support and process of new UNDAF development help the UNCT to work together.
We have moved into implementation phase of the UNDAF and therefore no longer have so many inter-agency meetings as two years ago. Also, with all [country] Trust Fund money now disbursed, there is less incentive for agencies to work together.
In the past there was not UNDAF, no joint programmes. The coordination structures are well functioning.
Please note I have only been here for one year.
One can see that efforts are being made to achieve coherency but I am not sure if the UNCT pays much attention to the coherency drum beat if they think that their Agency interests may be affected which is natural.
We have a new UNDAF for the period 2013-2017 which is a much improved version of the previous one. We have also developed a UN Transitional Framework as the strategic planning document that outlines the DPKO mission and the UNCT's common vision for the country.
Formulating a strategic framework helped in enhancing coherence
I have less than 2 years in the country
Based on feedback received from UN colleagues
I cannot compare because I just arrived in Armenia
I was not here 4 years ago. Since I arrived more than 2 years ago, the focus has been mostly on humanitarian assistance and crisis management
I don't know because I'm member of the UN for two years only.
No doubt UN is better recognize by the GoC as a key player
I was not in Yemen 4 years ago. Cannot compare situation with previous posting either, as it was a DaO country - Albania
I am here for less than 3 years, so can't compare
Having started operations recently, we can not compare with the past.
I am serving in the Organization since 2010
More can be done, but we are moving in the right direction
Because of the leadership of the RC, not necessarily to the agencies. The UNCT is expanding with new programmes that tend to behave like agencies adding complexity in the efforts of streamlining and speaking with one voice
Member just starting 2011
Increasing number of UN entities are engaging in Yemen; DPA and OHCHR being the most important ones in the last 2 years. Unfortunately, the UN has never managed to discuss a coherent strategic presence. And that is unfortunate as Yemen is one of these countries where the UN, pulling all its elements together, could prove how critical the organisation can be.
UN Team seems to have more members who are strong advocates for UN coherence.
I have joined UN system since two years
Need to focus more on UN Coordination especially in areas where more than one UN Agency is addressing with the same Ministry
I began in March 2011
Recruited in 2010 ;
Strong new results-based UNDAF, but still competition on resource mobilization



I arrived in Uruguay 2 years ago, so the answers related to that topic are based on reports from my predecessor and comments from UNCT member and PAHO local staff.
Newly arrived, no knowledge on the past 4 years
I have been in the country for less than one year
The UNCT has only met for only couple of times over three years I served in [country]. Although there is lots of opportunity in [country] for UN system collaborative efforts for both RAs and NRAs
Improved communication and information sharing
I have been in Gabon for 20 months
I only assumed duties in Guyana 2.5 years ago so I don't know what the situation was like 4 years ago.
Have only been 6 months in duty station
I was not in the country four year ago
No cohesion, no real common goal
Arrived in 2011, thus unable to compare with 4 years ago.
Can still be improved upon.
Confusion between UNDAF, one UN and joint programming...although [country] is not a pilot country much more push for one UN and poorly drafted joint programme while UNDAF evaluation not complete... increase of thematic groups to address UNDAF thematic groups and joint programme thematic groups
No progress made over last 2 years, which is equal to regressing
A new RC is in, the previous made a mess, and that has created a lot of confusion on how the Government sees the UN as a whole. Not major problems with agency to Government cooperation.
Have been in the country only 4 months so do not have the information
La situation de crise post-électorale n'a pas facilité une progression notable <b>Post electoral crisis situation did not facilitate noticeable progress</b>
Aunque yo no estaba en el país de destino hace 4 años, hay comentarios generalizados sobre la mayor coherencia del Programa actual. <b>Even if I was not in the country four years ago, you will find general comments on the general coherence of the current programme.</b>
New generation of UNCT members, more committed to UN Reform and working together.
the lack of a country owned plan is a major challenge
I don't know since I assumed my position two years ago
I have been here 2 years. More coherence between some agencies despite the lack of leadership from the current and the past RCs. Current RC seems to want to create disunity between agencies.
Have only been in post 3 months
My assignment started ten months ago and I have no basis to answer this question.
More joint programming Better coordination and sharing amongst agencies
I'm just involved with the UNCT for two years and a half.
First UNDAF (2011-14), and fully aligned with Government's NDP
A broader and more strategic CAP was formulated in a very participatory manner.

Although I joined the duty station last year, I believe the UN development system has made some advancement but still about the same in terms of coherence compared with four years ago.
I am recently appointed in the country (19 months)
For the year and half being here it's improving a lot
There is somewhat increased interaction between some agencies – and much better joint feedback on Govt docs, EU and HR instruments. Having a collaborative HR adviser has been helpful in this regard.
I have been here for three years now virtually with the same UNCT. There have been major challenges that threatened to tear the team apart. However with the arrival of a new RC, signs are the team is likely to be more coherent. The Acting RC who took on the mantle for over six months before the arrival of the substantive RC also did a very good job. So yes we are on the way to coherency.
I have only been in my country of assignment for 4 months so cannot comment
My assignment started 07/10
I have only been in post for 10 months and thus comments are based on observations made by my predecessor and colleagues
Been here only for two and half years
I have only been assigned here for one year
Only last year joined the UNCT
Though I was not stationed here 4 years ago, from all accounts the system is definitely more coherent and coordinated than previously.
I have only been working in the UN for 3 1/2 years so I am not in a position to make a comparison to four years ago. However, as a national I have worked closely with several UN Organization for 19 years in various capacities and it is my belief that the UN System in Belize seem to be more coherent now than four years ago
Just arrived
Arrived 4 months ago. What should I use to compare...documents, comments and experience from other colleagues?
The situation has become competitive rather than complimentary
I was assigned to this country only one year ago
I arrived a year ago
New UNDAF began in 2012; old one was really outdated and not used, particularly following revolution and emergency in 2010.
Although I have been here for only a year, I have seen and contributed to the efforts to make the UN development system more coherent.
Have only been in duty station for less than the 4 years
Our 41 One UN Programme "outputs" will soon have joint-UN AWP's, meaning all our actions will turn into Joint Programmes in a more natural manner than funding-driven Joint Programmes of the past (e.g., HSTF, MDGF).
I have been in the country less than 2 years.
We need to move from rhetoric to real action with flag flying
Have been in post for 1 year only therefore cannot compare with 4 years ago
Arrived in this Duty Station 5 weeks ago
Arrived 09/2011 but compared to previous posting, this system is somewhat more

coherent
Situation is not comparable after the armed conflict and regime change in Libya
Country context emerging from conflict forced a degree of change.
not in duty station 4 years ago
I only serve here since last year, so cannot compare
Hard to say as 4 years ago the UN system was heavily engaged in emergency humanitarian support to conflict affected areas. The context has changed greatly in the past 2 years.
Only arrived 7 months before, have limited visibility on this point
I was assigned November 2011
1) UN Joint Presence Offices; 2) One UN Fund in Kiribati; 3) More strategic implementation of UNDAF with clear annual reviews/plans and MTR; 4) Effective joint programmes and joint programming.
I was not here in 4 yrs ago, but what I heard from colleagues, it was much less coherent.
Improved programme coordination and communication
Increase UN synergies and information sharing
I have started only 3 weeks ago and cannot reply.
Assumed the post just 2 years ago
Only assigned to Pakistan 4 months ago
Efforts have been made, but there is resistance.
Although a new member of the UNCT, the feedback from government and donors is a more coherent UN system working in a more coordinated manner within the framework of established institutional framework for DAO
Can't comment - I was not here 4 years ago
Not much has changed
I was not in the country four years ago
I have been posted in my current duty station for just over 2 years
I was not in-country 4 years ago!
I arrived two years ago and I do not find the UN development system here coherent
L'esprit et le mécanisme du One UN se développent et en particulier grâce à l'UNDAF. Cependant la crise qui a duré 3 ans à Madagascar et continue jusqu'à maintenant n'a permis de développer que les projets humanitaires et d'urgence
<b>One UN spirit and mechanism are being developed, particularly thanks to the UNDAF. However, the ongoing crisis that started three years ago in Madagascar has only allowed implementing humanitarian and emergency projects.</b>
I was not in the country four years ago
Gender and health UN interventions are being a bit harmonized
A lot of effort went into putting together the UNDAF 2013-17 document with broad and extensive consultation with key stakeholders. This in a way was drawing on lessons learnt from the mid term evaluation of the 2008-2012 UNDAF which existed on paper only. Hopefully the 2013-2017 UNDAF implementation will succeed.
No agency dropped a part of what it was planning to do anyway
I think we have reached maximum coherence
I was not on the job four years ago and hence cannot compare the level of coherence.

I was not in country four years ago
I have been here for one year only my comments are therefore limited to observations and understanding over the past year

**10. If the UN development system has become more coherent in the past four years, to which factors do you attribute this improvement?**

**Please rate the importance of each of the following measures in advancing UN coherence during this period:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Somewhat important</b>	<b>Slightly important</b>	<b>Not important at all</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Programming instruments and processes that are more streamlined and harmonized	155	161	73	15	404
The new Management and Accountability System for the Resident Coordinator system	106	175	88	30	399
Programme coordination groups that actively monitor UNDAF implementation	157	154	62	28	401
Establishment of joint funding modality (e.g. MDTF, One Fund)	115	111	86	79	391
Increased use of joint programmes	158	145	76	25	404
Agreement on joint resource mobilization strategy	80	136	108	65	389
Establishment of common premises	76	95	96	118	385
Establishment of harmonized business processes	82	131	112	63	388
The commitment of the Government	184	114	69	28	395

The leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator	260	110	25	8	403
An adequately resourced UN Resident Coordinator's Office	158	139	69	27	393
The adoption of a One-UN plan	101	107	87	86	381
The support received from DOCO	49	130	133	75	387
The support received from the UNDG regional team	47	120	154	69	390
The support received from donors	115	117	92	69	393
An improved spirit of cooperation in the UN country team	283	93	28	3	407
Please provide further detail on your responses above and add any other important reasons for improved UN coherence:					111
<b><i>answered question</i></b>					<b>418</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>					<b>100</b>

### Comments:

The Government pool encouraged us to act in coordination
The questions that are not answered are not applicable.
UN agencies, funds and programmes are taking coherence serious since the beginning of DaO pilots.
The reason of the items without answer is that they don't apply to the situation
- Enhanced Joint Programming; - Working in UNDAF Clusters, Joint Teams and joint initiatives, Responsibilities of lead Agencies, Coordination by RC/RCO.
Croatia does not receive much funding for anything, but the MDG-F, for example, was a powerful incentive to work IN PARALLEL if not exactly together. More resources for coordination would be helpful as a catalyst for joint action.
The accountability of entire system included in RCS needs to be fleshed out in measureable indicators
The single most important factor that will increase coherence is the interest and commitment that UNCT members will have to work together. Otherwise neither HQ instruction nor any programming tools will make a difference. Where there is interest to work together and not compete it will happen - and has happened.
At the country level it is very much possible to create a truly motivated team effort but this is hampered because of lack of coherence among the UN system at corporate level which tends to somehow entail agency specific focus. There is little if any support from DOCO or RTs to strengthen the RC system beyond rhetoric.

Agreeing on one voice and establishing joint communication platforms such as UN website and UN newsletter also contributed to greater coherence.
Some of the factors are marked low due to their lack of resources. If they had been better resourced they would have been highly important (e.g. DOCO)
The above ratings do not mean that all of the above factors have been consistently and continuously achieved over the last 4 years; there are fluctuations, for example the sharp decline in the financial resources provided by DOCO do not make them less important as a coherence enabler.
There is one case missing N-A as we don't have a lot of the instruments that are in the list here.
The humanitarian work and a very challenging operating environment also require collective action and work. Moreover, the coordination matters have also been operational at field level with one UN staff acting as UN Focal Point and leading in all interagency matters at that level.
Responses marked as "not important at all" indicate that they are not applicable to the [country] case. Government commitment is rate as slightly important, as in the [country] case there is little opportunity for coherent development planning by government.
The joint programme on Gender enhancement and Women Empowerment serves as a good example of the coherence brought by the women working together.
Although RC Office tries to cost share locally, strengthened HQ support is required to resource the UN RC Office adequately
The strengthened leadership of the RC together with more UNCT determination and commitment to work in a more cohesive way so as to support national development priorities
No support is received from DOCO with regard to UN Reform or steps forward in delivering as one. As a self starter country that has been implementing elements of UN reform for some time it is the instruments and agreements for increased coherence developed at the country level an the good will of the UNCT that has made the difference. This WOULD NOT IT BE POSSIBLE, without the facilitation by the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator, or the in country UN coordination team.
UNCT & RC setting ambitious targets on working together, including details on values, principles and division of labour
I found that all the matters listed above deserved to be marked Very Important but I marked them according to what the situation is in our CO Team. For example, the Government in our country shows unquestioned goodwill towards the UN but finds it difficult to provide clear and consistent coordinated support. The team recognize me as the RC and we work well together but that does not mean that I can always convince them to act as One UN; they do so only when it is convenient ! I find the Regional teams thrive on gossip and eye-service and make judgements without having the full information.
There is virtually no support from DOCO anymore for increased coherence. Country teams need to make it work on their own but insufficient and unpredictable UNCT/RCO funding, which is critically important for taking initiatives for increased coherence, is a major constraint to achieving results including the pace at which greater coherence can be achieved.

KSA is an NCC country
There has been reasonable Government commitment to UN coherence, but there has been insufficient clarity by Government on development priorities, fragmentation among government ministries, a weak results culture and accountability structures, and a reluctance to work with civil society, all of which generate a less than optimal environment for "UN coherence".
Ref: resourcing of RCO is insufficient
Cannot compare
Commitment of all agencies in a UNCT
The above checks are to reflect elements that would have contributed to greater coherence. The question is posed assuming that there has been coherence even though I have responded that there has been little progress.
All member of UNCT team did a great job in all items.
The dramatic earthquake of Jan 2010 has united the UNCT behind the daunting task of humanitarian relief and recovery. While some discrepancies persist in approaches, the magnitude of the task has required a coherence of purpose and joint action, including the cluster set up
Recognition & utilization of specialized agency capacities
Cost Sharing UNDP-NRA for thematic DaO focal points
Join initiatives which articulate agencies mandate are very important as well as a common un view promoted within the UNCT
The most important factor has been the UNCT's decision to actively engage in partnerships outside the UN, especially in government-led programme based approaches.
I do not know.
Joint funds or programmes are counterproductive unless there is an harmonized set of rules and processes or we choose a single management agent
N/A
UN in Sudan programming was coherent because of the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and Darfur Humanitarian Emergency.
I indicated what would be important to improve the situation
The adoption of One UN Plan in the country makes all above-indicated measures "very important" in advancing UN coherence.
Over the past three years there has been a real attempt by the two RCs to foster a spirit of one UN but there still remains the issue of collaboration on issues which all agencies are working on with the same sector. There is now a new RC and already there is discussion on coordination and advocacy from the level of the UNRC which is a very good sign for this year and within the context of the new UNDAF
I began in March 2011
There is a need to better engage the donor community globally on the added value and merits of the UN system coordination approach to overall aid effectiveness in country. A case in point is the proposal by donors to rotate on an annual basis the co-chairmanship of the development partners' forum among heads of UN agencies, without due consideration for the recognized role of the RC.
A letter of commitment was signed by all UNCT members. All problems arising from common work are openly and frankly discussed, thus enabling the team to reach

consensus.
Donor pressure on UN to collaborate is not matched by adequate support in resource mobilization
[Agency] does not participate in the DaO Coherence Fund in [country]. There are no harmonized business processes among the agencies. We still have duplication
NOT APPLICABLE
It became less coherent.
Although the funding of the RC office is essential to ensure coherence of UN development system, actual financing during the reviewed period was not adequate.
Harmonized business processes would be important if these were fully harmonized
No comparison with four years ago possible
Reduced resources improve cooperation
MDG Fund joint programmes allowed for effective coordinated action among several agencies; new government committed to reparation of victims of internal conflict announced during UN SG visit to country provided important thrust for UN system actions to work in support of this major human rights goal.
These still need some improvement.
UNCT seeking cohesion to get government funding in adopting all possible avenues leaving behind programme rationale and coherence
Lack of progress is mainly due to individuals and individual agencies opposed to change due to fear of loss of visibility, importance and fear of enhanced accountability
Previous RC emphasized joint programmes and there were several in our country, which forced agencies to collaborate. This set a foundation for collaborative work. The new RC is more inclined to foster jointness of UN positioning over joint programming.
"Not important at all" option was used in the absence of the "not relevant" one
Some of the above issues e.g., harmonized programming processes and new programming instruments would have been extremely important should they have been in place. As they were not - or insufficiently so - I indicated not important while the correct answer should have been "not applicable". Much more effort on the two aspects would have been needed. Similarly the government did not push the UN agenda. Should they have done so, it would of course have been an additional motivation and push for the UNCT to accelerate the coordination and coherence agenda.
Answering this, as if we the UNCT and the entire UN is going to improve coherence and hence then, what elements would be good.
N/A as coherence has not changed
The RC coordinator system and emphasis on the Joint Programme have been key to the increased coherence of the UN in Uganda
I filled in this question based on my two years experience
Some (not all) agencies want to work together - it simply comes down to individuals.
The willingness of the UNCT members to work together and explore new avenues is quite decisive
Some things could have worked better if leadership would have been more coherent and there was a strong resource mobilization strategy
It is not clear whether the question refers to the country or not.
The UN Country Team in my country has now been focusing more on "substance" rather than "mechanisms" and "processes". It is now becoming more "strategic" in



terms of selecting those areas that make coordination inevitable for achieving results and not trying to cover "everything under the sun".
The coherence of the UN system is still limited to the development of an UNDAF, establishment of a number of coordination bodies, and limited joint programmes. The Common Premises accommodated a good number of agencies. Common businesses and services are limited.
When referring to 'support received', we presume this is technical support (and not financial support). The financial support from DOCO for the RCs office is extremely important, but the technical support has not been important.
No experience of one fund
Perhaps most important: the local government is "forcing" upon UNCT more coherence and joint delivery. It seems to me that the quality of coherence increases in direct proportion to the pressure applied by host governments.
In a small country team good will between individuals, recognition of the value of working together on certain topics - limited to a few agencies in each case who have related mandates in that area - is what makes a difference for both coherence and results. This does not require, not is it in our case built on, RC leadership, but rather shared leadership and empowerment of the CT members, as well as having admin support sometimes from the RCO.
See comment 4
The commitment of individuals in UNCT to making DaO work
I have served in both [DaO country] and in [DaO country] and obviously the factors weigh differently depending on country.
Though the recruitment of a UN Coordination Office has been very helpful, overall the UN RC's Office cannot be said to be "adequately resourced". Though there are program coordination groups (joint teams) since I've been here, they do not appear to have played a role in monitoring the previous UNDAF - this is a role that has been mandated for the current UNDAF, 2012-2016, so there should be significant improvement in that function. There have not been formal "joint programs" since my posting here, but there is significant collaboration at the technical level among agencies addressing the same issues.
Although in my previous response I indicated that I am unable to make a comparison the choices made above is based on my interaction with UN Organizations while I was at the Ministry and therefore, my selections are based only on my observations of external engagement.
Has become less coherent so didn't reply to the above
The question is poorly asked - if one does not feel it has become more coherent than it is not possible to answer in a correct fashion. Are we rating what has changed, what is important? Some of these measures are very important but have not be addressed in the country we are in.
One more factor, the positive and friendly relationship among UN country team members.
Our programming instruments from our respective Headquarters are not yet helpful for country level operations. We are told to harmonise and work together at country and yet our respective agencies still plan and report in our respective "silos" using different planning and reporting formats and cycles.

Development of new UNDAF was very crucial factor
The past UNDAF was a document confined to the shelf. The fact that we now have an UNDAF and an UNDAF Action Plan points to improvements. The signing of this document by the Government indicates its commitment as well. The UNRC leadership was adequate in the development of the UNDAF and the action plan. At any rate, the coherence appears to be moving in the right direction.
N/A
The key reason is the belief and wish of agencies to work together, but it very much depends on HOA
Improved cooperation being small resident agencies.
The insistence of the Government on better coordination is a paramount factor
Nothing to add at this time
Less coherent
More emphasis should be put on integrated joint programming and resource mobilisation
Donor support is of course important; however the impression is their support has generally fallen short
Clearer messages from UN HQs; however, this could still be stronger and better.
The answers above 'not important at all' does not mean that they are useless, but they are not utilized or in place here.
It is true that last 3 years UN System is improving slightly in a coherent way at least concerning internal mechanisms and also because we are implementing UNDAF process (2010-2015). Nevertheless, the image of a UN team still quite far of the efforts deployed by DOCO and UNGE. It gives the impression, here, that each UN agency is working by itself according with its programmes and priorities. There are few joint programmes between agencies. However, with a new UN Joint Programme (5 Agencies together) focused in Aral Sea (star in 2012) I hope it will be a kick off to undertake a real cooperation between us.
The RC/HC Peter Declercq (UNHCR) had a great understanding of the humanitarian context and allocated most of his time to the complexities related to the humanitarian interventions of the UN. By far most of the resources were actually allocated to these as well.
One UN voice echoed by various agencies
There is still fragmentation and difficulties to respond jointly
The leadership of the RC is the main thing that has made a difference. Other factors have not played any role in Ukraine.
The RC office is growing large and some time involved in programming of specific interventions like youth and gender rather than focusing on monitoring and coordination.
Leadership of the RC does not mean telling everyone what to do, it means working with and understanding the needs of all agencies and respecting the mandates and what they have to offer, and ensuring a very strong firewall between RC and UNDP (the new M+A system for RCs does not address this sufficiently)
No responses because I don't know how it was 4 years ago, but coherence and joint programming still leaves much to be desired!
L'amélioration de la cohérence des SNU est surtout du au renforcement de la

coordination et le suivi et évaluation des activités. La mobilisation commune de fonds et l'établissement des programmes conjoints n'ont pas encore été opérationnels en 2010 et 2011
<b>Coherence improvement of the SNU is mostly due to coordination, monitoring and evaluation strengthening. Joint resource mobilisation and the development of joint programmes were not yet operational in 2010 and 2011.</b>
Most of these tools still do not exist. I based my indication on presumption
The opened spirit of UNCT members to put their effort in working together but also the new mandate given to UNWOMEN with regards to coordination of gender issues within the UN.
Strong government commitment to DaO at the highest levels
Commitment to UN shared values
As I just arrived and the office only opened mid last year I can not provide feed-back
N/A
The resources received through DOCO during the past year have not been adequate for the functions expected of the UNRC's office
Adequately resourced UNRC office very important, but NOT A REALITY, therefore rated lower importance above

**11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	31.7%	161
Somewhat agree	48.4%	246
Somewhat disagree	11.0%	56
Strongly disagree	2.6%	13
Don't know	3.9%	20
Not applicable	2.4%	12
Please provide any additional comments		97
<i>answered question</i>		<b>508</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>10</b>

<b>11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. - Ranked by top UN entities</b>				
	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
<b>RC, accredited to Government (73)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNDP other than RC (39)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNICEF (41)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>WHO (60)</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNFPA (32)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>FAO (26)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>UNESCO (18)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>UNHCR (14)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNAIDS (28)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ILO (12)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>WFP (17)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNIFEM/UNWOMEN (16)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>IOM (18)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>UNIDO (15)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>UNODC (6)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>OHCHR (8)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

UN-HABITAT (8)	4	2	2	0
UNEP (2)	1	1	0	0
IFAD (2)	1	1	0	0
UN-OCHA (3)	1	2	0	0

**11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. – RCs responses by Country Income groups**

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	15	18	14	2	64.5%	49
Somewhat agree	2	12	6	2	28.9%	22
Somewhat disagree	0	1	0	0	1.3%	1
Strongly disagree	0	1	0	0	1.3%	1
Don't know	1	0	1	0	2.6%	2
Not applicable	0	0	0	1	1.3%	1
Please provide any additional comments						19
<i>answered question</i>						76
<i>skipped question</i>						2

**11. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped the UN to achieve better results than if each UN agency had planned its support to the country separately. – DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries**

	DaO pilot or self-starter	Not a DaO or self-starter
Strongly agree	41%	28%
Somewhat agree	45%	50%

<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Don't know</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>
	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Comments:

Since most of the focus over the past few years has been on humanitarian work, UNDAF remained in the background. Nevertheless, UNDAF allowed for a greater coherence and therefore focussed attention on results.
It is a clumsy tool to manage that straightforward and laudable aim
The programme results achieved today would also have otherwise been achieved. There is more information exchange, including of information that is not useful
UNDAF has not helped to achieve a joint strategy and coordinated action
The mid-term evaluation of the 2008-12 UNDAF concluded largely that implementation was very poor.
Our individual plans are somehow based on UNDAF
The political situation in Madagascar did not allow the agencies to work according to the UNDAF which was changed into a strategic vision then re-changed into a UNDAF interim 2012-2013.....As a result the coordination between agencies took place with joint funding programme.
Les résultats escomptés communément définis ne sont pas toujours le résultat d'activités contributives des agences préalablement mis en commun <b>The jointly defined expected targeted results are not always the result of activities previously put together/undertaken by contributing agencies</b>
Far too general, not strategic enough, it is a list of activities agencies are engaged in.
WFP is only embarking on development programmes as from 2012, hence too soon to tell
It also comes down to working relationships, respect and trust between agencies and what each has to offer on a specific issue/programme
UNDAF forces all parties to sit together, plan and review. It doesn't always make a difference but it at least brings everyone to the table.
In contrary we continue to compete for individual agency funding
The UNDAF provides a useful focus, but not necessarily more coherent, data-driven programming. There is a tendency for agencies to flag engagement in an UNDAF pillar w/o the agency necessarily having the resources or capacity to deliver
What really counts is the willingness of agencies to work together and pursue concrete (funding) opportunities--UNDAs are, in my view, time consuming planning efforts -- with frameworks which too often remain at the stage of plans...
It is helping to expand to multisectoral response
The UNDAF had very little to do with whatever positive HUMANITARIAN results were achieved. As said earlier, by far the greatest focus (and funding) was on the humanitarian front.
Very little buy-in on UNDAF from government, joint programming more important

The UNDAF prepared in 2007/2008 and its process did not seem to have based on strong 'joint planning/joint programming' at the time, as I have seen in other countries.
However, there is still an apparent, though somewhat diminished, hiatus between so-called specialized agencies and the ExCom agencies. This should be addressed.
UNDAF planning has become a bureaucratic process of its own, still too often duplicating individual agency work.
There is no firm joint programming in the UNDAF, but a compilation of programmes. however, the exercise is done jointly and with a great amount of consultation, which increase the knowledge of what each agency will be doing, and the possibility for linkages and integration
Development of the new cycle of UNDAF has created space for better synergy and achieving higher result
Not in duty station when current UNDAF developed
Not treated equally by agencies as a planning tool to this effect and outcome.
There is not a strong monitoring mechanism so performance is hard to verify. In addition the majority of the UN's work is in humanitarian operations.
Some agencies like UNICEF for example simply continues to go ahead with their programme without much wish to coordinate
The UNDAF was confined to the shelf. So it is hard to agree or disagree.
It now has to be matched with clear implementation guidelines and strong M&E
UNDAF has not been used at all.
Not everything done by specialised agencies can be included into the UNDAF. The UNDAF and UNDAF are more useful for the Funds and Programmes in short the Ex-Com Agencies.
I would say in general, I think the UNDAF was not really used in Sudan as a tool
This is true. But for some agencies, UNDAF outcomes are just a small component of the overall work of the agencies.
WHO planning process is not harmonized with UNDAF
Although it should, the current country UNDAF did have very little comparative advantage in working together, the new UNDAF is under finalization
At outcome level yes, at output level not sure
I said somewhat agreed, because while the UNDAF has played a key role in improving the UN coherence, often times it is not seen as a country document but a UN document and there is no ownership demonstrated at the highest political level although signed by the Government. At UNFPA all technical support request made by the Government and Civil Society must demonstrate the linkages to the UNDAF and the CPAP
The previous UNDAF did not seem to be a strong frame of reference for agencies; the new one will be more so. Additionally, there are areas where joint programs are impractical, because of the varying mandates of the agencies, especially specialized agencies such as WHO and FAO.
UNSF 2011-2015 implementation on progress and shows promising results
Yet to be seen.
Mozambique's One Plan only started on 1 January 2012 so it is too early to say how helpful it is towards achieving results
All fund, programme or agency mandates and operational programming will always fit into the overarching UNDAF whether by design or not as the UNDAF has very broad

outcomes to be achieved during its lifetime
Agencies work separately with very little work together no joint program in a country where budgets are microscopic and agencies few.
The framework is a good tool but is hardly referred to by most agencies.
The UNDAF is valuable in aiding joint reporting on results but does not lead per se to increased synergies or better results. Its also important underline that some agencies carry on doing whatever they are able to raise funds for: programming is not limited to the UNDAF content. The M&A framework could be helpful but it's not properly applied - particularly the firewall. In this sense the RC system ends up providing a clear fundraising, visibility and high level of government contact advantage to UNDP at the expense of the rest of the UNCT
We want and need this to be true but are not there yet.
The experience is not long enough for the country to be systematic
The results of the UNDAF were greatly dictated by bigger agencies and not always were linked to country priorities.
We don't measure results
However, the process is way too heavy
I am just experiencing the new UNDAF which starts this year
Vertical AWP's and implementation at agency level still dominates.
The previous UNDAF (2007-2011) was a bit of compilation of the country programmes/activities of different organizations and "all over the place". The current one (2012-2016) consciously segregated areas where coordination is essential for delivering the intended results from those where agency-specific actions are enough. This is making the notion of coordination much more clear and "actionable".
Yes absolutely but many agencies went their own ways in any case.
The UNDAF should have basket fund to help achieving together common objectives for an increased impact
Yet to implement the current UNDAF
Agencies have used the UNDAF to put in their projects. UNDP has just carved out their programme areas.
Agencies still work on their own, despite the UNDAF
Available framework tools and processes are not effective enough to overcome resistance of individual agencies or HoA
UNDAF is being revised now while thematic groups and joint programme activities did not have good performance
This is still evolving.
This is true particularly after the government requested the UN system to review UNDAF and align it to the priorities of the 2010-2014 national development plan, providing more focussed direction.
UNDAF serves as an important instrument that brought together UN agencies, in contributions but also in dialogue.
There are still several different planning frameworks and instruments being used by the agencies, duplicating our workload to cope with all the planning requirements and timeframes
This enabled more solidarity among the Team and reduced flagging from individual agencies.



For example we have a joint UN program on HIV/aids based on UNDAF objectives
UNDAF brings UN staff together across agencies, UN agencies have still their own tools and requirements
A well prepared UNDAF is just one element, we need to give more attention to UN DAFs in the implementation stage (now much time dedicated to UNDAF design, much less to implementation)
So far it has not yielded in term of the results in DPRK context
The planning framework we have had here has been neither effective nor meaningful, and is little more than a list of what each individual agency does.
The planning framework is retroactive and therefore not pro-actively guiding the achievement of better results.
Results are enhanced much more by our strategic engagement in programme based approaches and in the government's own reforms.
The weight of UNDAF is not very important; the most important thing is the discussion of joint initiatives taking into account the country needs.
Plans are important but commitment is far more important
Very high transaction costs in preparation, implementation and monitoring
More should be done to involve the UN Stabilization Mission in the integrated process
The UNDAF is an important tool for the development of our job.
As long as there are no predictable resources for a 5 year UNDAF, the UNDAF remains a wish list/vision and is only as good as the individual or sometime joint efforts Made by agencies to secure the necessary resources.
In the case of Haiti, the UN system uses the ISF
Our strategic cooperation framework helped achieve better results
Based on my previous experience.
I strongly believe that the UNDAF at least gives us a semblance of unity and credibility and at best is the most effective and efficient way to work.
The UNDAF Barbados and the OECS 2008 to 2011 was a 'modified' framework, where the planned results continued to be largely agency-specific.
The quality of previous UNDAFs did not allow for explicit improvement. Although it is too early to tell (2 months into the new UNDAF), we believe the newly-adopted highly participatory drafting and follow-up will improve efficiency and effective achievement of results
We in Kenya do not have any empirical evidence to support this notion
The UNDAF priorities changed due to commencement of heavy war. The process of formulating the new UNDAF (2013-2017) is enormously helping for the UNCT to be working together in defining future priorities.
In Rwanda, the Common Operational Document (COD, One Programme) signed by Government and RC/UNCT was very instrumental in the implementation of the DaO reform process, as it outlines the operational aspect of the UNDAF in the spirit of Delivering as One.
Commitment is built through the process of producing the UNPDF
Of course, this needs to be evaluated for evidence-based analysis
We are pioneering UNDCS distinct from UNDAF which is strategic in its orientation, light in terms of process and lean in terms of volume. This is the 2nd year of implementation. If we manage to operationalize a robust M&E system, it will prove to

be a successful model as it allows agencies the leverage and flexibility to align their programme with the high level results and at the same time pursue their agency specific need-based/responsive activities to deal with the emerging development challenges. DOCO support is critical which unfortunately is not coming forth
However, only where such is backed by M&A framework and individual performance assessments at all levels so there is incentive to work with and through such a One Plan or One Programme
The impact of the UNDAF for the UN to achieve better results is minimal. Reasons are many including: a) many of the specialized agencies already had their country strategies/programmes approved before discussions on the UNDAF even started. So, their input to the UNDAF was to 'impose' to everyone else what their agency had already decided on with the government, leaving very little room to manoeuvre for everyone else; b) understanding of 'results' varies hugely between one agency to another and capacities to distil and plan for results is very low. Rather than 'results', agencies tend to focus on ensuring their key themes/topic/words are reflected in the document at all cost. However much you may try to strategize/prioritize or focus, the UNDAF seems to become a long list of what everyone is already doing or will do regardless of everyone.
Croatia does not have an UNDAF. But this is for the best, since enormous amounts of time can be wasted in "spending two years to plan five."
Further work is still required to ensure the UNDAF framework is utilized as the framework for UN planning replacing single agency frameworks. It will be important to ensure increased commitment of the UNDG members to have the UNDAF action plan replace country programme planning documents of specialized agencies, funds and programmes
Absolutely. The UNDAF has provided the overarching umbrella for support and has served as an instrument to bring thematic and cross-sectoral considerations under one joint platform.
More than the final document itself, the process has pooled together the UNCT
Resources are limited and in a country that is now MIC there will be an even greater constraint on resources so we need to work together.

**12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strong evidence	54.2%	274
Some evidence	39.7%	201
Little evidence	5.1%	26
No evidence	1.0%	5

Please provide any additional comments	78
<b><i>answered question</i></b>	<b>506</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>	<b>12</b>

**12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country? –RCs responses by Country Income groups**

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count
Strong evidence	14	20	13	5	68.4%	52
Some evidence	4	12	8	0	31.6%	24
Little evidence	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
No evidence	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Please provide any additional comments						12
<b><i>answered question</i></b>						<b>76</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>						<b>2</b>

**12. In your country of assignment, is there evidence that UN programmes are increasingly developed in response to the priorities identified by the recipient country? –DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries**

	DaO pilot or self-starter	Not a DaO pilot or selfstarter	DaO pilot or self-starter	Not a DaO pilot or selfstarter
Strong evidence	57%	53%	82	192
Some evidence	38%	40%	54	147
Little evidence	3%	6%	5	21
No evidence	1%	1%	2	3
	100%	100%	143	363

**Comments:**

Moving away from the humanitarian work, there is strong evidence that priorities identified by the Government form the basis of UN's work.
The current UNDAF under preparation is based on the IPRSP prepared and approved by the Government.
They always were, so no change
Also before DaO, UN agencies responded to national priorities. No change caused by DaO
Both UNDAFs are aligned to government priorities
The national strategy is one of our key reference documents
Despite the political situation, consultation with technicians of the ministries were maintained
La mise en oeuvre de l'enquête ménage en est un exemple <b>The household survey implementation is an example.</b>
Programmes were jointly developed by the UNCT under the leadership of the Nat. Government
There is good will on both parts to align the PRSP (DENARP II) with the UNDAF
Our programme are more donor driven, rather than taking country priorities
I view the UN as still too supply-driven and often ideologically stuck in certain development models (economic growth for example, which is a clear national objective, is not seriously pursued by the UN)
The Joint country steering committee co chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the RC has proved critical for this
Disaster Risk Management Joint Programme in Pakistan
Not yet.....the next UNDAF, in the making, is an opportunity. In the specific case of Sudan, government priorities may not be totally aligned with the priorities as these are perceived by the UN, development partners and the people of Sudan.
Difficult to say that our priorities (Programme and Budget) are matching as much we can say with those of the Government .Theoretically yes, but in the real life , Government can change in a roll-out perspective
One Plan is developed in line with Gov. Socio Economic Development Plan
UN programmes were always identified in response to priorities identified by recipient countries. It is the sine qua non of our work.
Many agencies are engaged extensively with government counterparts, and the new UNDAF takes into consideration the Sri Lanka development plan Mahindra Chintra vision
Humanitarian responses were based on the joint Govt and UN priorities, as for the new UNDAF it is mainly developed within government 10 year national development plan.
Not in duty station long enough to determine
Consultation has been strong and care taken to ensure that sensitive issues are not unduly censored.
Relations with the political government are fractious and lacking trust. But current UNDAF process includes govt participation and intention is to align results with the government plan where possible.
There is more openness by govt to discuss national challenges
All interventions under new UNDAF presumably directly respond to the priorities of

the 5 year plan (National Socio Econ Development Plan) of the country
Refer to various corporate evaluation results
The UN tends to respond to donor priorities as well and specific programmes are often developed in response to funding made available by donors.
Public pronouncement of Government officials of co-ownership of UNDAF as responding to country priorities
New UNDAF is in line with Govt medium term development plan.
Our UNDAF is based on the country's Growth and Development strategy, fully aligning with the country priorities according to our mandates and resources available.
For WHO, we work closely with the Ministry of Health and it is my assumption that other agencies do this as well. Of course, we are a complex emergency country and do not always agree on the priorities
Through the UNDAF development process.
Limited by the weaknesses in national strategic planning
Little advancement and full potential for join programming is not explored.
This was very evident in the development of the UNDAF 2012-2016, where the Government was a key partner in the process.
This depends of course on the fact that the recipient country needs to have a vision where to go (which in our case is not at all the case)
They have their national priorities well defined. The UN has no other choice (and it should be like this) than to program within the government priorities.
In both my previous and present duty station
The UN programmes through the UNDAF and Country Programmes are expected to respond to development needs as expressed in the National Development Plans
UN Programmes are not developed based on country priorities; rather they are developed based on the mandates of agencies.
UNDAF is related to the National Development Plan. However, it is difficult to measure the specific UNDAF contributions to the national priorities in clear terms.
Agreed with a proviso that (a) "recipient country" does not mean only the government but civil society actors; and (b) not to forget that the UN does have a normative role to play which may not always be always appreciated by certain segments of the concerned society.
There is an effort to respond to country priorities
Health and Education Sectors are responsive to Govt Plans
No direct observation
Areas of nutrition, social protection and DRR are clearly Government priorities where UN has added value.
The development of the new UNDAF will only be completed after the Government has published its latest development plan.
The new UNDAF 2014-2018 will definitely do
UNDAF review processes and mutual accountability are weak and Government is providing limited leadership
Some agencies programmes indeed but joint programme should be more focused and linked with UNDAF instead of new joint programmes adopted because of requests a high political levels in the hope of getting funding

The country is taking leadership in this area.
All FAO implemented Programmes are demand driven, requested by Government, thus responding to their priorities
The country changes its priorities constantly
Recent UNDAF preparation is going in this direction
Based on UNDAF just finalized
UNDAF= réponse collective et coordonnée des agences du SNU à la SRP. <b>UNDAF= collective and coordinated response of SNU agencies to SRP.</b>
Alignment of UNDAF to PRSP
UNDAF focus designed from the National development plan priorities
The One UN Plan is prepared in line with the national social economic development strategy (SEDS) and social economic development plan (SEDP)
ALL PROGRAMMES ARE DEVELOPED IN RESPONSE TO NATIONAL PRIORITIES, AM NOT AWARE OF ANY OTHER
UN programmes remain driven by mandates of agencies much more than by national priorities.
Need for a better coordination between local partners.
The UNDAF and agency country programmes respond directly to the National Strategic Development Plan.
The planning processes require to take into account national priorities
Given ongoing security issues, difficult to gauge recipient country priority identification process
In all programs of de UN, first identified all priorities before to do any action.
Again, the core of the problem is unclear national priorities (a fixation with “stability”) and insufficient dialogue between government and national development partners
This is a special country case. Consultations take place with the government but for various executive board restrictions the Government is not a signatory to the Strategic Framework.
Note the [country] is a fragile state where some UN Priorities such as governance, human rights, justice are not necessarily considered priorities by the host government
Because we waited for the Government to complete its National Priority document before completing the UNDAF we are so highly appreciated in country.
The UNDAF was developed with strong government involvement and at same time as National Development Plan was being written. Programmes are checked for coherence by a high level government Partnership Committee.
This can be discerned from the work of the medium term plan of the Vision 2030
The UN is seeking to respond to government priorities. But succession of governments and long periods of inter-regnum from one government to the next, makes this difficult
The UNDAF/COD is fully aligned to the national Vision 2020 and EDPRS, elaborated with the Government and signed by the Government. Joint planning and reviews are taking place with stakeholders and counterparts and the country also put in place a SWAP mechanism that further facilitates the UN's response to national priorities.
Full alignment with National Planning Cycle
UNDCS is full anchored in the vision and strategic planning documents of the government and process of its preparation was led, owned and directed by Government

The main problem is that the Govt has very little capacity to do strategic planning. For them, everything is priority. Combined with the fact that there is no coordination between government bodies, it is difficult to understand what really the priority is and with whom to work. There is a strong need to build that kind of capacity in the country before we can comfortably say that the UN is responding to the most important development needs identified by the recipient country.

The UNDAF action plan is aligned with the national development plan, but the alignment could have been improved if the national development plan had been taken as the starting point the UNDAF exercise had been seen as an opportunity for agencies to change their way of working and programming within the country. Instead some agencies tended to, to a too high degree, simply transfer existing programming into the UNDAF framework

### **13. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to strengthen the government's role in the overall coordination of UN activities in the country:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly agree	25.7%	130
Somewhat agree	48.3%	244
Somewhat disagree	14.1%	71
Strongly disagree	5.5%	28
Don't know	3.8%	19
Not applicable	2.6%	13
Please provide any additional comments		85
<i>answered question</i>		<b>505</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>13</b>

### **13. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to strengthen the government's role in the overall coordination of UN activities in the country. -DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries**

	<b>DaO pilot or self-starter</b>	<b>Not a DaO or self-starter</b>	<b>DaO pilot or selfstarter</b>	<b>Not a DaO pilot or selfstarter</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>58</b>

<b>disagree</b>				
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Don't know</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>361</b>

### Comments:

There was full participation of the Government in the whole process.
The establishment of an UNDAF Steering Committee through a recent Cabinet of Minister's resolution will provide the needed support for coordination, which did not previously exist.
The message from the Government has been to have a lighter consultation process leading up to the new UNDAF, as previous more comprehensive consultation processes, while ensuring strong government leadership, has been perceived by the government as too work and time intensive. The consultation process for the current UNDAF cycle, while closely involving the government, has therefore involved a decreased level of intensity and scope. However, all documents have been shared with and consulted on with the government, and sector level coordination has in many areas seen a strengthened involvement of the government.
Again, we do not have an UNDAF, but we consult often with the Government on its priorities.
Although they participate in the consultations and eventually sign the document, it is not a process or document that is embedded in their own development planning. As a result, once signed, the UNDAF is shelved. It is not something they refer to, they do not demonstrate responsibility for the results nor hold the UN accountable for their achievement.
This has more to do with a post Busan AE/DE agenda for where it is effective it is when a strong overall coordination capacity and motivation exists in govt lead to do so for ALL the donors, and the UN acts as One within such
There is a lack of interest on the part of the Government in MICs like [country] to play the coordination role which UN system in conjunction with EU and WB is assiduously trying.
Due to weakness of the central planning Ministry, Government has not fully leveraged the benefits of UNDAF as a coordination tool for UN activities. Much of the coordination still takes place at the Line Ministry level and coordination has improved at this level.
Early days yet but strong Government participation in planning
It is the UNPDF as well as the mechanisms and systems established for its joint management
The Common Operational Document (COD) outlines the operationalization of the UNDAF in the spirit of Delivering as One and the Government is signatory to this document. The Government also chairs the One UN Steering Committee.
The instrument remains process heavy and difficult for use as a tool or framework to secure/promote government ownership and coordination



We lack hard facts to respond to this question
A senior government official, ministerial level, co-Chairs both the UNDAF Steering Committee and the UNDAF Trust Fund Steering Committee
Greater coordination was achieved within the last two years in developing the new UNDAF 2012 to 2016.
Annual joint monitoring processes are the key which eliminate fragmented single UN agency dialogues throughout the year.
Lack of appropriation/commitment/interest from the government
It has indeed strengthened Government's ownership and participation.
Government leadership in the [country] remains weak
Given the country context, which is evolving, it was not possible to have the government take a leadership role. However, this has not diminished the onus for producing a consultative Strategic Framework.
Based on my previous experience
Yes, the UNDAF and the systematic steps taken in its preparation with Government have strengthened Government ownership of the UNDAF
Mixed: Government capacity weakened by the earthquake and subsequent political crises.
In sensitive areas ( e.g. anti-corruption) the UN must also encourage governments
The Government would prefer not to have to deal with the UN at all, and if it has to put up with the UN being present, it wants to control the UN. No planning frameworks will function effectively until there is a more conducive environment in which to work
The UNDAF helped strengthen to the Government's role.
Not yet, due to political instability the government has only now started to assert its leadership
Was not in-country when UNDAF developed
The [country] government is disorganized and plays a small role
Different parts of government are also working more together and recognize the importance of coming together horizontally
The UNDAF remains as a reference document; we are still guided by agency priorities that are influenced in turn by the government and country.
Lack of coordination between line ministries is a problem.
UNDAF is aligned to one planning tool of the Gov which is not applicable to all agencies
The government (some sectors) still needs to take ownership of the process
Government is more and more perceiving UNCT as "One"
UNDAF review exercises display a somehow surprisingly low level of government partners' interest and engagement.
Too early to say since the new UNDAF has been signed very recently. The old one did not strengthen government's role
Government involved and UN laying foundations for future ownership
Coordination role not yet effective
We did not carry out this exercise, only the RC initiated a non-participative drafting of a common country strategy guidelines that was not consulted with the government
UN contribution is small and government is providing little attention to UN processes

With a stronger UNDCS M&E framework having been developed and launched, the UNDCS (Turkey version of the UNDAF) will be very critical in supporting overall UN coordination
I had been involved in the first UNDAF for Iraq, the Government Partners were generally bewildered by the process/terminology
The UN has failed to use national coordination mechanisms or to put the UN's role in supporting coordination into UNDAF
Not possible to respond to this given that I have just joined the team
Why the Government should coordinate UN activities within the country?
At some levels increased efforts were made but not as coordinated and coherent as it should have been.
In the country I work, UN coordination is more of a matter of the UN agencies "getting their acts together" than the government taking a leading role in it.
Government is not interested in UNDAF
The Government got more confusion because of the often changing rules for partnership frameworks proposed by donors, including UN.
There was good participation of govt counterparts in developing our new PF. The coordination of UN activities however should happen as part of rather than separate from overall development partner coordination - in line with aid effectiveness principles and reducing transaction costs.
Government seems to be lukewarm towards the UN planning frameworks
Coordination of the government is not coherent; programming not well understood and civil servants only interested in getting per-diem in meetings organized by the UN.
Government not willing to take leadership
During the first year implementation of UNSF the government participation getting momentum
Though the Government participated strongly in the UNDAF development, it remains to be seen whether it will play as strong a role in UNDAF implementation and monitoring.
Just in the present UNDAF exercise the Governments seemed to take more ownership of the exercise. Nevertheless beside Planning Ministry most of the line Ministers are still not fully aware of the rationale of the exercise.
Limited by the limited participation of government in the process
Through the participation of the Government sector in the UNDAF development and implementation.
No evidence of this at all
Govt has not used the UNDAF at all.
This is an ongoing process and remains to be seen as the country begins to implement its new UNDAF starting 2012.
It is too early to comment on this.
Refer to various corporate evaluation results, especially where Govt views are quoted
Not in this case as UNDAF is coordinated by MOFFA which is having weak communications with sectoral ministries
Cannot say that the involvement of Govt in formulating new UNDAF was that strong
I have been in Khartoum only 3 months.

A balance is needed here as there are sensitive issues that should be pushed by an UNDAF that not all governments are happy about.
Not in duty station long enough to determine
The process has just started ...
Not really, although the UN has engaged with the GOSL extensively to finalise the UNDAF
The latest Annual Review is being conducted in coordination with the Government, but the Gov't coordination mechanism does not yet work as efficiently as it should.
UNDAF is not very important to government
I can say now, in the middle of UNDAF Process. A Steering Committee has been accepted by the Government to coordinate and make an assessment of inputs and outcomes. We must analyze the results at the end of this year 2012 when the Mid-term review of UNDAF comes out.
The DEVELOPMENT framework is not well aligned with the current HUMANITARIAN imperatives of Sudan. A flexible approach is required where both modalities are considered and where one can - ideally - navigate seamlessly between these in time and space depending upon the changing circumstances.
Devolution process after 18th Amendment of Constitution in 2011
Slowly developed and required trust between both parties.
There are no signs or evidence on stronger government's role
La période de crise politique vécue par le pays n'a pas permis de renforcer le rôle du GVT <b>The country political crisis period undermined strengthening the role of the Government.</b>
The Government has developed his own reporting tool to coordinate the assistance. Groups with extended developing partners exist. The UNDAF is a separate existence.
The Government is interested in partnerships with individual Agencies/Entities/Funds.
No evidence of coordination body (govt and UN) set up to oversee implementation of UNDAF
The work of UN agencies is primarily with line ministries, not with the government department of donor coordination. Coordination must be around specific national policy issues, not just "of UN activities"
The UNDAF is more an impediment to intelligent conversation than a conversation starter
Again, moving away from the humanitarian work, there is increasing evidence of Government assuming a greater role in coordinating UN activities.

### 14. The UNDAF or another UN planning framework has helped to increase the participation of civil society in the work of the UN in the country:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	8.8%	45
Somewhat agree	43.4%	222
Somewhat disagree	27.5%	141
Strongly disagree	8.4%	43
Don't know	8.2%	42
Not applicable	3.7%	19
Please provide any additional comments		75
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>512</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>6</b>

#### Comments:

Civil society can work with UN in the country only through the Government
There is an absence of a functioning independent civil society in the country. Through the work of the UN Country Team we are working with a number of community based organizations, local councils and government organized NGOs.
Civil society is included as partner across outcomes. Efforts are planned to ensure closer engagement and partnership between the UN and civil society
Again, we do not have an UNDAF, but we work extensively with civil society.
There is a conscious focus on strengthening CSO participation
The UNDAF mid-term review pointed out the need to increase collaboration with the CSO; but not much has happened since. UNCT recently decided to establish a CSO task force to look into this and see how it can be implemented.
We remain weak on this front, and it is more at the UN Joint Programme and One Voice level that the interaction and engagement with civil society gets more firmly rooted. we need to look at multiple instruments for such and not try and hang everything that must happen on an UNDAF or One Plan
The implementation of the planning framework is inclusive and people-centred; the civil society should have been more intensely engaged at the design stage also.
Strong UN -CSAC participated in UNDAF development and is represented on its implementation management committee
We still need to work hard on this.
Delivering as One supported the continued advocacy for increased CSOs representation in relevant groups and committees. The planning framework also helped to strengthen the cooperation between the One UN and CSOs.
The Government view on civil society is critical and hence UNDAF ownership by civil society would have a huge cost of Government disowning it.
We lack the information

There was CSO participation in UNDAF development and the UN has many CSO partners. However, due to security situation in Iraq, partnering with CSOs is difficult at the strategic level.
We have formed 5 "Outcome Groups" to assure follow-up of the UNDAF results. Each of these groups is very participatory, both in terms of relevant agencies, Government officials, donors and NGOs. Although a significant number of NGOs are currently members of these "Outcome Groups", they are not yet at present sufficiently representative of the civil society in the country.
There is also much greater scope for involvement during implementation of the UNDAF 2012 to 2016.
In the country we work CSO are weakened and even though we always include them their capacities are awfully weakened.
The civil society in the DRC is insufficiently organized to be able to articulate a vision for the DRC. In addition, the weak substantive and operational capacities of the civil society require dedicated support before it can effectively participate in the implementation of UN programmes/projects
Due to the country situation, adequate consultation could not take place. But this is an evolving country context and consultations with civil society are envisaged in the implementation stage.
Based on my previous experience
In Egypt, instead of Common Country Assessment (CCA), the UN RC brokered an agreement between Government and development partners (inc. UNS) to support a team of Egyptian social scientists to prepare the study "Situation Analysis: Key Development Challenges Facing Egypt". This study was based on government documents and a wide variety of studies provided by national and international development partners (including the UN system), and numerous meetings with these partners (including with the UNCT). The end result was a high-quality, nationally owned study (which was endorsed by the Cabinet of Ministers in July 2010) that identifies the key development challenges facing Egypt over the next 5-10 years. The way it was carried out allowed for quite a high degree of national participation, especially bearing in mind that the study was undertaken under an authoritarian regime. This study also replaced the UN CCA, which saved the UN and Government staff time and money.
The Govt's antipathy to INGOs is a problem but their push to [localise] everything also has some positive effects
The civil society has helped to strengthen their participation.
Was not in-country when UNDAF developed
Civil society as been left out completely
The process has been very government/UN focused and CSOs have been somewhat marginalized
Civil society participation still varies depending on the agency country programme concerned. The existence of a UNDAF has not really affected this.
Need for relevant mechanisms for further involvement.
NGOs have not been involved at all.
There is no national civil society but international ones
Not much participation of civil society

The Government disagrees with the participation of "independent" civil society.
The opening of UNDAF outcome groups to other than government counterpart organisation has been flagged as very positive by civil society groups.
All stakeholders have been involved in the process
The government still has a strong say in which CSOs are involved in the UN's work
Civil society participation is still weak in these processes.
One of the main objective of developing partners is to enhance civil society capacities... which is yet to be done
Apart from CSO participation in SitAn and collaboration with individual agencies there is no joint UN approach to partnership with CS
Le processus interne aux agences a permis jusque là l'implication de la société civile. Il faut noter qu'une attention commence à leur être accordée (invitation à la retraite ONUCI/UNCT)
<b>Until now, the process within agencies has allowed for civil society involvement. We observe that it is getting more attention (invitation to UNOCI/UNCT retreat).</b>
The International NGOs appear to hate UNDP and as this is inseparable from the RC - there you have it.
There was no much interaction with NGO due to the context of the country
Civil society are members of the UNDAF Priority Working Groups
Due to government restrictions, civil society organizations are not well engaged.
Involvement of civil society lies on shoulders of a very few UN organizations. Very little to do with UNDAF.
Civil Society has little participation in UN work
UN in Moldova is not running a full complex programme with civil society, thus participation of NGOs was reduced only to a limited number of NGOs partnering with UN.
It did as they were involved in the UNPF however a very few agencies had to argue for keeping their role prominent in the final document.
Limited number of civil society organizations whose capacity is very limited.
No agency really has work with the civil society which is in fact an extension of the government. NGOs are "owned" by high level officials or their spouses.
This area needs more work, though there was civil society participation in the review of the draft UNDAF.
I do not believe it was the UNDAF that pulled the UNCT closer but rather the effort of some single agencies. The constant monitoring and evaluation of UNDAF achievements is minimal.
Limited in the past but improving under the new government structure
Participation of civil society is still limited. Some discussions have been going on to increase civil society participation in the UNDAF implementation.
I doubt it but do not know
CSOs are implementers of some programme areas; most of the support is going to Government.
Can't comment on this yet.
Refer to various corporate evaluation results, especially where CSOs' views are quoted
Not in the case of this country

Yet too early to say
National NGOs are weak and most UN cooperation is with INGOs or ministries.
This could be more actively pursued and addressed with more extensive consultations, but has steadily improved.
Not in duty station long enough to determine
The UNDAF has had not role in increased civil society participation in the work of the UN. But the partnership between civil society and the UN system is quite strong.
To some extent, as many UN agencies have partners in the civil society. and there has been an overall consultation with them as a group as well
Gov't does not allow officially the role of civil society
Little involvement of civil society
The context of the country makes it difficult.
I have see no evidence of this
Aside from sub contracting we have little relation with civil society
Very little participation
La tendency est beaucoup plus les ONG et la SOC
<b>The trend is more NGOs and civil society groups.</b>
No evidence of structures which allowed civil societies to be involved in the design and implementation of UNDAF
Participation of civil society is supported by several agencies, but the UNDAF didn't help to improve this.
The planning process brought a few of the larger NGOs reluctantly to planning sessions where mainly they tried to identify funding opportunities for themselves
Difficult in multicounty UNCTs serving 15 countries and with limited NGO community in those countries

**15. UN agencies receive contributions from donors for specific programmes and projects in addition to their regular (core) funds. In general, such additional donor-funded activities are less relevant to the country's needs and priorities:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	4.9%	25
Somewhat agree	15.8%	80
Somewhat disagree	27.5%	139
Strongly disagree	48.2%	244
Don't know	3.6%	18
Please provide any additional comments		87
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>506</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>12</b>

**15. UN agencies receive contributions from donors for specific programmes and projects in addition to their regular (core) funds. In general, such additional donor-funded activities are less relevant to the country's needs and priorities. –RCs responses by Country Income group**

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	1	0	1	0	2.7%	2
Somewhat agree	3	2	1	0	8.2%	6
Somewhat disagree	1	11	8	0	27.4%	20
Strongly disagree	13	17	10	4	60.3%	44
Don't know	0	0	0	1	1.4%	1
Please provide any additional comments						19
<i>answered question</i>						73
<i>skipped question</i>						5

**Comments:**

These are more linked to the agenda of the donor rather than the common programme that the UN system is trying to adhere to.
In the extremely restricted donor environment that we function in, every dollar counts and adds significant value to the work of the UNCT.
It is not altogether clear whether what the question is intending to ask is whether donor funding runs contrary to country needs and priorities or whether agencies are mainly funded from core or non-core. In general agencies in Lao PDR are mainly funded by non-core funds, but activities funded are still aligned with the UNDAF.
Donor funds are generally aligned with country priorities -- here in Croatia that means preparation for EU membership.
Occasionally, UN agencies will accept funds to implement activities that are not within their mandates, or projects that are not their top priority, simply because they need funds to survive. But that does not mean that this is always the case, nor does it mean those funds form the majority of the funding. It is an occasional fact. But, the best would be for donors to contribute to core funding, enabling agencies the flexibility to programme as needed.
Where the UN is more disciplined, as we are now in Zambia, this is no longer true. Donor funded activities with the UN are very much in line with key national priorities.



In Turkey, complementariness, synergy and value add of UN based on the country specific needs constitute the criteria for donor funding
Some are relevant and some are not
Much of our programmes are funded by Donors.
In Rwanda, donor's contributions are un-earmarked, i.e. the donor does not earmark the funds for specific projects/programmes. The funds are used to fill funding gaps to allow the One UN to adequately respond to national priorities.
Those funds are critical for UN programming in country (being a MIC) receiving very little core support
The donor contributions are strongly focused on areas where UN and Government work together
Although this is not immediately perceived as an issue, the problem could be countered by the establishment of a One Fund. In addition to this, the Moroccan Government has been a donor itself for several years.
If linked to the UN that has carefully considered harmonisation with national priorities these additional donor funds can be extremely valuable and important. It is unclear what the purpose of presenting this question in the negative form is. Other DPs are also expected to align their funding with national priorities. This is the case in Cambodia.
The little donor funding we receive in country tend to be targeted towards recognized national priorities; more often than not.
Donor funding complements UN core-funded strategies and programmes. They are therefore as relevant as the UN core-funds and the programmes that the UN proposes
In the absence of the requisite core resources, non-core resources are critical. However, for predictability and better results, among other reasons, core resources are to be preferred.
Not applicable in our context
These additional resources could be in response to national priorities
These additional sources are absolutely key
IOM is totally projectized so receives no core funding. I do not think what IOM is doing is any less relevant to the country's needs and priorities than what UN agencies with core funding are doing.
All donations help to the development of our country.
Donors tend to coordinate their funding decisions, and overall extra budgetary resources exceed core funding
ESCAP is a regional body
Many progressive development programs are funded just by donors
Donors contribute to substantive programmes in Paraguay. Most of them are good partners with UN Agencies in the field
All parts of the UNDP are relevant to the government, and more than ever we make sure that all our activities are thoroughly discussed with government
Agencies negotiate other resources based on their country programmes, which are based on the National Strategic Development Plan.
Usually resource mobilization is done in alignment with existing programmes and priorities.
Liaison with donors in line with country needs/priorities
We only engage in donor supported initiatives that are relevant to the country's

needs/priorities
More relevant to country needs
It depends upon the leadership of Government and UNCT can be also key in helping to reorient the funds towards country core needs and priorities.
Have not seen any donor contribution to joint UNCT activities!!!! Donor contributions were received in response to UN Agency specific project/programs.
Donor-drivenness is a huge issue. Instead of accepting the UNDAF as a framework, some donors are still more interested in pursuing their own priorities and ask UN agencies to implement
Very few donor "voluntary" contributions reach Uruguay.
WFP does not have core budget
Such contributions are based on proposals that address country's needs and priorities in specific areas/sectors
To the extent that donors require that these programs be implemented by multiple agencies, they are catalysts for improved coordination and collaboration among UN agencies.
WFP adopted a country strategy in line with UNDAF and Government PRSP and WFP strategic plan priorities. Donors are now much more showing interests – likewise for government, despite limited donors presence in Congo. Stronger development partners are required in a country that have sufficient resources to address its development needs but may need dev. partners support for capacity building... UN and development partners are lacking a proper strategy and division of labour and donors tend to blame the coordination system in place which itself has little capacities and lacking experience. UN coherence should serve much more for definition of sound strategic priorities and alignment instead of an agenda focusing on pushing on one UN and quest for funds.
Not much XB donor money, however the available money seems to be focussed on areas that are both donor and government priorities
Donor funds received for joint programmes (of various types) have encouraged collaboration among agencies.
Agencies should continue receiving funds to answer to the priorities set jointly with the Government, but it will be important to harmonize action.
The donor funded activities are part of the UNDAF and Agency Programmes that are linked to the Country's Priorities
All programmes are linked to relevant priorities
The situation differs case by case and defies blanket generalization.
Donor funds specific programme components on the basis of bilateral agreements with individual agencies. Fund is usually well targeted and not donor driven
Additional funds are always need and directed to relevant needs
Several UNCT members would not exist without XB funds and thus would not be present and useful in efforts to address country needs and priorities.
Although this is a MIC the disparity between the rich and the poor is incredible. Any resources that would come in through the UN agencies definitely contribute to addressing these imbalances
As far as we are concerned we only raised funds within our programs and only accept funds within our programs. It is a pity but I can't think that I know the policies for the

other agencies in this country. Nor that I think they know ours.
It is difficult to secure funding for poverty reduction programmes
Unclear question
Humanitarian and development needs are high, donors funding is very limited
There needs to be greater promotion of national development frameworks and the UNDAF to donors, and use of such frameworks by donors to ensure that the resources address national needs and priorities.
While there have been continued cases of donors pushing their own agenda that do not respond to the priorities of the country, there have also been some effort to ensure that donor funded activities take into consideration the context of the country
In general extra-budgetary activities are more targeted and more effective allowing us to implement essential part of our strategic plan
In Tunisia the contribution of external donors is usually negotiated and aligned with national priorities
Donors' contribution is helpful when such contribution is to support the needs and priorities of the country. This is done through the development of joint programmes.
There is a lot of humanitarian funding but hardly any development funding
They are very relevant and reflect the priorities of the Govt and the UN and the core strengths of each agency.
Contributions from donors are negligible
Donor-funded activities substantially contribute. For instance on HIV, external donors account for more than half of resource needs of country
All UN activities, regardless of sources of fund, are part of our One UN Programme, implying that every activity is confirmed priorities of the host country.
Donors are interested in country needs and respond to these needs with VDs
I believe most of donors funding (non-core) come where needs are felt on the ground.
Agencies coordinate with ministries and state government in development of projects.
Donor-funded projects in Belarus are generally very relevant to the needs of the country and priorities of the government.
Not in duty station long enough to determine
The specific programs and projects are usually part of UNDAF
[Agency] does not receive core funding. All our programmes/projects in Sri Lanka are developed in close cooperation with local and central authorities, with our field teams, and are totally relevant to the country's needs
It all depends how the negotiation has been handled
If the UN agency had a budgeted programme well defined & prioritised objectives it could have used additional fund to fill in the gaps & support unmet needs and country's priorities. Otherwise a donor-driven approach just leads to chaos and would not be useful.
In the case of UNESCO, our donors expressed strongly that funds must be invested in the field of Cultural Heritage preservation and restoration (Tangible and Intangible Heritage ). Fortunately, those priorities are matching with Government's purposes ( long term basis)
For UNICEF 95% of funding has been non-core over the last few years
Overall they are very relevant to country needs

If we are talking of donor funds that are nationally allocated, such funds are, in most cases, made available for national priorities
Depends on agency but we would not seek funds if objective of the specific project was not relevant
Donor contributions to UN agencies help to fill priorities that could not be met by the Government
UN agencies must negotiate for flexibility based on national priorities.
For WFP that has no core resources, donor-funded activities support the country's needs and priorities.
Les fonds reçus relèvent des urgences <b>The funds received are for emergency situations.</b>
This is 100% of specialised agencies. Are these agencies less relevant to the country's need and priorities?
In the case of Mexico this is the case
Donors - as the UN - have generally similar views on what is important or not.
Donors contribution were mainly channelled through CF and the JEC was the distribution mechanisms for that, under which the Government was a strong partner in resource allocations
We do not accept contributions that are not aligned with the country's needs, particularly tied aid.

**16. From your observations, the growth in non-core/extrabudgetary/earmarked resources available to UN agencies has lessened the UN's ability to strategically plan its support:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	16.3%	82
Somewhat agree	35.4%	178
Somewhat disagree	23.9%	120
Strongly disagree	17.5%	88
Don't know	7.0%	35
Please provide any additional comments		74
<i>answered question</i>		<b>503</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

**Comments:**

Every time, less and less contributions due to the sanctions.
Since our core resources are so limited, non-core is the only way we can operate a robust programme in Croatia. Our problem is that in a few years none of the agencies will have funding, with the exception of UNICEF, which is already self-supporting.

The question is worded badly. UN's ability to plan/programme strategically is affected by the unavailability of funds. It is not affected because the funding is from core versus non-core. It is the fact that there is very little money to do anything, forcing everyone to spend enormous amounts of time searching for money when in fact they could be implementing programmes.
Where this is so, it is a weak excuse on our part for being less results-oriented and less strategic in our contributions. When done well, the non core helps us be even more strategic and plan together well.
This statement has to be contextualized within the country specific situation. With the decline in non-core resources, UN system has to prove its worth to contributing to the transformative changes in the lives of the people. The pursuit of programming approach distinct from project based interventions could enable the UN system to retain strategic focus
Short-term and temporary funding modalities limit the ability of the UN to adopt a long-term programmatic approach which is suitable for a development context
In Rwanda, this challenge does not exist, as donors provide un-earmarked contributions to the One UN Fund. Agencies are not allowed to fund-raise in country individually.
Arguably, there is a case to be made that this will encourage agencies to make more strategic choices in considering their sectors of intervention.
There is insufficient core money to attract cost sharing by donors and government
Strategic ability to plan is not a function of growth/volume but rather the character of funds (the question should be in relation to pool/unearmarked non-core versus projectized non-core and how that effects strategic planning)
Depends what policy priorities this is linked to. If they are HQ driven or regional drive with little consultation with the country level to the UNCT there is danger they will not be able to be as strategically placed as other funds. BUT if this dialogue does take place at the country level with RCs and UNCT's (who in the end ARE the in country experts) the opportunities for alignment and timely discussion with govt and other partners are greater
The assumption should be managed carefully in MIC, the statement of the question leads to confusion
I would agree that UN agencies would benefit from having increase core funding but i would not go as far as saying that non-core funding hampers UNs strategic position.
Not applicable in our context
As above. It depends
If the non core resources are received in areas already supported by the UN agencies, these extra-budgetary resources are reinforcing UN agencies objectives, they are welcome. UN agencies should not accept projects and resources which detract them from their mandates
The UN in a middle-income country (MIC) such as Egypt relies upon non-core funding. This allows the UN to convert strategic plans it has developed into capacity building programmes.
It becomes a donor led priorities
In principle it will lessen our ability to plan strategically. I cannot state that this already has happened.
These resources also encourage the UN to align their strategic planning to the strategic

planning of the donors! (i.e. the UN member states!)
From my observations, high core contributions make UN agencies complacent and wasteful about how they use resources, but it is true that total projectization does make strategic planning more difficult
Growth? Cuts you mean!
In Paraguay, it is very important to mobilize regular resources for programming activities
We are mobilizing non-core resources for key priorities of the UNDP
This specifically limits our ability to engage in pooled funding and other aid effectiveness mechanisms, which our donors mostly want us to do more!
A strong core base at the beginning of the programming cycle is essential to plan and engage appropriately the counterparts
Nothing poses a greater challenge to the UN as a whole, on many fronts, than this problem.
We should work with donors to address priorities identified in the NDPs
Earmarked resources are less flexible and limit activity span of UN agencies.
Not applicable for WFP
It actually helped a lot to strategically plan particularly non-earmarked.
In most cases, the extra-budgetary funds have been mobilized by UN Agencies in support of their work which is strategically planned
The non previsibility of aid is another constraint to the UN support to recipient countries
Non core earmarked resources can be strategic if the donor is aligned with government priorities and this is the case with several donors in this country.
In time of crisis the UN has interest to build coherence in strategically redefine and align its priorities with government and development partners despite that development partners are not all donors...and Congo has the resources to deal with its development. IT should be better focus, do less but do it well
Firstly information on XB resources of individual agencies is not shared and agencies tend to bend their priorities to the XB resources hence less space for joint strategising
Our country is experiencing a decline of this type of funding.
Depends on how you would negotiate this.
New to the team not too familiar with previous cycle of support
We have an example of an area-based programme in one province of Thailand which has been planned and implemented by multiple agencies with one of the UN coordination funds. It does not seem to have a clear and realistic strategic intent (e.g. influencing policies, piloting for nation-wide replication) and pretty much a pure service delivery project. Thailand as a middle-income country has already gone beyond the stage of this type of area-based programme long time ago but availability of funding seems to let the concerned agencies continue this type of activities.
This is not the case for Iran where donor funding is limited
Non core resources support our low budgets
Of course, for several reasons including: (i) most XB donors place caps on time horizons for implementation, i.e., serious multi-year planning is virtually impossible and (ii) each XB donor has different time schedules for pledging and disbursement (i.e., we receive funds anytime between January and December and this complicates

strategic planning and promotes "budgeting gymnastics".
There is no growth in no-core resources. If anything donors are reluctant to provide support because of the perceived MIC status of the country.
Very little funds available to the UN in the country. Micro-budgets. The counterpart funds have not arrived for the past 4 years. There are very few "other funds". Hence, socio-programs including those of the UN are lagging behind.
Loaded and biased question.
Non-Core resources are less due to the middle income status of Botswana
The support generally would be within the national needs as expressed in the national policies and strategies; however they are not necessarily according to the most important priorities.
Currently all UN agencies in the country facing funding problem
It is rather the constant reduction in core funding that affects the WHO strategic approach
We never know when or if that money is going to come. So we plan for "virtual money" and when it fails to come, it dents the credibility of our Agencies and the UN as a whole.
The growth in resources mentioned is not visible from here, what we see is rather a cut in resources...
It depends on the issue/area. In some cases it has grown and in others it has decreased
Donors' priorities normally corresponds to Government priority where the latter wishes support from donors/UN
What is important is for agencies to have predictable multi-year funding.
Projects are timely responses to new needs. Core budgets lock in funds and programmes for a four year period.
Not in duty station long enough to determine
To some extent, the earmarked and donor conditionalities are also result of the UN funding proposals.
From UNOPS perspective, see point 11. We deal only with non core. And indeed, non core is more unpredictable, particularly since most donors will fund on an annual basis, rather than multi year plan. In [country], the shrinking of the donor base has also contributed to a smaller margin for implementing strategic plans
There is certainly that risk, but I suspect it varies from agency to agency, depending on the level of core funding and its ration to non-core funds.
Earmarked resources not necessarily support enhance coherence
I don't think so. Globalization is an inclusive process. Donors' policies have a big influence now at the strategic level. For our agencies and also for Government.
Although increasingly donors accept some resources earmarked for humanitarian purposes to be allocated to recovery and development interventions.
In PDCD country non-core XB resources are more flexible and at larger scale, so this simple analysis is not accurate at all at field level
We need to adapt to this changing scenario.
Not for WFP that has no core resources but perhaps applicable to other agencies with core budgets.
Ce sont les fonds extra budgétaires plutôt qui font défaut <b>Actually, there is a lack of extra-budgetary funds</b>

The UNDAF remains the reflection of the "best scenario" more than a programming tool
Sometimes priority is given to sectors that are the most funded instead of sectors where the needs are highly expressed!
Long term planning is difficult and completion not certain
Earmarking is now an accepted feature in the Albania DAO, too. Also, the donors who give non-core resources are also the same who are vocal on the agencies' boards - so there is general consistency.
This comes in addition to core. Core too small to realise strategy
I feel less emphasis is given to economic development, which would reduce poverty and food insecurity, compared to political and human right related activities.
However, each agency has to be alert on the risk to deviate from core strategy when big non core funding offered

### 17. Do the UN agencies sometimes compete with each other for donor funding for projects?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	78.6%	394
No	21.4%	107
Please provide any additional comments		107
<i>answered question</i>		<b>501</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>17</b>

### 17. Do the UN agencies sometimes compete with each other for donor funding for projects? –DaO countries vs. Non-DaO countries

	DaO pilot or self-starter	Not DaO pilot or self-starter	DaO pilot or self-starter	Not DaO pilot or self-starter
Yes	76%	80%	108	286
No	24%	20%	34	73
	100%	100%	142	359

#### Comments:

There is not much donor funding in this country
UNDP, UNICEF, and UNHCR all compete for funding for Roma inclusion, for example.



All Agencies are very dependent on donor funding.
All the time! And this results in a lot of tension.
With reduced ODA, a strong commitment by donor and the govt to One UN, and the UN system seeing the benefits and visibility and impact of working together, this is much less so today. But it also requires discipline and good behaviour on the donor side not to fuel such. JPs have helped bring same sector agencies together.
Not in this country context. There is high level of understanding and cooperation where this is concerned. Under the Resource mobilization strategy - there is agreement that agencies will consult with Donors jointly in areas of shared interest.
The One Programme fosters coherence and clarity across agencies on who supports what and fosters complementariness in a relatively scarce resource environment.
As per the UNCT Code of Conduct (part of the Common Operational Document, COD), agencies are not allowed to fund-raise in country individually. Resource mobilization is done jointly and is coordinated centrally by the RC.
Not much though - because the donors provide funding to agencies based on their respective mandates and also performance
Yes, when a donor requests a specific agency to do something which lies within the mandate of another agency.
Although less than in the past
It happens, but very rarely
Yes, some cases still exist. However, in general, we see a more cooperative and collegial approach towards resource mobilisation. A substantive specialisation of agencies will also further reduce competition.
Not at all, the UNCT under the RC leadership has become a space not only to strategically plan joint initiatives but also to share information and coordinate agency individual initiatives avoiding as much possible eventual competition on resources
Being an NCC/middle income region there is a small pool of active donors and limited resources. Competition is therefore strong for scarce resources.
It will be valuable to continue to promote a programme based approach in the distribution of funds and in dialogue around country level development practice. Under an UNDAF it is a programme based approach that is promoted. Whilst UN agencies may seek funding opportunities in similar areas the level of coherence developed at the UNCT level will managed this. BUT also there is a duty of care of bilateral donors at the country level to not increase fragmentation or mission creep within the UN system and these issues can be addressed at HQ level in dialogue with donor HQs. This is a key issue for overall aid coordination at the country level. This, in the end, is the interface for development cooperation worldwide.
This is a fundamental issue which relates to the overlapping of agency mandates, government and donor preferences. It would be useful to have greater and more accurate mapping of UN agency competencies and service line capabilities
Very much strongly agree. The GEF is a perfect example.
Sometimes healthy competition
Not applicable in our context
Not within the Joint office
I have seen it in other places but not in Burkina Faso
Generally no, though there are some exceptions. However, the question is frankly

biased. There should have been more options in the response, as with other questions in this survey.
Competition exists, but partnership too. We always will have to juggle these two realities together.
But there is evidence of such competition among donor agencies.
Donor funding in middle-income countries such as Mexico is scarce and we all go for the same funding sources
Agencies ALWAYS compete...not sometimes
The lack of resources in MIC causes a complex dynamic where some smaller agencies compete desperately for their survival on the ground.
The question is answered for Burundian reality. I don't see competition on the ground
Not overtly, but we do all try to look better in the eyes of donors
Particularly small with limited operational capacity, which in turns damages the reputation of the system
However, this is not common and happens not too frequently.
There still is lack of transparency, competition for funding and agencies stepping into areas that clearly belong to the core mandate of other agencies
In countries and areas for which there is donor-funding
Always
The political economy of the aid landscape provides counter-incentives for cooperation. UN agencies are competing for funding, including the specialized agencies. This results in a fragmentation of projects, rather than in coherence
As resources become scarcer
This happens when there is overlapping of agencies areas of intervention
I do not think these needs to be asked, and UN should work to have clarity among agencies on mandates and areas of operations. This an exercise UNDG should lead.
Recently the approach has been for all agencies to prepare joint proposals for funding, with each agency responsible for the component of the project for which it has a comparative advantage, so there is more collaboration rather than competition
Increasingly not, happened in the past
There is evidence that the big agencies like UNICEF and UNDP tend to get the bigger shares of funding based on their comparative advantage in terms of term decentralization and their funding agencies
Don't know
Indeed and even for government funding while results are not even available under UNDAF and joint programmes and coordination is becoming issue for dev partners.
Shocking recent example on 10mil Euros in which an agency basically ran a parallel process opposite to the joint approach that was agreed upon
It is a regular feature of each agencies action, but at HQ level, these issues can be resolved and then countries will follow. Do not expect UN county teams to agree for HQ to react, by learning and then applying. There is a need for strong directive
All the time.
Yes its happen sometime when there is no coordination
UNDP and UNOPS only to my knowledge
Even non- UN System agencies as IOM.

Absolutely - vicious competition - there is serious mandate creep and active competition
Noticed that some donors are insisting on coherence by UN agencies in approaching them for support
Not the case in this country
More than sometimes.....it is a worrying trend!
Always, all the time
Each agency seem to have traditional donors (though limited)
HQ level agreed mandates do not apply at country level.
But every time less because we realize that joint programmes have better results
And the greater access of the RC to some donors, as well as the exploited confusion between UNDP and 'the UN' affects the balance of power and fundraising potential of different agencies. It is used sometime to support smaller agencies, but also to create dependency and thus reduce equal and empowered dialogue within the team
This has been very evident this year with regard to the EU funds for addressing MDGs 4 and 5.
Not here. But yes in other countries where I served before.
This will be difficult to change among UN agencies working in similar areas
Not any longer, really. But the donors are unwilling to provide un-earmarked, multi-year funding and will select their favourite programmes and favourite agencies for funding and the UN won't be able to afford saying no, coherence or no coherence.
Due to the clear division of labour
The UNCT always try to work a team, there a very good understanding among the UNCT members
Yes, due to grey areas in the interpretation of mandates
In Iraq, this is particularly true
Occasionally. Due to limited number of donors and overlapping areas of work.
For the Humanitarian Work Plan there is pooled funding and agencies have to submit proposals
Some agencies are better at resource mobilisation than others or are viewed by donors in a better light. Please refer to the DFID ranking of the UN Agencies. So when resources are scarce, competition is inevitable.
Because there are no many donors
They do whether there are joint funds or not
But there is conscious attempts in place in UNCT for joint work and resource mobilization
But as long as we are transparent and coordinate eventually (to avoid confusing the donors and wasting our own time), competition may not necessarily a bad thing
As the core funds are insufficient donor funding complements the core capacity
Almost always
Yes definitely.
Specially when in the same sector e.g. WHO and UNICEF
Competition is healthy.
For as long as there will be separate agencies, there will be competition for funds. This is just normal. However, competition should be healthy and, if possible, be turned into

complementariness.
Not privy to such details
There is competition between different agencies for donor resources - Especially fact that RC also fundraises makes it difficult - The absence of strong development officers within donor agencies/embassies makes it an even bigger problem as the donor doesn't have technical knowledge to identify the right UN agency per technical area.
This is more acute during humanitarian emergency response where there is a tendency by most agencies to work on areas that are beyond their mandate and competences.
All the time. Either because of overlaps in projects, or just because funding is limited and donors will prefer agriculture over education, or will prefer to give 2 smaller amounts to both agriculture and education
Very little direct donor funding due to the country's upper middle income status. there is almost no major traditional multilateral donors in country
But we try as much as possible to coordinate upstream
GEF and MP for ex.
As I said, in this country, each UN Agency seems to work, at the level of implementation of activities, in an isolated way just to defend Flagships. Ignoring, this is worst, that the Member States are the same in the Boards of individual UN Agencies.
Very much indeed. There is need for a clear division of labour, a clear code of conduct and some agencies specifically should stop encroaching upon the mandates of other agencies. The latter specifically destroys the concept of "one UN". The latter is about managing diversity which requires clear division of labour and a code of conduct.
Why not? Healthy too?
In Eastern Europe the competition is very cut throat.
Especially for GEF funds
Very much so
By working together under UNPDF, this competition should be reduced.
They do compete even if the project is not reflecting their mandate
Frequently and increasingly yes.
UN programmes in particular
Not 100% but much less than before
A clear case is the Peace Building Fund, but there are other multilateral as well as bilateral resources that are target for competition between two or more UN Agencies
Pas pour le cas de Madagascar car beaucoup de partenaires ont cessé leur financement <b>Not for Madagascar because many partners have stopped their financing.</b>
Competition is more pronounced in the Pool Fund mechanism
Even exercising monopoly of power
Competition among agencies (with donors) is generally a healthy thing, as the donors can comment on the merit of programmes and the performance of agencies. With DaO and pooled funding, these discussions and competition have gone "underground" into the UN team, and are sometimes in transparently solved or through the application of some mathematical formula - not considering the merit of worth of proposed initiatives or past performance
Our mandates are generally separate enough to be OK. Sometimes UNDP strays into mandates of other agencies

Rare, and generally worked out within the UN system between relevant agencies
But we try not to - it is just current reality. Ideally we would all have sufficient core funds and not have to seek donor support to address government needs and priorities.
On rare occasions only, and sometimes because donors might play UN agencies against each other

**18. If the answer to the question above was Yes, please check any of the following statements that apply:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Competition among UN agencies is healthy and the Government welcomes it	11.5%	43
Competition among UN agencies creates confusion for the Government	67.9%	254
Competition among UN agencies increases the workload on Government officials	29.9%	112
Competition among UN agencies diverts the agencies' attention from the main tasks of providing support to the country	58.3%	218
Please mention below any areas where competition among UN agencies for donor funding is very noticeable, and any other comments you wish to make on this subject:		99
<i>answered question</i>		<b>374</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>144</b>

**Comments:**

Gender migration
Time is then spent in trying to get teams to work together - rather than against each other
Humanitarian vs. development activities to support the country.
Disaster response is one area where everyone will be stepping over each other for funds and creeping into each others' mandates.
Gender issues where UNFPA, UNDP and UNW exercise their mandates without clear delineation of roles and responsibilities
A significant amount of the Agencies Regular resources should be obligatorily earmarked for join programming by their principals and under the RC's coordination in order to really have a true commitment from the different Agencies that conforms the undg.
Governance
It happens, but very rarely
A better answer for question number 1 would be the following: "Such competition is not healthy for UN agencies, but some Governments welcome it"

Social services delivery; climate change/environment
Governments do expect individual agencies to bring in resources in their area of expertise / mandate, but they are also confused about how it should / is working
Basic Education/School Feeding (UNICEF-WFP; Food Security (FAO-WFP.
Competition creates animosities within the UN system especially in a non-core, limited donor MIC context.
Competition is healthy but only to a certain extent! Governments might not always like it but what ultimately matters is whether competition leads to a better development result. Non-constructive competition must be avoided.
The process of joint programming can be extremely competitive
Transition
Beyond mandate and comparative advantages.
OCHA funding for emergency, health, food and nutrition
Opportunities are missed to bring on board the best available expertise, experience etc
Competition among UN agencies is destructive for the image of the UN as a whole
HIV/AIDS
The problem is that projects tend to be aimed at opportunities of financing and not to the needs of the country
UN agencies must promote joint planning and activities instead of competing with each other.
Competition among UN agencies dilutes the spirit of Delivery as One and doubles - within the system - transaction costs.
Livelihoods, food security, climate change
As there are chances that aid would increase, particularly for Gvt with limited capacity in resources mobilization
Competition can be seen by government and partners as UN not be able to coordinate among agencies and deliver based on comparative advantage
Competition increases the transaction cost to the government
Humanitarian interventions
The competition is related to overlap in mandates among agencies.
The government welcomes it as long as it means more funds to it, but would prefer one voice from the UN.
There is much competition for government funding... and the joint programme are not well drafted not all linked with UNDAF while agencies may also have their own strategy... RC/UNCT have interest to know what others are doing....and see how to create synergy instead of imposing....one UN competition is not healthy...
At times it is the Government that is competing with UN agencies while quoting direct budget support and the Paris principles, although they have proven lack of capacity to absorb the funds.
GVT sometimes benefits from a divide & impera approach
Everything relating to any areas of social services
Health
Due to grey areas in UN agencies mandates
In addition to my comment above, I believe that if a title of project proposal to support any Government is covered mainly by any specific UN agency (as its comparative

advantage) in a given country, those UN agencies which are working in that field should definitely cooperate in order not to create confusion as well as function more effectively.
There are some real philosophical differences in approaches. There has been open criticism other agencies.
Gender issue (BNUB, UN Women, UNDP, UNICEF), Food and nutrition (WFP and FAO), Health (WHO, UNICEF and UNFPA)
It depends how competition is managed- sometimes it is healthy and other times not
Environment, Human Rights, Governance
Cross sector issues such as social protection
Refugee crisis response
The above is a very simplistic and loaded question. Competition can be health or unhealthy depending on how it unfolds.
N/A
Early recovery activities.
We send the government different messages sometimes you are UN other times an agency
Difficult to agree on any of the above. Competition is a reality and we are all partially responsible: UN agency governing bodies and chief executives who do not make tough decisions on relevance in 21st century of several UNCT members (especially in emerging countries; parlous financial situations in many agencies, forcing upon UNCT members impossible policies of financial self-sustainability of field operations; host Government officials (also private sector leaders) who rarely speak or act with one voice and who rebel against 13% programme support costs arguing it is too high; traditional donors with completely inconsistent policies to promote the "do more with less" fallacy; and individual UNCT members, whose performance is often directly tied to local fund-raising.
This doesn't seem like the right question. Funding competition happens because mandates and roles are not clear (or respected) and for the reasons already detailed above. This doesn't have a direct impact government except for item 4. However competition, more clearly, differing perspectives and views of different agencies related to different development and human rights topics is useful -and appreciated very much by line ministries, foreign affairs and other govt and non govt agencies - except the central planning body, who believe that having no differentiation between the agencies would be beneficial.
As mentioned earlier the EU funds for MDGs 4 and 5 became a sticking point within the UNCT.
Thailand has a small UN programme ... competition is not strongly evident
MDG Spanish windows
Confusion for donors
No estoy de acuerdo con las opciones anteriores creo que es por tener financiamiento para apoyar al país y ganar liderazgo. <b>I disagree with previous options. I believe it is for getting funds and to support the country and gain leadership.</b>
The UNCT should work as a team
Competition for donor funding does not create confusion for Governments but for

donors. The competition should not exist if mandates were clearer.
Education, environmental related issues including water
Competition among the Agencies limits the list of UN priorities
None of the above. Competition does not involve the Government. Competition is acceptable as long as the aim of the fund is to support country.
Humanitarian Funding
Competition in joint funds, for IRF/PBF of peace building support office. for DAO, strong disagreement in sector working groups. For joint funds, small agencies compete for every penny as they have no other sources.
The classic example is the EU funding given to UNDP for the Chittagong Hill Tracts development project. UNDP felt attracted to the large sum of money involved and implemented the project which had substantial components in health, education and other sectors, where other UN agencies had greater competency and advantages.
No of the above possible answers are good. The option should competition among UN agencies is related to UNCT function problems or something like this.
HIV, SUN
Mother and child health, TB, HIV, environment and health
Overall health related issues, nutrition, HIV/AIDS, gender
Where mandates seem to be similar and global MOUs are not quite 'accepted' by all parties at the country level.
Overlap mandates in Environment, humanitarian, development issues
Risk Management, Food Security, Rural Development, Gender Issues
If agencies coordinate their activities carefully then there should be less risk of competition within sectors. Agencies should only work where they have relative, recognized strengths.
The Government also benefits as this can divide the UN from being more focused and critical on human rights issues.
Competition is a reality
Fundraising for humanitarian assistance to Abkhazia - One of the UN agencies goes beyond its mandate - Donors who have worked in their careers mainly in CEE/CIS are not familiar with UN system, UNDAF, etc. and provide resources to RC and transfer funds to UNDP.
Humanitarian emergency assistance, life skills and income generation activities.
See above. If agencies stick to their mandate, there should be no competition but complementariness. Donors however may or may not want to fund certain activities/sectors
Education, health & WatSan
Not a lot of competition
UN agencies without core funding need to mobilize resources for keeping their existence in the country
Humanitarian aid
In Uzbekistan, Government tries to draw profit of this competition. In sectors like Education, Health, Governance, Capacity Building (all areas). So, an agency like [agency], which now has a little budget for Programs is in a position where the other UN agencies working in the same field don't take care to work together, share funds, abilities, knowledge and human resources. Even in the context of UNDAF



implementation where we can share our Work Plans, inputs, outputs, it is extremely difficult to convince each other to set up common activities in a sustainable way.
On the "recovery front" especially. "Recovery" has three challenges the boundary between it and humanitarian action is open to interpretation; potentially anything can go under recovery thus in the absence of a clear division of labour one has chaos; "recovery" assumes a linear progression towards stability/development which is frequently not the case. How do agencies not experienced with humanitarian action deal with a deterioration of the context?
It hampers delivering as one. Not healthy at all.
GEF; I hold the view that we're still far away from a One UN, driven as most of us are to advance our own agendas...
With a rapidly dwindling list of bilateral donors, as well as dwindling funding available, receiving additional bilateral funds is increasingly becoming a zero sum game, with agency A getting funds for a project at the expense of agency B
In some cases the competition is very negative and distortive
Reproductive health, for availability of resources some agencies work against mandated agencies even without having the technical capacity and not in line with the global division of labour
Especially in areas where mandates overlap.
Environment
Competition among UN agencies creates friction and hostility among UN agencies. This is particularly the case in a country with limited core resources and a small donor community.
A soon as one fund may be available it is the shopping list of agencies putting all potential activities. The coordination efforts are then concentrated on formulating proposal without funding perspective takes
Responding to open ' call for funds' by donors
Some times, the agency will focus more on well funded sectors giving less attention to the initial mandate.
EU (IPA) funding in general; Social Inclusion; Anti-corruption; Anti-discrimination; Municipal support / rural area-based development
Government doesn't care where agencies get their funding from.
None of above applies, competition is healthy, has to prove money's worth and comparative advantage
None of the above - any potential overlap is worked out internally
Health (between WHO, UNICEF and UNFPA); youth (between UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA)
Not very noticeable in UN WOMEN areas of work, and UN coherence a clear priority in corporate Strategic Plan

**19. Have any programme related measures been taken by the UNCT over the last four years that reduced the burden on the government when dealing with the UN system?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.7%	292
No	37.3%	174
If so, please mention the most significant of those measures:		205
<i>answered question</i>		<b>466</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>52</b>

**Comments:**

Assistance for reporting under UN Conventions
Not sure
HACT implementation and joint UNDAF review
Helped establish coordinating mechanisms that would reduce the burden on the Government in dealing with the UN.
I don't know of any such measure.
Don't know
Approaching the Government as One (e.g. preparations for Rio+20)
JEC, GMC, Line ministries focal point appointment
The fight against HIV/AIDS for instance
DaO; Nkonsonkonson concept note; common action plan.
Common planning, mid-term strategy
Harmonized Policies and Procedures Guidelines, a and Cost Norms
We tried to introduce the UNDAF Action Plan but Government perceived that as increased workload, so we dropped it
We removed the UNDAF, but worked directly to a common GoA-UN programme of cooperation
EU-UN cost norms
I am new to the duty station and don't know
Common reporting
Not to my knowledge, but it may exist
The UN provides technical assistance to strengthen the capacity of the national Intl. Cooperation Agency.
Joint progress report on programme achievements
Joint UN programmes
UNDAF
By having UNRC as central point of contact for UN system helps reduce the confusion.
In contrary we keep asking for special treatment and favours
Different UN Agencies continue to work with their concerned Line Ministry. For

example, WHO with MoH, FAO with Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
UNDP Early Recovery Coordination Support at local level
Regular interface between the UN RC and Senior Representatives of the Government
3 Pillar working groups set up along the 3 goals of the UN Integrated Programme where government interact with the UN family under one roof; joint UN meetings with senior government officials rather than individual meetings
Agreements between UNS and government and institutions
This is not applicable to Pakistan due to Devolution in 2012
A good RC/HC led to greater coherence of the UNCT
Yes but the Government still quite contained in its priorities and try to divert our priorities in spite a better work at the level of UN RC Coordination Office. In particular last two years.
Only assigned 4 months ago
DAD
UNDAF has the potential if implemented in a monitored and result-oriented manner
Interagency committee for health, national council for children
Supporting common M&E framework; Joint Annual reviews/plans; Joint programmes; UN Joint Presence Offices;
Establishing PWGs/Sub-PWGs
Joint programming and annual reports
Don't know
Coordinate signing of CPDs of UNFPA, UNDP, UNICEF
Not in duty station long enough to determine
One Plan and consolidated review of UN programming with national stakeholders.
We participate in sector working groups and very rarely call specific UN related meetings outside the SWGs.
Not to my knowledge
Improved aid coordination
Harmonized procedures
MDTF
HACT compliance
Coordination mechanisms improved
Mandatory quarterly reporting of expenditures to the government is now coordinated by RC's office
Establishment of theme groups
UNDAF Action Plan is one such example, though it is still a new instrument and it is not yet clear whether it actually reduce the burden while maintaining clarify on the process.
We preach it but do not practice it
Mostly in regard to vulnerable populations
Not by UNCT but by members of the team - agencies - for example setting up health coordination meetings
Sector coordination; division of working areas between agencies
One Plan with single AWP that gives overview of all UN activities in the country. One Budgetary Framework. Well coordinated gender JP that even resulted in helping the

Government units to coordinate among themselves.
Working in Task Teams
Single communication entry point at high-level through RC.
At least in the last year, the process of arriving at the new UNDAF, other joint programmes developed
Attempts to organize coordinated meetings/events
Joint planning with Government
The joint programmes make coordination with the government easier and less burdensome.
Joint Programming initiatives
Not that I am aware of
Just to mention one is Iraq Public Sector Modernization
One programme
Joint Programmes enabled UN Agencies to speak with one voice. Governmental officials were provided with coherent approach and strategic direction of relevant issues. They did spend less time in meeting separately UN entities.
Don't know
I cannot speak for the last 4 years, since I've only been here 1 year and 4 months. However, the united front presented by the UN system in developing the UNDAF allowed the Government to speak to all, if it spoke to one. In addition, the EXCOM agencies are working to introduce HACT.
The UNSF which signed by the government and UNCT is a step on the right direction
MoU with NESDB
Functioning sector working group
Establishment of Joint Programmes on Gender and Strategic information, in addition to the Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS
One planning and review mechanism as well as HACT
One plan, one monitoring framework, one review structure, cross-agency development results groups, HACT,
Better reinforcement of the RC Office.
General commitment to reduce complexity and transaction cost.
See comment to question 4
UNDAF documents; RC-coordinated responses to Minister's requests
Better coordination on programming and on relations with Government trying to have one UN voice
The establishment of joint teams
Better communication from the side of the UNRC office with the Gov has helped.
Trust Funds, joint programming
Do not know
Only one Humanitarian Coordination mechanism
HACT is one such approach, but it has not been fully implemented.
HACT - though not all using; common budget reporting, new UNPF and possible UNPF action plan
Alignment with governmental strategies
I don't have the information

Leading by RC
HACT
UN-DaO and UNDAF
Priority Working Groups, UNDAF Steering Committee
One "UNDAF Action Plan", instead of 4 individual CPAPs!
Establishment of steering committee within the UNDAF
Joint implementation matrix
Much more coordination in the support to the development of the second Strategic framework against poverty.
Although I was not here during the last four years, I believe the improvement is that the government has now a clearly defined channel for communicating with the UN on issues related to the all UN.
Through the PTF, the Government has possibility to interact with the UN as One. The RC is the Vice chair of the PTF with the Prime Minister as the Chair
Joint monitoring and joint mid term review
Some work in the health sector to standardise systems... not much success... but good effort.
UN joint mission organized by RC to FAO (Rome), UNIDO (Vienna), UNDP BRC (Bratislava) has improved our cooperation
I believe some joint programmes have increased the burden with the implementation of committees at different levels (MDGs JPs)
Programa de Inmunizaciones y el fortalecimiento de la respuesta nacional para enfrentar la Pandemia de Influenza A (H1N1) <b>Immunization Programme and national response capacity building to Influenza A Pandemic (H1N1)</b>
Technical committees (government-UNCT) constantly working
Common reporting to Government through the RCO; Joint Steering Committees for the JPs
a) Commentaires conjoints au GVT notamment DSRP et PND ; b) Mécanismes de coordination PTF; c) Réunions régulières avec le GVT <b>a) Joint comments to Gvt, in particular DSRP and PND; b) Coordination mechanisms; c) Regular meetings with the Government.</b>
While I am not aware that the country finds dealing with the UN a burden
Joint Teams
The RC stronger role in coordinating,
Joint UN/AIDS programme, it is a good example
DAG coordination groups, when the Government chooses to attend such meeting.
Delivery as One (DaO) and joint programming.
The MDG-F has increased coordination among UN agencies
One consolidated reporting per year on UNDAF
Joint programmes and assessments
UN-partners coordination platforms, joint planning and regular implementation review, more effective communication
Support to good governance, gender participation, rural institution strengthening and wealth creation through emphasis on agriculture and value chain development

Having joint UNDAF programmes in selected states harmonises planning
Joint Programs
A Central Unit of Coordination has been established chaired by the Ministry of International Cooperation is a government body working in synergy with the Programme Harmonization Group on the UN side.
RC action and sector lead agencies liaise with government
Alignment with govt structures
The development of the UNDAF has ensured coherence and collaboration among the agencies
Coordination of technical support; Donor coordination; Joint development of UNDAF
Joint annual review of UNDAF instead of individual agency annual review
Lot of capacity building to be closer to the Gvt institutions, promoting/encouraging participation.
Drafting of new UNDAF
Do not know
Do not know
One UNDAF annual review instead of each agency's annual reviews.
Speaking one voice and working more and more together make business much easier for Government
Participation of selected UN agencies in government managed sector basket funds.
HACT System
HACT but need to extend timeframe for accounting for funds
Harmonized programme/project management and adoption of One UN Plan
Coordinated participation to meetings and donors/govt. tables. Speaking with one voice
the creation of a coordination office for REDD+
I don't know.
The adoption of HACT by some UN agencies
Minimum impact however
I do not know.
We have (mostly) ceased to have agency-specific programme reviews and to replace these with UNDAF reviews, but also common sector reviews along with other development partners.
Mid-year and annual reviews are done collectively, all UN organs and one ministry. Eases transaction costs for government
Through meetings for presenting UN cooperation activities to the Government, for instance
Don't know
Fluid communication mechanisms have been installed between the Government and the UN
Don't know
Joint programming meetings, cluster system
Joint communication. Common outreach strategy
Joint presentation on budget and program delivery
By establishing theme groups
In a pilot phase, there is always more work and for the UN and for government. It is

however the objective to eventually put in place more efficient procedures that will make life easier for governments and the UN.
Human security project
Common premises
Defining lead agencies and using fully the HACT process
Joint programming; ISF aligned with government national plan; joint agency programme management unit within a government entity
The replacement of the CCA with the "Situation Analysis" (see below – no.9).
Better interagency coordination under joint programmes
1. One single annual review of the UNDAF instead of the multiple agency annual review. 2. UNCT is elaborating a common national execution manual for UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF
One Annual Review
HACT
We established one single Joint Steering Committee for all the 3 gender-related Joint Programmes we have.
But the strategic cooperation framework is hoped to do just that
Annual Work planning
Number of meetings and procedures
Joint programme reviews
Based on my previous experience
Joint annual assessment for the four ExCom agencies, instead of each agency conducting a separate assessment with the Government.
The UNDAF and a series of programme frameworks including: 1) the security and stabilisation support strategy; 2) the peace consolidation programme; 3) the UN-system wide protection strategy and 4) the UN strategy for combating sexual violence
UN hosts meetings on common issues to encourage exchange of ideas and adoption of common positions
Joint action plan, strengthened sector working groups co-chaired between UN heads of agencies and government secretaries
UNDAF; continued co facilitation by the UN of govt technical working groups (9 out of 18); common view points to ensure common platform for determined position on key areas of concern; joint advocacy points for joint UN advocacy on issue of mutual concern linked to CMDG attainment to support dialogue with all stakeholders and govt; HACT; annual joint UNDAF review that has replaced 26 bilateral UN annual review meetings with Govt; joint support programme for HIV/AIDS; Health Sector Support programme (previously chaired by UN); breakthrough priorities for resource mobilisation within the construct of the UNDAF; UNRC representing the voice of the UN at all key high level govt dialogue meetings;
The UNDAF has allowed the Government to have a common platform and instrument to coordinate activities with the UN System
Light UNDAF; Common Action Plan; HACT; Organisation of 1 UNDAF review; One UN voice through coordinated participation in donor thematic groups
Joint signing ceremony for CPAPs
Common planning, pooled funds and joint programming reduced significantly the multiplier effect of separate UN systems on govt.

Consolidated inputs to the Aid Management Platform
UN RC and WB Representative co-chair a donors' forum on which senior government officials are also included. The UNRC and WB Rep are also official observers on the Government's Partnership Committee which vets high impact projects and projects looking for government cost sharing
The UNCT has been proactive in harmonising the systems reporting to the government of Kenya
Joint programming and Joint programme of Assistance for the North helped Government own and coordinate support significantly better
Coordinated UNDAF working group determining priorities and joint meetings with Government on key issues among UNCT members
Many measures were taken in the DaO reform process that reduced the GoR's burden and transaction costs when dealing with the UN system in Rwanda. In fact, the entire reform process focuses on reducing the fragmentation of the UN system, and allowing the country to have a clearer overview of the UN's work and to really work with the UN as One organization.
One common Country Programme Board meeting to review annually the progress on the implementation of the common Country Programme Action Plan.
PLEASE, DEMONSTRATE WILL AND COMMITMENT BY SYMPLIFYING!
Support to Jakarta Commitment and support to support to national trust funds
One UNDAF oversight committee; Joint Implementation Plan (UNDAF AP)
Joint annual reviews
In the health sector, which involves five UN agencies, a coordination arrangement that allows the UN to meet and plan with the Ministry as One team has helped reduce the burden of Government dealing with agencies separately. As part of this arrangement, the health related agencies will also develop one joint work plan with the Ministry which again simplifies their relationship with the UN agencies.
The new Development Cooperation Strategy and its implementation mechanisms have enormously reduced the burden and the transaction cost
One HACT; One UN representation at all donor-govt working groups so one lead entity represents the whole UNCT in each sector or theme group; joined-up M&E but where we can do more; reporting as One on UNDAF reviews and on JPs
Joint programmes, joint initiatives, joint missions.
Joint initiatives, joint reporting
One UN program in a DaO country
UNDAF elaboration mode
Mainly related to HACT implementation.
The RC office was requested to become the sole entry point for coordination with the government and to be the entity to ensure coordination between development partners. The UNCT consequently agreed on a strong RCO staffing structures, which recently was agree to be decreased drastically, primarily due to reduced contributions from UNDOCO and individual agency budget constraints. The decision to do a full UNDAF action plan was a significant step forward as was the agreement to become a DaO self starter country
On Human Rights, Food Security, etc...
RC serves as focal point for the government. Agencies representatives link to sector



ministries.
One programme and its joint programmes
Common quarterly reporting to the Government was instituted some years ago to ensure a coordinated and coherence response. In addition, UNCT responses to individual requests by Government, that have multi agency implications are coordinated and responded through the UN RC's office. The establishment of an UNDAF steering coming to jointly review and monitor implementation of UNDAF is another mechanism to reduce burden on the government whilst dealing with the UN system. In addition, well functioning theme groups, and inter-agency working group on Monitoring and Evaluation and on crisis coordination, all seek to provide coordinated support to the Government.
UNDAF formulation
UNDAF and joint thematic meetings

## **20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the undg on issues related to UN coherence at the country level:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly agree	15.1%	69
Somewhat agree	60.3%	276
Somewhat disagree	19.4%	89
Strongly disagree	5.2%	24
Please provide any additional comments		76
<i>answered question</i>		<b>458</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>60</b>

## **20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the undg on issues related to UN coherence at the country level -Only RCs responses**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly agree	12.0%	9
Somewhat agree	54.7%	41
Somewhat disagree	29.3%	22
Strongly disagree	4.0%	3
Please provide any additional comments		13
<i>answered question</i>		<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>3</b>

## 20. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level -RCs response by Country Income group

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	6	2	0	1	12.0%	9
Somewhat agree	10	17	12	2	54.7%	41
Somewhat disagree	2	12	6	2	29.3%	22
Strongly disagree	0	1	2	0	4.0%	3
Please provide any additional comments						13
<i>answered question</i>						<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>						<b>3</b>

### Comments:

But not the means to implement - sometimes get too much strategic advise
It is very difficult to receive needed advice when required.
There used to be a lot of communication, but I confess that most of it meant little to us in terms of the work we do here or our relations with one another.
Very rarely and only in the form of general guidelines. What is needed is country specific reviews and guidance.
Guidance without teeth is warm and friendly, but of less use. It is time we went from being aspirational and hopeful through so much guidance, to focus in on reforming rules and procedures and overall legislation where needed, to make DaO happen as an institution. Currently, much still relies on individuals in the UNCT making it happen (or not) at country level
Lack of structured guidance and absence of system for seeking RCs input to the UN coherence effort
Written guidance is fine but no-one to substantively interpret it when required it
RCO receives information on the status of UN coherence discussions at HQ level.
In the case of pilot countries, most of the experience in terms of UN coherence at country level was rather gathered at country level. However, the UNDG was useful in providing oversight and support to the process.
The guidance is ambiguous and without a robust support these turn into additional responsibilities for which we have no capacity to support
Periodic communication, but light on strategic guidance.

Receipt of general directives from Ms Debbie Landey via email.
However, how well this strategic guidance is used by heads of agencies is not clear
probably...the impact is not felt in any case
Not from what I can see
I have not witnessed any guidance/support
Do not know
RC's office seems more driven by UNDP guidance
I don't know.
Not aware of this
There are still some inconsistencies in orientations received from our respective headquarters.
There are TOO MUCH "guidelines" from UNDG. The UNCT must have a high level of autonomy to decide on issues at country level. Very few of the UNDG instructions are really "strategic"
Don't know
I am not aware.
Don't know
I don't know
N/A
Mainly through visiting the UNDG website. Outreach to and regular interaction with countries by UNDG is strongly recommended
N/A
Receiving guidance is not the issue all UNCT should receive guidance to avoid implementation of one's agenda and misleading the whole process. UN RC must also know the added values of each and complementariness. real leadership process and interest of strategic coordination with donors and others...
No clear guidance about UN support during the crisis
Guidance seems non-binding and leads to endless discussions on interpretation and the fact that certain agencies are special/different
I have not seen this.
Facilitation between UNCT and Donors and with Prime Minister Office
There is no coherence. The Management and Accountability Framework do not exist. RC does not follow the JD. There is no firewall. The RC says he will not raise funds for the UN (not his job) and he has said he will focus on raising funds for UNDP. At any meeting he only represents UNDP.
I do not know
I do not know!
Guidance is not enough; there should be a set of examples of good practical examples from pilot countries.
There is no clear evidence that this happens
If so, he does not implement really!
Perhaps, not visible to those outside of RCO
No UNRC in country
I guess, I really don't know
Don't know

Do not really know.
No direct observation, as I do not work at this office
Very incomplete, extremely burdensome guidance without clear overview
Always there are issues specifics to each country how UN operates
We wouldn't know
I do not know
This question should be answered by the RC office.
Actually I do not know whether they receive it but if they do it was most likely not implemented or even shared
As a UNCT member, and not a RC, am not sure about this statement
Don't know - it looks more like domination of UNDP
There have been instances when the information received by the RC is not the same received by other agencies in the System.
Don't know what is received
There is no need for a more cohesive UN collaboration
This has not come up in discussions in UNCT to my knowledge (in Juba prior to Khartoum). Recent effort to strengthen coordination with UNAMID may have come from UNDG but I have no certainty of that.
Not privy to all communications received by UN RCO
No - The firewall is being breached (UNDP-RC)
Don't know
I am not sure about strategic guidance from the UNDG to the RC office
DOCO's instruction is confusing to RC and to UNCT
I Do not know
The UNRC represents the interest of UNDP rather than that of the UN family, especially as they are paid by UNDP
Implementing UNDG guidelines on joint programming was left to the agencies. Most of the time the agencies do not follow the guidelines reflecting lengthy process to agree. I suggest more capacity to agencies on UNDG guidance
No idea!
Hard to say as this is not communicated to us
Application effective de l'UNDAF <b>Effective implementation of UNDAF.</b>
It is difficult to comment
Don't know
I don't know what exactly the RC receives from whom, by some of the RC initiatives and moves go far beyond what the UNDG agreed. This is creating conflict.
Hard to say, really, what the RC Office receives from UNDG
Do not know.
Don't know
I guess so.

**21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	22.5%	113
Somewhat agree	49.5%	249
Somewhat disagree	22.3%	112
Strongly disagree	5.8%	29
Please provide any additional comments		59
<i>answered question</i>		<b>503</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

**21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –Only RCs responses**

Answer Options	RC (accredited to Government)	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	4	5.4%	4
Somewhat agree	33	44.6%	33
Somewhat disagree	29	39.2%	29
Strongly disagree	8	10.8%	8
Please provide any additional comments			23
<i>answered question</i>			<b>74</b>
<i>skipped question</i>			<b>4</b>

**21. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. –RCs responses by Country Income group**

	Income group					
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country	Response Percent	Response Count

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>39.2%</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Please provide any additional comments</b>						<b>23</b>
<i>answered question</i>						<b>74</b>
<i>skipped question</i>						<b>4</b>

### Comments:

Sometimes the advice is inconsistent with the UN coherence but more agency mandated.
Some agencies more than others.
They agree at HQ level but implementation is another issue even at HQ level and agency-wide level.
Guidance is clear from UNDP that the RC is to represent the UN team as a whole. UNDP has been working recently to achieve a better understanding with UNHCR, in particular.
A few agencies get positive encouragement and are on same wavelength. Others, either by their silence, or quiet divergence, actually cause great disruption. UNDG Principals must also be held to account for their guidance and performance on this score. If not, the cookie crumbles right from the top!
Specialised agency members are uneven in their commitment
In the absence of strong commitment from agency HQ and clear directions to support and participate in the RC system continues to be the major stumbling block
A lot is said in theory from the corporate level, but actions and policies contradict it, leading to field level confusion.
These usually concern interagency MoUs that tend to be supply driven; i.e. not clearly in response to a demand from countries or UNCTs for greater coherence on a specific topic, more often than not.
Agencies HQs, including UNDP's, show little interest in UN coordination
One key challenge in the DaO process at country level is the gap between HQ and field offices. Increased support and "one-ness" from HQs is needed to allow the UN to really Deliver as One.
But this guidance is not always compatible as to local level realities and priorities as to the working with other agencies under a common programmatic framework for a common set of results aligned with national priorities.
I assume that they do but if so, the relevant documents are not shared with the RC
Highly varied picture between agencies. Some strongly yes, others not at all.
The degree of such guidance varies across agencies and the agencies do not share it in any case
The degree of strategic guidance varies between ExCom and specialised agencies
Not reported regularly to the UNCT but evident in their annual reporting process given the questions they ask of the RC Office in each reporting cycle

There is a high percentage of uninformed and un-trained or poorly briefed Agency Representatives. Furthermore, guidance provided to agency reps from HQ seems to be limited. Agency reps rely heavily on the RC's office for such guidance
Though it is difficult to know exactly what guidance is being issued, it is clear that different guidance in both its content and scope is provided by the respective agencies.
Ex ex-com do receive clear guidance. Specialized agencies receive less clear guidance.
Some more than others, FAO seems to be pretty much on the ball.
Not known.
Some agencies are not committed 100%
Not from what I can see
Little guidance. Zero support.
We do, at least.
Guidance has limited impact as long as we have separate agencies, rules and cycles
This is very true for UNICEF
See comment above (15).
Update are shared on a regular basis
I am not aware of other agencies, for UN-HABITAT I received clear instructions that we should work in a delivering as one framework and I fully support this, but too difficult to convince others.
We are encouraged to work with the UNCT as much as possible
N/A
Agencies are in favour of UN coherence but may have reservation due to leadership issues and way UN coherence is executed
Agency guidance seems to firstly focus on preserving agency turf and not fully in line with letter and spirit of the UNDG guidance
Guidance coming from UNICEF is very clear. Not sure of other agencies
I receive excellent support.
Yes but these messages are often conflicting amongst agencies
Iran does not seem to be a priority to HQs when it comes to issues of coherence...
Our own HQ also wants our own recognition, a double discourse
We receive some, though it does not always help. Some other agencies seem less aware and have less HQ guidance on the matter. With small teams for most agencies and plenty of substantive work to do, it can be difficult also for all to keep track.
The squabbles that sometimes manifest themselves within the UNCT are an indication that either not all UNCT members get clear strategic guidance or if they do, they just ignore it.
Our agency gives strong signal that we must participate actively in UNDAF processes, avoid competition and collaborate when possible with other agencies on program planning and implementation.
Perhaps, not visible
Some messages received in the last few years.
Coherence is only expected to happen at country level since our HQs still operate in their respective silos. Even agency guidelines for planning do not mention anything about coherence. Staff appraisal is silent on coherence or "delivering as one"
Depends on the agency

The messages are not very strong for specialized agencies.
But this guidance does not always seem to be in favour of UN coherence
One thing is to get the guidance, another thing is to implement it
I know about UNICEF. UNICEF sends regular guidance, updates on coherence including updates from global meetings; Q&As from other countries on topical issues, which is shared with all offices.
It is not a major emphasis.
Only vis-a-vis my headquarters
Not much
Yes. But more of the messages received from our Headquarters (UNESCO) are similar or just a copy of DECO or UNGE.
UNESCO is in full compliance with One UN and DaO
Not all agencies as reflected in lengthy discussions on issues already the UNDG has guidelines on. Weak government counterparts encouraged UN not to follow guidelines and even to exert minimum efforts to review guidelines
I can only speak for my organization. Not sure in other organizations
I think it is our individual responsibility as Representatives to seek guidance if we feel we need it.

**20. and 21 combined. The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level. The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level**

Answer Options	The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level - Only RCs responses	The Resident Coordinator's office receives clear strategic guidance from the UNDG on issues related to UN coherence at the country level - All of the UNCT responses	The members of the UNCT receive clear strategic guidance from their own headquarters on issues related to UN coherence at the country level	Response Count
Strongly agree	12.0%	15.1%	22.5%	9



Somewhat agree	54.7%	60.3%	49.5%	41
Somewhat disagree	29.3%	19.4%	22.3%	22
Strongly disagree	4.0%	5.2%	5.8%	3

## 22. Looking to the future, how effective would the following measures be in improving UN coherence at the country-level?

Answer Options	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Slightly effective	Not effective at all	Response Count
Further streamlining of the programming instruments and processes	265	164	46	11	486
Enhancing the role of programme coordination groups	201	218	56	17	492
Requesting UN country teams to set annual and multi-year targets for increasing coherence	186	196	75	34	491
Fully implementing the Management and Accountability System for the Resident Coordinator system	179	210	82	13	484
Giving the Resident Coordinator a stronger coordination role over all the UN funds and programmes	151	135	108	97	491
Giving the Resident Coordinator a stronger coordination role over all the UN country team members	176	119	101	93	489
Establishing common premises	121	120	152	96	489
Sending clear signals from agency headquarters advocating more UN	290	122	68	10	490

coherence at country-level					
Harmonizing the agencies' results-based management systems	245	174	55	17	491
Harmonizing the agencies' reporting procedures	240	166	62	26	494
Increasing harmonization of business processes	239	160	70	18	487
Providing the Resident Coordinator's Office with greater resources	258	133	77	25	493
Providing the UNDG Regional Team with greater resources	95	151	163	77	486
Please feel free to propose additional measures to enhance UN coherence:					80
<i>answered question</i>					<b>497</b>
<i>skipped question</i>					<b>21</b>

## 22. Looking to the future, how effective would the following measures be in improving UN coherence at the country-level? RCs responses by Country Income group

	Income group			
Answer Options	Low income country (LIC)	Lower Middle income country (LMIC)	Upper Middle income country (UMIC)	High Income Country
<b>Further streamlining of the programming instruments and processes- 73 responses</b>				
Very effective	14	20	16	4
Somewhat effective	4	8	4	0
Slightly effective	0	2	0	1
Not effective at all	0	0	0	0
<b>Enhancing the role of programme coordination groups- 73</b>				
Very effective	11	14	10	3
Somewhat effective	5	15	5	1
Slightly	2	1	5	0

effective				
Not effective at all	0	0	0	1
<b>Requesting UN country teams to set annual and multi-year targets for increasing coherence -72</b>				
Very effective	9	11	10	2
Somewhat effective	6	11	6	0
Slightly effective	2	4	1	2
Not effective at all	1	3	3	1
<b>Fully implementing the Management and Accountability System for the Resident Coordinator system -74</b>				
Very effective	10	16	4	2
Somewhat effective	5	8	12	0
Slightly effective	2	6	3	2
Not effective at all	1	1	1	1
<b>Giving the Resident Coordinator a stronger coordination role over all the UN funds and programmes -75</b>				
Very effective	15	20	15	4
Somewhat effective	2	8	4	1
Slightly effective	1	3	1	0
Not effective at all	0	1	0	0
<b>Giving the Resident Coordinator a stronger coordination role over all the UN country team members -73</b>				
Very effective	16	23	13	5
Somewhat effective	1	4	6	0
Slightly effective	1	3	1	0
Not effective at all	0	0	0	0
<b>Establishing common premises -73</b>				
Very effective	4	11	6	3

Somewhat effective	6	6	8	2
Slightly effective	8	11	6	0
Not effective at all	0	2	0	0
<b>Sending clear signals from agency headquarters advocating more UN coherence at country-level -75</b>				
Very effective	18	29	17	4
Somewhat effective	0	2	3	1
Slightly effective	0	1	0	0
Not effective at all	0	0	0	0
<b>Harmonizing the agencies' results-based management systems -74</b>				
Very effective	15	21	11	1
Somewhat effective	3	8	4	1
Slightly effective	0	2	4	2
Not effective at all	0	0	1	1
<b>Harmonizing the agencies' reporting procedures -75</b>				
Very effective	15	24	12	2
Somewhat effective	3	6	5	1
Slightly effective	0	2	3	1
Not effective at all	0	0	0	1
<b>Increasing harmonization of business processes -74</b>				
Very effective	15	24	11	3
Somewhat effective	2	7	8	2
Slightly effective	0	1	1	0
Not effective at all	0	0	0	0
<b>Providing the Resident Coordinator's Office with greater resources -74</b>				
Very effective	18	29	16	5

Somewhat effective	0	2	2	0
Slightly effective	0	0	2	0
Not effective at all	0	0	0	0
<b>Providing the UNDG Regional Team with greater resources -74</b>				
Very effective	9	8	1	1
Somewhat effective	5	9	7	0
Slightly effective	4	11	11	3
Not effective at all	0	3	1	1
Please feel free to propose additional measures to enhance UN coherence:				19
<i>answered question</i>				<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>				<b>3</b>

### Comments:

In terms of resources for the regional team - it should be more in terms of profiles and capacity of human resources to handle supporting the UNCT.
Adequately resourced UN RCO and clear lines of accountability within the UNCT.
The mandate of the UN RC has been expanding over the years. However, in light of decreased resources available for coordination, the support has been declining. There is an imbalance between the responsibilities and the high level of accountability that the RC has, with the significantly decreased human and financial resources to support this function.
Coherence from UNDG, Agency HQ, regional offices down to the Country level is absolute must to achieve greater coherence.
Strip away all the unnecessary process-related burdens.
A better interaction between DOCO and RCs; all agency planning and programming documents for the Country must be endorsed by RC certifying that apart from pursuing their agency specific activities, they do contribute to the UNDAF/UNDCS results; the agencies while monitoring the implementation and reporting on results must report on the contribution their COs have made at the country level to the implementation of UNDAF/UNDCS outcomes; Agencies must allocate at the country level some resources to strengthen the coordination function- this is absolutely essential to instil a sense of ownership and accountability
Giving Governments the tools and capacity to live the change alongside the UN
Providing DOCO with greater resources (very effective)
RCs being consulted on appointments to UNCT i.e. HoAs
This UNCT already regularly works to improve the implementation of DaO. Greater individual accountability of UNCT members for their role in the team enforced by their

respective agency HQ would go a long way. This UNCT already has harmonized reporting procedures and RBM for the cCPAP, however individual and dissenting agency reporting requirements still exist, without due consideration for DaO.
The point on "sending clear signals from agency HQs advocating more UN coherence at country-level" is of vital importance to increase the effectiveness of the efforts to increase UN coherence!!
Clarity in the roles and responsibilities and providing minimum operating capacity to support RC function would remain very critical. This is an area where urgent attention is needed.
In order to ensure the deepening of reform and coherence of the UN System, The RC's should be well resourced
It is of utmost importance to provide the RC Office with greater resources to ensure the proper implementation of UN Reform at the country level
To NOT expect a one 'DAO' model fits all country contexts. UNDG indicating clearly what resources can be drawn from UNDOCO by country teams. If financial resources are not available what ARE the resources, advice, examples and tools available via UNDOCO colleagues to support country lead UN coherence. This area of information or resource sharing is currently silent and information enquiries cannot be met. In the end basic adequate resources to ensure professional advice and facilitation/coordination support at the country level within UN coordination offices/UNRC offices is what is needed, this is where the guidance, shaping, consultation and rollout of UN coherence takes place, this is the only place the UNRC can draw on for dedicated assistance, and this is where there IS NOT any resources coming from HQ, with no clarity with regard to HQ level agreement for UN agencies to be in a position to contribute cost share contributions at the local level. SOME UN agencies continue to advise that they are informed by their HQ's that they are not to or cannot contribute cost share contributions at the country level, YET UNDG/UNDOCO insist this is the mechanism for funding UN coordination budgets at the country level. The second measure would be, on an annual basis providing UNRCs an indication of the donor dialogues/trends that have taken place and are evident at the HQ level with regard for willingness to support country level coherence. Currently RCs are doing this work with their teams on a country by country basis; it would be INVALUABLE to know of these global trends that can then be followed up at the country level. This is the sort of very useful resourcing in terms of advice that could be provided through the UNDG/UNDOCO mechanism and UN country teams, UN coordination teams and RCs would be very willing to dialogue on this further if requested....
It is easy to suggest all these measure but implementation does take a toll on CO staff and UN Representative. We need more resources and manpower to effect these changes. There are still mixed signals when UN Country Team is torn between One UN and their own Agency agenda.
On a security stand point, common premises seem to become soft targets for criminals. Hence a certain hesitation in going for it.
To be frank, enhancing UN coherence rests largely on the host country. To a very large extent it depends on a functioning democracy, where the Government, in consultation with its citizenry, sets development priorities with clear roles and responsibilities, and with international development community (including the UN) being called upon to

support these priorities and being held accountable for generating the results that have been agreed upon. While some steps can always be taken to improve UN coherence, for real progress to be made, the “enabling environment” for development needs to be in place.
Ref: RC stronger coordination role: UNCT is already relatively coherent and willing to accept the RC leadership; the RC currently is the approving authority for joint programmes. Thus the RC coordination role is already quite strong. Ref: greater resources for the RCO: system support is actually going in the reversed direction.
Providing clear and attractive financial incentives for increased UN coherence
All these assume that all agencies have plenty of manpower and resources to spare from actual delivery to attend endless meetings and prepare inputs to innumerable documents. It also assumes that coordination is a fair process, but any process in which the "lead agency" has the whip hand in coordinating is inherently subject to conflicts of interest
Institutionalising the RC's coordinating structure at the country level
Sending clear instructions from Agency HQs advocating more coherence at design and implementation of the communication policies
To standardize internal procedures that are completely different
Common premises should NOT be pushed in the present economic climate. They inevitably lead to greater cost, and they do not provide enhanced security. Moreover, if HQ entities can function across several national boundaries, what's the problem with UN country teams functioning coherently in various parts of the same city?
Providing training and peer learning facilities
Get the M&A system duly implemented and we will go a long way. In addition, invest further in the recruitment of true coordinators and in the continued capacity building on ensuring UN coherence
Clear and strong 'carrots and sticks' system to be put in place
Reducing disconnects between UN planning framework and agency specific planning frameworks. Reforming HACT to reduce transaction cost by extending accounting for funds period to six months and allowing carry-over of a balance.
Ensuring that for joint UN programmes the Agreements between agencies is standard. If each UN Agency has its own LOA it creates challenges which often results in an aborted process for joint programme
UN coherence should be based on the complementariness of expertise and value added of each agency.
Countries should be placed at the centre of UN action, hence the need to allocate more resources to them.
The RC system should change radically: the responsibility of coordinating the UNCT should move from 1 person (the RC) to a FUNCTION. Eliminate the RC post and designate each head of agency to act as "protempore" RC during 1 semester, with rotation among all the heads of Country Offices.
Separate between the RC functions and UNDP Resident Representative functions. If in specific countries the RC function is supported coherence will happen. You cannot do much in a country when you have the RC the only international staff member in UNDP? He needs assistance from the system in training UN staff in the country and initiating programming. With limited finance RC cannot do much.

Because specialized agencies like the FAO have slightly different systems, giving the RC control of funds and programmes may cause some problems, especially if the RC is not a team player. Also some of the financial systems of UNDP are too slow and costly. It makes better sense for our country office to see about its own financial affairs.
Engage member states / governments and donors even more
UNDG should increase their engagement/interaction with country teams
In case of [country] (political and security) situations and taking into consideration the experience of similar situation and what happened in Iraq and other (HOT) countries, the idea of comment premise is not a good idea and must take more in depth discussion
One staff only dedicated in following indicators, projects. If let to one agency, that agency is overwhelmed and has no time to ensure coordination role.
Enforcement of RC / agency "firewall" is recommended.
UNCT retreat in 2012 focused on UN coherence adopted by all but expectation of poor execution which will be supported by increase of joint programme not all in alignment with UNDAF while capacities are limited. hence the process is oriented just to state that it is work in progress in 2012...at least this is what I expect to come... programming mechanisms are poor
HoA accountability to DaO need to be reinforced, HoA get away with anything and solely respond to their Agency incentives & accountability
The planning processes are unnecessarily heavy. Why not simply take the national plans and coherently show where the UN can advantageously collaborate with the nation? As things stand now it is completely unrealistic to expect nations to not only do their own planning but also 'plan with the UN'.
Resource mobilization is crucial.
Establishment of joint funding modality (e.g. MDTF, One Fund), Increased use of joint programmes, Agreement on joint resource mobilization strategy
"A new RC who is interested in promoting the UN and in seeing results rather than and RC set on dismantling systems (so there is less work to do?), and creating conflict and disunity via abusive chairing of the UNCT when his way is not the only way". "Putting in place an RC who is emotionally mature and has a code of ethics compatible with those of the UN". (It is hard to answer the above questions because with our current RC and the lack of leadership there cannot be any progress or coherence except by the good will between agencies who want to cooperate.)
Strong committed RC and firewall in place. Commitment to a coherent UNCT
Advocate at headquarter level (HQs uncoordinated attitude and lack of UN Coherence reflexes are an impediment at CO level)
Resources management should also be enhanced at RC's Office.
Emphasize the "Delivering" in the DaO concept. Create mutual trust. Harmonization/coherence is a means not an end. It should not lower down agencies' performances to the lowest common denominator.
It will be a high time for us to start discussion "coordination for results" at the strategic level rather than continuously discussing "mechanics" of it in terms of structure, process and procedures. An analogy can be drawn from the experiences of Education Reform. Education Reform in many countries fails because it uses inordinate amount of time in discussing structure, process and procedures (e.g. new type of education administration, budget, teachers' salary, etc.) without squarely tackling the final result,



i.e. how well students learn (or not). Too much attention to the former tends to dissipate limited resources and attention span of people before they can really set out on the core business of education, which is the latter. There seems to be a good lesson learned from it.
The UNDAF should be supplemented with JOINT sector-based AWP. For UNCTs in Middle Income Countries, additional measures for staff sharing, common business processes, common services, and better focus on greater value addition are important.
All these measures are helpful and necessary. But not sufficient. UNCTs will focus minds when host governments speak with one voice and put pressure on UNCT to be relevant, useful and efficient in the context of specific national plans or development instruments. In the final analysis, each country will have the UNCT it deserves. The onus is very much on partner countries, whose clarity in terms of needs and priorities will speed up UNCT coherence.
1. Consider rotating the RC function between accredited agency heads in countries with a smaller agency presence. 2. Find ways to communicate more clearly and incentivize clear recognition of the value added of UN agency diversity. 3. Motivate agencies to focus on their mandates and avoid competition by not seeking funding or a leading programmatic role in areas where other agencies hold a clear mandate and competency. Respect and promote different models increased coherence in different contexts rather than one size fits all. Take care not to develop more complex, bureaucratic and time consuming programming and reporting tools which take agency time away from our core mandates
Emphasis in terms of performance by the members of the UNCT should be placed on the role they have played in ensuring coherence. This currently does not seem to be the case
Joint programme (and not always joint programmes) are often the answer but many UN agencies are not keen on taking this on again due to the competition for resources and the preference to run parallel activities/processes and dealings with the in-country partners.
One UN has been going on for six years. You cannot have coherence if you don't have coherence at regional and HQ level. It is time to leave the UNCTs alone with the instruments they have to get on with their work and achieve the results they have committed to. Meanwhile, focus on bringing genuine coherence and DaO to regional teams and HQ locations.
Better coordination depends on the mentality, a number of agencies like to show off
Hopefully the idea here is not to come up with an RC who gets too powerful and overbearing as that kind of power can be abused.
Business processes must be harmonized at the HQ level - Programmatic harmonization can be invented at the field level but not the operational procedures. Common reporting is the other area where HQ must intervene if DaO countries are to go further forward. RC must become the supervisors of all agency "heads" for true effectiveness, with signatory power to enter into contract for all the agencies.
Diversifying selection of resident coordinators. Not more people from UNDP.
Harmonizing the procedures based on governing bodies decisions
Effective and functioning firewall RC and UNDP
The current coordination role is strong enough if applied effectively and firewall is

ensured between the RC's office and UNDP, e.g. by accrediting UNDP Representative. DaO should allow each agency to grow, allowed to fulfil its mandate within a coordinated UN team.
Effective Monitoring and Evaluation is key. Giving the Resident Coordinator more authority will work well or not depending on the capacity of the RC.
Empowering RC role is only helpful if the firewall is fully respected -As long as the dual responsibility of UNDP ResRep and RC exists it will not work. The country has a very competent and good RC and very competent and good UNDP Res Rep, but the fact the same person has to do both function makes it schizophrenic as RC he has to fundraise for all agencies as UNDP Res Rep he has to fundraise himself as he is evaluated on resource mobilization capacity. You can't win in this set-up.
Harmonization in principle makes good sense. But too often harmonization is about reconciling all agencies' guidelines and processes. As a result, harmonization too often becomes the antagonist of simplification.
Where there is no 'team', consensus based leadership and capacity for coordination by agencies, supported by coherent guidelines and processes encompassing multiple agencies, coherence in country is not easy to achieve.
Clear division of labour among UN agencies at country level - reflected in the UNDAF at outcome and output levels. Clear code of conduct, when breached to be transparently addressed (and minuted) at UNCT meetings. Flexible UNDAFs (cooperation frameworks) that allow UNCT's in transitional contexts (mixed humanitarian/development) to properly reflect the local context.
Decisions need to be taken at Executive Board levels to be implemented coherently
Ensuring UNRC represents all agencies equally and is not UNDP-biased
For the special situation of [country] and the presence of UN offices outside the country, the programme coordination groups changed their mandate to be a planning bodies and takes decisions without consultations. The weak government counterparts also added to this problem.
Resident Coordinator is not committed to coordination. There is no influence whatsoever from undg Regional Team.
Coordination of UN activities can take place only if and when the funding of these activities is secured... otherwise there is no commitment to produce extra efforts for unpredictable result.
Establish greater harmonization at the HQ level.
As said, we have streamlined programme process and would want time to try out and evaluate before moving further on this. I also find the M&A framework not clear - it is confusing in part. The "coordination" role needs better definition - there is much confusion whether this is a "facilitation" role, or a "management" role - trying to have "manage a single common programme". With different agencies and governance structures, this creates conflict rather than improving coordination.
We need stronger corporate buy-in from agencies at HQ level
Increase investment in team-building support, using savings from reduced investment in processes
Building capacities of Country Team members and providing them with more resources for the effective realization of their respective programmes.
More visibility of UNCT HOAs/UNRC in media, as a team, group photos at every

important host country/region occasion, so that UNCT faces become familiar to host govt officials and general public

**23. From your observations, please rate the willingness of key external development partners to collaborate with each other and with the UN at the country level.**

**Please rate the partners on the scale 1 to 3 (with 1 as very willing):**

	<b>1 (Very willing)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3 (Not willing at all)</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
International financial institutions and other multilateral organizations	85	327	76	488
Bilateral donors	144	315	24	483
Please provide any additional comments				46
<i>answered question</i>				<b>490</b>
<i>skipped question</i>				<b>28</b>

**Comments:**

Very few multilateral organizations/bilateral donors available in the country.
There are very few donors in the country and no international NGOs are present. Due to the very restricted operational space, bilateral and multilateral aid to [country] is very limited, except for the Asia Development Bank lending on large infrastructure projects.
It is more on sectors and themes that they cooperate and coordinate in, not at every level.
Depends completely on personalities.
When it comes to IMF and WB, this has been left so open ended and open to individual decision. So one goes from always having had the IMF and WB as part of the UNCT, to a change in directors now stating that they are NOT a part of the UNCT. The issue here is less about whether they should or shouldn't, but a clear and confirmed line to all whether these institutions are indeed a part of the UNCT or not. No wrong answer here, but then we follow a standard approach
In MICs donors are not really willing to bring in huge amount of funds for assistance
Some donors want it more than others. Leaders here are: EU and AusAid. Some donors desire to have big say but without offering much resources and support (in my current duty station, DFID/UK and US fall into this category)
Willingness depends on relative weight of partners in specific country situation

Bilaterals want UN to work together but expect us to pay the transaction costs for increased harmonization. Core funding for a professional RC officer track from P-3 to D-1 depending on country context, is crucial.
Sometimes it depends on the individuals heading these missions the IMF works together but the World Bank works alone until it needs "something" from the UN.
The desire to collaborate is there, but its translation into actual actions and results varies and is dictated more by donor preferences.
Based on my previous experience in a MIC.
Not applicable
Need to be strengthened
Bilateral Donors: There is a mixed picture, some countries do support, some (notably also big) donors do require the UN to play by the donors' rules. IFIs: we have seen no serious interest so far, IFI have other functioning modalities
The [country] government is so unreliable that donors feel happy not to throw their money into the waste ground
Collaboration functions up, but not including, opening the pocket book or writing a cheque.
World Bank and DfID are key.
The impression is that Donors and financial institutions are willing to partner with NGOs as the latter gain the ground
Bilateral are very few in the country and have very limited programmes and technical assistance. They acknowledge the UN presence and comparative advantage
Some development partners are very willing, others work on their own; this position varies widely among donors and partners.
Bilaterals still do their own thing even though they claim to favour the DaO.
At this crucial junction donors are questioning the on going coordination within [country]... again it was raised by donors at World Bank programme meeting yesterday (21 February). While [country] has limited donors and UN agencies have limited capacities while the country has plenty of resources and but poor capacities as well as there is a need for UN to play a leadership role to bridge the gaps and enhance relation between government and donors even if [country] has the resources for its development...UN coherence should play that role too not the quest for funding. Donors expect greater UNRC role in promoting and improving coordination and UN coherence for this there is a need to have a very experience RC not newly appointed one with limited field experience that see donors the same way government sees them
WB, EU etc largely ignore UN at country level
All of these at the end, depends on negotiations and the smartness of the RC and/or the Representatives of the agencies
Donors have no interest in middle income countries and UN's role
Relations between UNDP and WB have historically been disastrous. WB Country Manager is 100% willing to cooperate
Huge variability among bilateral donors.
In the case of my country which is an upper-middle income one, there are no bilateral donors as such, hence the rating of 3.
We work with USAID, Plan internacional, JICA
You should include our future: the private sector.

Not sure how to respond this question. Normally all bi-lateral donors would like to see more collaboration within the UN system but in this country they have so few resources to put in that they don't really get involve much with the UN system.
The country is under sanction, this situation affects the country to receive support from the external development partners
For Iraq, it is becoming a challenging issue for the UN agencies in Iraq how to mobilize resources locally because Iraq is considered a middle income country by donors; although so many vulnerabilities are still affecting million of Iraqis
Bilateral donors at country level are dealing directly with the Gov
Collaboration among partners is at its infancy in Tunisia
UN system is well accepted by partners.
Bilateral donors are mainly focussed on humanitarian issues and not development
Bilateral donors don't really understand UNDAF & RC System - Most donors in middle income countries are not familiar with the UN system as it is in LDCs.
It is not that they are unwilling, but neither major IFIs nor bilateral donors exist and there is no donor coordination mechanism.
In Uzbekistan, bilateral resident donors are working almost exclusively with Government counterparts.
Most multi-laterals and bi-laterals have their clear agendas, there is some scope for cooperation but it is not very easy. When focussing upon issues/themes one can make better progress.
Parallel funding is common
IFIs and WB attends UNCT meetings which is positive. Other than that not much engagement
Most partners find it impossible to collaborate with "the UN as a whole", as they would normally be interested in specific parts of it. For instance, a partner interested in "environment" wants to talk to those UN partners that deal with environment, not with the "entire UN system". The partners know exactly with whom they need to talk.
The UN has a lead role.

## 24. How would you assess the cooperation between the UNCT and the World Bank at the country-level?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	5.5%	27
Somewhat effective	25.3%	125
Slightly effective	30.0%	148
Not effective at all	24.3%	120
Don't know	9.3%	46
Not applicable	5.7%	28
Please explain, referring for example to concrete collaboration strategies or programmes:		89
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>494</b>

<i>skipped question</i>	24
-------------------------	----

**Comments:**

WB doesn't have any programmes in Iran.
The World Bank is an active member of the UNCT and co-chair of one of the UNDAF theme groups. There has been some collaboration at the programmatic level, but there is potential to do much more.
Still a lot of work and understanding required from WB and others IFIs as they have more budgetary resources. There is clear separation of sectors we work in any country as they work basic on economic/fiscal policy advisory and we in sustainable livelihoods and basic services delivery. We can work together more closely in aid coordination capacity enhancing at country level according to the Paris, Accra and Busan agreements.
The World Bank does participate in UNCT meetings but actual collaboration is still limited.
We have good relations and have worked together on joint op-eds, for instance, and some joint analytical products. But there is no cooperation in project implementation.
Co-chairing of informal ambassador group; UN active participation in CG; but not much active programme cooperation.
In most cases, key messages are different. They compete for funds from the same donors.
Good cooperation at the strategic level when needed. No competition and good personal relations. Common voice on issues of economic reforms and climate change, for example. But no institutional buy-in as part of One UNCT.
Apart from sharing information on limited areas of mutual interest, there is no interest on the part of WB to work with the UN system on strategic basis.
This is about to change with new WB leadership assuming office
No presence of the WB
Very effective for post disaster needs assessment and DRR in general. Somewhat effective in Education. Less effective in other areas mainly because the IFIs and UN Agencies have different main government counterpart agencies (Finance versus Planning), so it is less easy for the government to foster that cooperation.
The WB does not attend SMT meetings if at all.
This has improved significantly in past 6 months with new WB leadership at country level.
We have a two window Trust Fund and shared Steering Committee meetings. We co-chair the Iraq Partners Forum.
Good cooperation at technical level, but no WB interest at high level
Although it is a nominal member of the UNCT, the World Bank has in practice opted out from any discussion from the UNCT, except for their participation to the Inter-agency communication group. The collaboration with the World Bank varies from agency to agency. Some of them (ex. FAO) maintain good working relations with the World Bank at the sectoral level.
This cooperation has grown stronger over the past two - three years and has been a welcome and productive change.

None
The UN and the World Bank are presently collaborating at the strategic level on the development of a peace consolidation programme; a shared conflict analysis and the development of conflict prevention measures
World Bank is not present in the country as yet, but information sharing and bringing in World Bank expertise is taking place.
Due to country context, there is slightly acceptable level of cooperation
Despite the existence of a decentralization framework in which, UNDP/UNCDF, several bilateral donors and European Union are supporting the national decentralization programme, the World Bank decided to set up a new project and to locate it in the Prime Minister's Office. After 2009 floods, UNDP and World Bank developed a joint PDNA; however, we heard that the World Bank is poised to approve a project aiming at strengthening the capacity of government in dealing with disasters while the UN agencies are already doing the same. These are examples of missed opportunities for collaboration.
WB has participated actively in UNCT, in UNDAF and joint campaign for peace and dialogue
The World Bank was an important and effective member of a joint UN – WB mission on Food Security and Nutrition in 2009. The Bank has also contributed to other UN analytical exercises from time to time. Unfortunately, partnerships between the UN and the Bank (as well as other MFI's) are constrained due to the limitation imposed on them by the Government, namely limiting their funding to “productive” projects, which tend to be large-scale infrastructure (e.g., airports) and energy, where the UN is not involved, thereby reducing possibilities for collaboration.
The World Bank is among the main group of donors in Haiti; cooperation is not on programmatic matters but rather on more strategic issues such as donor coordination, which the RC leads as chair of the main donor group in Haiti.
The WB do not attend UNCT meetings on a regular basis
World Bank does not participate in UNCT
Due to security the World Bank has been absent for much of last year.
Cooperation between UNCT and WB in MX is scarce
Local World Bank rejects UNCT integration
It is very effective at the strategic programme level. It begins to fall apart when we have to deal with the lawyers and fiduciary risk people from Washington.
UN Joint Team on AIDS
Environment protection and anti-corruption/anti-money laundering
Collaboration on Social Protection, Productive Safety Net Programme, National Nutrition Programme
There is no joint program of work or common projects with the WB
[Country] is in context of a fragile country and does have the capacity while WB usually works with the Government
World Bank is not an active member of UNCT; share information and participate on a very sporadic basis
Needs more cooperation as there are great opportunities for collaboration
We had several meetings with the WB CO and field missions in Guinea. The outcome is nil so far. During the recent WB's mission in Guinea of 10 Administrators including

Mr. Agapito Mendes Dias for Guinea, the invitation letter received called for a diner where discussions were to be held with the UNS on development issues, harmonization of procedures and possible synergies. The only outcome was a diner with only bilateral discussions if not at all.
But good relationships
In the two years I have served in this duty station, the world bank has never participated in any UNCT meetings. Collaboration is very weak to my knowledge.
Development partners coordination need fast improvement and donors raised the issue with the Bank lately...there is a need for clear division of labour among development partners and have stronger RC to enhance leadership.
Collaboration on AIDS funding through PMPS - Great participation to all country team
They need to be part of the UNCT
WHO and WB are closely collaborating on the establishing of an Health Systems Performance Assessment
WB Country Manager is reaching out to mend fences with UNDP. WB has always been open to collaboration with non-UNDP Agencies.
World Bank co-chairs the Iraq Partners Forum (donor forum); participates in the Security Management Team (SMT); invited to UNCT meetings; involved in flagship joint programmes (Private Sector Development, Public Sector Modernisation)
Limited to policy discussions in sectors where the WB manage trust funds
WB left the country and does not keep UNCT informed on what they may be doing from outside the country
No Cooperation
The WB has not participated in UN CT Meetings for years and they did not participate in any of the UNDAF related meetings
Not sure it exists. However, with the regional IFIs collaboration is excellent (e.g. Inter-American Development Bank.
The relations tend to be agency and programme specific. UNICEF enjoys extremely effective collaboration with WB around education and social protection.
It is frankly not applicable. The World Bank only have a technical person who is providing technical support to the ministry of planning to try and come up with the public accounts I believe since 2008.
World Bank for strange reasons is a member of the UNCT but does not sign the UNPAF. The bank only gets info from UNCT, make use of inputs, manpower but doesn't recognize partnership with UN. This should be addressed as the World Bank doesn't consider UN's role and contribution
WB Rep. absent from all meetings. Even the RC never met him
I see no evidence of significant WB-UNCT cooperation - however, that might be just my perspective.
There are some joint projects between some UN agencies and WB but by-and large WB prefers to operate independently
Little involvement of WB in UNCT work
The World Bank country manager is included in the extended UN country team.
The World Bank is too dominant and too influential with government.
There is a limitation to this given the centralized structure of WB as opposed to UN agencies like UNDP that gives significant delegation of authority to their reps in the



field
They practically do not participate in UNCT work - collaboration eventually appears with WHO on health projects
The bank is an important co-sponsors of UNAIDS but do not associate with UN theme group or Joint Team on AIDS
WB not part of UNDAF discussion. They are in general not keen to share information on their programmes and prefer to do things by themselves. No incentive for them to want to work with the UN.
Especially in the area of health
World Bank has limited presence / funding in [country] due to sanctions.
My agency works well with WB
WB participates to the UNCT meeting occasionally, and has included the UNCT in consultation on their country strategic plan. UNCT members participate to technical working groups chaired by the WB. but no particular linkages in programming
Cooperation with the World Bank still seems a bit person-specific. It does not seem to have strong institutional commitment
Depends on the interest of the WB
UN and WB have limited cooperation in the annual donor and government meeting
Formal cooperation at level of UNCET and UNDAF is good but not effective since WB works at the level of Government and its ministries and institutions. Is a matter of credibility for them (WB) and the Government here looks happy with such intervention.
Depends on interest of WB country director; has declined with change in WB country director
Unfortunately here the WB is a complete lone-goer, by passing even other donor agencies
We still could not come up with strong evidence but willingness is present.
This is different from the cooperation that the WB has some agencies individually, which is good.
Too soon to tell, because World Bank only recently brought a Resident Representative into the country, but it could become very effective.
WB never presented any strategy-proposal for increasing joint collaboration
Pour Madagascar, au cours des 3 dernières années à cause de la crise, un cadre conjoint de travail n'est pas effectif
<b>For Madagascar there has been no effective joint framework for the past 3 years due to the crisis.</b>
WB participates regularly in the UNCT
Contributing to the strategic decisions of UNCT as a permanent member of the UNCT
The world bank is part of our UNCT, even though they are not participating regularly in our monthly meetings.
WB is not present at most of the meetings i attend
In spite of efforts, the WB has not been consultative
Very good cooperation - WB is part of the UNCT (along with ADB)
WB office for 14 countries located in Canberra Australia, while UNCT PNG has very

close dialogue and cooperation (country analysis) with WB office located in PNG.
--

## 25. How would you assess the cooperation between the UNCT and the regional banks at the country-level?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	3.6%	18
Somewhat effective	17.6%	87
Slightly effective	24.4%	121
Not effective at all	28.3%	140
Don't know	18.0%	89
Not applicable	8.1%	40
Please explain, referring for example to concrete collaboration strategies or programmes:		47
<b><i>answered question</i></b>		<b>495</b>
<b><i>skipped question</i></b>		<b>23</b>

### Comments:

The Asian Development Bank has significantly expanded its portfolio in Uzbekistan. They are represented on the SMT, and whilst several opportunities exist for collaboration, there has been little interest from them to do so.
Work UNFPA with African Development Bank is effective.
A lot needs to be done to bring them on board as they cooperate more with the IFIs than UNCTs.
The Asian Development Bank does participate in UNCT meetings but actual collaboration is still limited.
Some such as ADB are very cooperative, both at the regional and national levels.
AfDB and the UN co-chair the donors group in this rotation. So regular and very positive interaction and communications. Also joint advocacy in areas of common interests. More of a challenge when it comes to programme collaboration given the divergence of procedures and conditions.
New for Angola
EBRD and BSDB work more with the government and private sector investments
With no presence on the ground, it is much more difficult to develop a working relationship
We have two very strong projects between IDB and UNDP, they are much more flexible and better prepared than we are to collaborate despite this fact we are working very well but with a lot of red tape and cumbersome procedures from our side!
For example, we found out by chance that ADB was supporting the elaboration of a national inclusive finance policy, when inclusive finance is an important dimension of

poverty reduction and supported separately by the UN Agencies. ADB is not able to provide information about their programme directly to the RC; the RC is requested to make a formal request to the Ministry of Finance to obtain this information.
We are trying to make it work but it's somewhat personality driven with WB HQs not making this to be a priority for its country managers.
It is effective and constructive but quite limited in scope/scale
Hardly any cooperation with the African and Islamic Development Banks.
In this case the AfDB
Same case as for the bank.
Good relations, good collaboration on donor coordination, but less so on programme implementation.
On a ad hoc basis; therefore, needs to be formalized
Since my arrival to the country over four years ago, there has been no interaction
A certain degree of interaction but cooperation on concrete topics or programmes is scarce
This has improved very significantly over the past three years.
UN Partnership with IDB on Disaster Risk Management
There is no joint program of work or common projects with the IDB
Just collaboration but no complementariness, and synergy on operational ground.
UNIDO signed an MOU with ECOBANK on 10 March 2010 on Promoting Growth in Africa. Apparently, this never came into effect on the ground.
AIDS regional project
Need approach them
Because the regional banks are not present in the country
Collegial.
Although our organization was able to mobilize some funds from the ADB through the Ministry of health to implement the DHS.
See response to #19
Regular participation in UN and banks' activities. Joint programme exist in some areas (e.g. health).
With ADB - cordial relationship but no concrete collaboration
Same as above
No systematic cooperation and they are not part of the UNCT
In particular in the field of Education and Management (capacity building).
Recent RAHA II project under One UN is supplementing Japan funded ADB construction project of Torqan - Peshwar Highway, so geographically in line with ADB project, Only geographically
ADB has strong presence but more on there own.
Again - this is different from the cooperation that exists with individual agencies, which is reasonably good from our perspective.
Regional Bank IADB is not a UNCT member. There is not a single joint activity
Même raison
<b>Same reason</b>
BafD participates regularly in the UNCT
Contributing to the strategic decisions of UNCT as a permanent member of the UNCT

IMF is part of the UNCT, while ADB is not
as above
ADB - is a member of the UNCT
Regular dialogue with Asian Development Bank located in Fiji, and very close dialogue with AsDB located in PNG. However, the cross fertilization of programmes could be strengthened.

**26. Taking all factors into consideration, particularly the UN's effectiveness, efficiency and coherence, greater efforts should be made to involve non-resident UN agencies in the activities of the UNCT:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	37.8%	187
Somewhat agree	40.4%	200
Somewhat disagree	12.7%	63
Strongly disagree	5.9%	29
Don't know	3.2%	16
Please provide any additional comments		84
<i>answered question</i>		<b>495</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>23</b>

**26. Taking all factors into consideration, particularly the UN's effectiveness, efficiency and coherence, greater efforts should be made to involve non-resident UN agencies in the activities of the UNCT. Only RCs responses**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	38.7%	29
Somewhat agree	42.7%	32
Somewhat disagree	16.0%	12
Strongly disagree	2.7%	2
Don't know	0.0%	0
Please provide any additional comments		28
<i>answered question</i>		<b>75</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>3</b>

**Comments:**

Non-resident agencies create more work for the UNCT - so increased resources for the RC unit to then do so.
As long as they have technical capacities relevant to the priorities of the country
NRAs make things difficult for UNCTs as they go directly to their implementing partners. Only come to UNCT when they need operational support most of the time. They should be involved in country level programmes if they are able to establish country level programmes.
Non resident agencies should also make more efforts to inform the UNCT of their activities in the country.
Efforts to involve NRA from the country level should be strategic and from the NRA side, involvement should be made on the basis of a realistic assessment to meaningfully participate in UNCT activities
Yes but they need to make sure they have the right staff to participate. If they send only their most junior staff to all UNCT events, including those where decisions need to be taken, they become a burden to the UNCT. Decisions cannot be taken, everything needs to be consulted with their main offices etc.
Easier said than done, so need to think outside box, on specific modalities through which such can be facilitated, as we have been saying this for many years. Maybe the role and voice can be formally delegated to specific same sector UN entities who are present, and who are then held accountable for also representing that NRA....
This needs to be resourced better
Given the merging challenges and the complexity of the development issues coupled with competitive and changing international aid architecture and scenario, UN needs to provide best of expertise and maximize the synergies to be able to demonstrate its value add and create enhanced development impact. In Turkey we have been able to successfully engage UNEP, UNWTO, UNESCO in particular through JPs to respond to the development needs effectively, efficiently and coherently
NRAs are fully involved in the DaO process and are signatories to the One Fund
Current tendency is for non-resident agencies to only look at own interests and not interests of the team
NRAs participate actively already.
We make a lot of efforts already, but we could do even better. Their responsiveness given their multi-country responsibility is also an issue.
Strong efforts are already being made in Rwanda in this regard and have indeed strengthened the UN's coherence and ability to provide comprehensive support to national development priorities.
Not all are equally interested in coordination
In Mozambique, this is already advanced. No need for big change in effort. NRA officer posted in RCO ensures regular consistent engagement.
RC tries, but often it is the NRAs who do not have capacity or interest to respond
The involvement of NRAs should not distort the internal balance within UNCT
Strong efforts are made to involve NRAs in the activities of the UNST but this is still an important challenge as NRAs tend to sit in four or five Country Teams.
Strongly agree that this is useful and valuable, But in the context that this is already the case in our country context and we see the value of that which could be mirrored in

other areas. The answer is really to establish a UN country team without distinction and then look at how best to communicate with those members, including their in country desk officers, country managers etc where needed, this ensures very effective information flow and a well informed country team as a whole
It should be recognized that "involvement" is a two-way street, and should not be driven by NR agency requirements for funding.
It does make the UN more effective and relevant
We maintain a list of non-resident agencies and copy them on the Minutes of our monthly and ad hoc UNCT meetings
On the condition that they have substantive capacities that can support UN country level activities
Involvement of non-resident UN agencies should go both ways: the UNCT should try to reach out to these agencies; they should also try to keep in touch with the UNCT.
They should also contribute to share the costs
Inputs of non resident UN agencies were sought in the preparation of the UNDAF and its annual reviews
The RCO has limited human and financial resources - non-resident agencies need to have their own capacity to organize visits and to send advance staff to establish visit activities.
As a non-resident member of two other country teams, I have had mixed experiences, largely dependent on the personal style of a given UNRC.
This has proven to guarantee more coherence and better coordination. Nevertheless, agreements should be established in terms of mandates and accountability.
Non-resident agencies frequently ignore the UNCT and organize activities without communicating with the Resident Coordinator.
NRA's need to have at least a desk staffed by one competent and proactive staff in order to be active at the country level
The gains would be marginal in comparison with the effort.
This should solely depend on the country's priorities
It is weighing transaction costs against greater synergies. It is already a challenge to coordinate between resident agencies.
This has been requested by Counterparts
Has to be related to relevance to national and UN priorities - which would be justification for greater efforts.
All UNCT meetings should be diffused through internet to allow for a close and distant participation in debates on UN priorities, strategic issues and programming activities
This is particularly important for IFAD with respect to WFP, which is highly important in moving a value chain programme forward especially in the area of market access to farmers; produce
UNCT should include the non resident agencies via teleconferences, as their role is strategic.
Demand Driven, if needed in response to Government priorities
Not only non resident UN agencies but also in the case of Congo non resident donors that have a say through EU and OECD including CHINA. The bank has a clause with China and could be useful in this field
The NRA are already fully included in the UNCT Mozambique

We have excellent experience in Turkey on this
I have not seen a particular 'positive' out of this; however it is a necessary evil!!
Yes but efforts have been made enough
The problem is "How"?
Once again, the situation differs case by case.
In the case of Iran and Middle Income Countries, the few agencies with focused programmes and clear value addition is the better
Very difficult coordination
However, from experience, non-resident agencies are putting additional burden on UN CT and do not always contribute to the strategic planning processes and do not bear any responsibility with the government as they are not bound by signed agreements. Moreover, non-resident agencies are not able to provide immediate technical support that is usually provided by the programme staff from the offices of the UN Resident Agencies.
Taking all experience into consideration, agencies that are not present should not expect much from the UNCT and from the host government. To be heard, we must be present and engaged.
Especially in a country where only five agencies are present. Agencies such as UN Women should have a greater implication in all the processes which is not currently the case.
Depends on NRA capacity to contribute their share of RCO running costs and their ability to work with RBM based UNDAFs
The weakness is that not being present on the field their understanding of the context is limited and their implication most due to staff availability is usually reduced to information provided by the UNCT to the NRA
RC do his best to involve non Resident UN Agencies
Non-resident UN agencies can fill the gaps in term of development assistant to the country.
A number of NRAs, e.g. UNESCO have in fact been actively participating in UNCT activities, especially in UNDAF and joint programming
We have pretty high level of NRA involvement already in Albania
There are already a lot of coordination challenges with the resident agencies. Non-resident agencies do not know the country context and seldom want to insert themselves in existing initiatives, but establish their own.
Agencies should be working only within their core competencies.
There are already very substantive efforts made by Malawi to involve NRAs, so there is not much more that we can do.
They only make it more complicated - See last UNDAF process
Non-resident agencies will be well-advised not to meddle
They are adequately engaged, I believe
Certainly. but still a lot of work to do just within the UN family
Depending on the Government priority, capacity and willingness to accept NRAs.
In this country, definitely UN Agencies must be represented on the spot.with a fully agreement from Government.
The context in [country] is still too fragile to have most non-resident agencies play a

significant role.
Non resident agency is not visible and they are not willing to participate in One UN in Pakistan
This is done but there is always room for improvement
They do not provide any value added at all. We bent over backwards to involve them in the UNDAF development process and they appeared.
Not always clear what they bring to table; Increasing funding pool often seems their biggest interest
It requires very strong coordinating body. Currently UNCT is still struggle with our own coordination.
But only if the NRAs are willing to put time into this. If we are doing our UNDAF, a lot of time could be spent chasing inputs/comments from NRAs, and this can cause delays.
Non-resident agencies have not the same level of commitment, hence it would not be effective
Hard to integrate them with the daily activities of the based UN Agencies
Not so much "somewhat" but rather "slightly"
If you want a full reflexion of UN intervention in a country it is important to have non resident agencies. However being a non resident agency in several countries, I must admit that it is difficult to put strong reliable information in these "some how "fare away UNDAF", decreasing the quality of the UNDAF.
These agencies don't have significant programmes and are usually focused on one government agency which does not affect the overall plans of the UNCT
Why?
Where NRAs have been involved, their involvement was (generally) sporadic, untimely and with little consideration of the overall effort
The non-resident agencies have very limited capacity, and efforts to include them just over-stretch them and confuse government
Need for particularly involvement of UNCTAD and ITC, and also other non resident UN agencies

## 27. Are there any additional comments or suggestions you would like to make?

Answer Options	Response Count
<i>answered question</i>	<b>98</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>420</b>

### Comments:

The UNCT works in a very restricted operational environment that impedes significantly on its capacity to deliver coherently and effectively. Nevertheless, despite these challenges including the absence of an independent civil society, the UN has a



strong relationship with the government and is seen as a trusted and credible partner by the government, that is delivering on critical issues under its mandate, and broadening its partnerships (to the extent that this is possible) with a wide range of national actors.
Regional Offices and NRAs should seek more cooperation and advice from in-country UN agencies and funds and programmes, not just at the sectoral level alone.
Harmonization of agencies policies, regulations and procedures at the Headquarters level would be very important in improving UN coherence at country level.
The RCO capacity to liaise with NRA should be enhanced.
There is growing realization- evidence based, that UN working together creates enhanced development impact by optimizing the synergies and maximizing the knowledge and best practices function from all across the globe. However ways and means are not there to translate this realization and commitment especially at the country level into reality. For RC to exercise the coordination and coherence role, (a) corporate commitment of agencies is absolute imperative in terms of harmonizing their business processes and results framework; (b) RC needs to be empowered to authenticate the CPAPs and country planning frameworks of the agencies; and (c) resource commitment has to be made by the agencies to strengthen the coordination function at country level and to ensure a wider ownership and accountability
Coordination Office's decrease of available resources has resulted in laying off of coordination staff, resulting in very weak capacities to provide support to Agencies.
Reduce number of agencies with operational representation at country level and ask a reduced number of agencies to represent others.
Please, be committed at both global en regional levels to the reform: much talk and little action, so far! We are at the country level really needing your political will!
None at all
Please utilise this cycle of revision to take next steps to clarify the UN agency position on contribution of cost share contributions to UN coordination at the country level. This is the ONE BIG ISSUE when it comes to mobilising resources against the UN coordination budget and work plan, particularly now that DOOCO funds have shrunk to the extent they have. Without this clarification there is a potential for ever increasing distortion potentially in UNCT's if we are not careful. All agencies at the country level recognise the value of UN coordination at the country level but some are restricted by HQ directives to contribute in cash as expected by UNDOCO. All the expectations on RCs, on UNCT's and on the UN system as a whole at the country level in relation to Government's and other stakeholders, cannot be managed, advised, facilitated and strategized by an NOC (as indicated by the equation for determining DOOCO funds to UNRCs at present).... this single clarification of policy and at the same time advocacy for encouraging cost share contribution to UN coordination at this level is the single thing currently that will allow minimalist yet efficient UN coordination teams to function. Otherwise very shortly you will have a global network of RCs with very big expectations upon their shoulders with no resources available to them to do that work beyond convening meetings and recording that discussion.
I believe that there should be more face to face meetings with the RDT's if they are to judge us... more involvement and guidance not just the "long arm" of a faceless non-present entity !
There need to be some development results and accountability oriented indicators for

increased coherence. It is not helpful to talk of coherence in the abstract. There need to be indicators for accountability of individual agency Reps. Increased coherence is not the onus of the RC alone. Agencies at the country level need to contribute financially to the efforts of the UNCT for increased coherence in the absence of global funding. This cannot be voluntary or representation without taxation. With regard to RCO funding, the ideal situation would be to ensure predictable RCO funding from HQs - minimum 1 International Professional; 1 National Professional, 1 support staff plus additional funding for specific activities such as consultancy support and UNCT joint activities.
A decreasing level of support from DOCO is being felt and this doesn't help reinforce coordination on the ground. Some agencies are still dependent on their HQ for any decision to be made in the field. This is not helpful when the UNCT makes a decision having a budgetary implication, which is later on turned down by an agency HQ. More decentralized management arrangements would be most welcome.
The situation is different from one context to another.
There is a growing demand for alignment of UN assistance on coordination mechanisms (including at the sector level and the use of basket funds) involving donors, UN agencies and the government. In this environment, the UNDAF could be seen by government and donors as redundant.
1) Tinkering with generic bureaucratic tools (e.g. UNDAF guidelines) will not lead to better coordination and results. What matters most is a genuine collective effort to develop a collective vision of country context and priorities and to define relatively few joint activities in strategic issues. 2) We should also avoid a "maximalist" approach and try to focus on doing a few truly important things together instead of attempting to coordinate everything with all agencies. 3) In general, DOCO as well as the agencies should prioritise country level presences and capacity much more over HQs and regional offices in the allocation of resources. Donor countries should also be asked to restore their support for coordination functions at country level considering that the recent budgetary reductions are making it difficult for many RCOs to maintain even their minimum functions and the agencies are also suffering severe limitations which make it difficult for them to compensate for the DOCO budget cuts.
As is implicit in my response to a number of questions, this exercise needs to also focus on national considerations that foster – or inhibit – the UN's coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency, and not only or overwhelmingly on internal UN (or UN/IFI) considerations.
There should clear formal consent from non-resident agencies to RC to represent them. This is not systematically done as was in the past. But it is necessary to demonstrate support for the RC and UN coherence.
Please share best practices on the questions above
NONE
On communications matters, UNDG should work more closely with DPI, which has multi-faceted expertise on such matters.
Not.
No
I would recommend thinking not about coherence in the area of fund-raising and implementation of activities, but also in the area of coherent promotion and advocacy,

communication strategies...since it can influence on our image in eyes of donors, partners and beneficiaries. Instructions should be sent to the Agencies by their HQ and then they will be implemented at the country level
If you want ONE UN you have to work to harmonize structures, accounting and administration systems. I have a headache every time I need to process a payment order because I am not allowed to use Atlas, just a small example to tell you how difficult it is to work as one when each of us is so different.
No additional comments
We have to move forward together. We have begun well but still many things to do. But the momentum needs to be kept up and strengthened.
Please maintain the principle of "no one size fits all". The UN system must adapt to the environment in which it finds itself, and it must especially be able to be "outward looking", not overly focused on its own internal coordination at the expense of results for people through productive partnerships both inside and outside the UN.
NO
More coordination from the UNRC to other head of agencies
It is important to organize an induction session for the new comers in UNCT particularly for national staffs
It is very important to involve non-resident UN agencies in the activities of the UNCT, but considering their limitations of resources, particularly the number of staff.
"Delivering as one" is the way to better support the countries and UN policies and guidance should be more consistent with this ultimate goal.
N/A
Please stop sending us surveys, or at least limit the number of them. During the current week I have had to answer to 17 different surveys or evaluation instruments
Middle income countries present great opportunity for the UN to bring together its collective knowledge in supporting response to their development challenges
UN RC will promote resource mobilisation for joint programmes, also for NRAs.
There are few agencies that are holistic in their intervention approach. Such agencies touch on cross-cutting issues along their intervention lines. One of the agencies is IFAD. Therefore, it is suggested that relevant UN agencies should lash onto IFAD and take advantage of its (IFAD) presence in each country to design their interventions. For instance, IFAD is at the forefront of ensuring women and youth participation in development. All IFAD programmes are gender sensitive. IFAD is also pioneering a Community-driven development (CDD) approach which is a framework for all-inclusive, participatory governance/development (that promotes transparency and accountability). IFAD is also a driver of value chain agricultural development/agribusiness development trying to integrate development with economic growth to create wealth for the client countries and directly benefiting rural poor households. For these three instances, since IFAD intervention is location specific based on the decision of the governments (borrowers of IFAD fund), UN WOMEN in the affected countries can reposition to work in those location-specific sites that are benefiting from IFAD programmes. The same applies with UNIDO. It will be important for UNIDO to work in those locations (within the country) that are benefiting from IFAD value chain programmes. Similarly, UNDP in the affected countries can work in those locations that benefit from IFAD CDD programmes. This arrangement

will promote complementariness, leverage resources among agencies and upscale results. In doing so, UN agencies will inherently work as one.
None
RC & UNCT must pay more attentions to the HIV issue in the country and link it with development priorities to achieve Universal access target as well as MDGs by 2015
The UN agencies are essentially working together the day that UNDAF needs to be reviewed; otherwise more individuals spirit prevails.
No
None.
UN Agencies HQ Management should give clear instructions/orientations to their Representatives to fully support the One UN spirit.
Enhancing coordination and leadership is the main task of UNDG for Congo otherwise...Congo will be seeking the support for building its capacities and the dev partners will be failing the tasks due to lack of division of labour... and understanding in the dialogue with government. It is not only UN coherence but the role of development partners and how the UN could bridge the gaps that help and encourage Congo in moving towards an emerging country. Otherwise it will be more costly to development partners in the near future... government is spelling out a new PRSP almost finalized,, it is time for UN to promote a strong leadership and better coordination within UN and with development partners.
Guidelines, procedures etc are fine however what we really need to change is attitude, behaviour and corporate culture of individual agency HoA, who take themselves far too serious and behave like small emperors ... whilst in fact being responsible for small issues / small amount of resources and mediocre technocrats
No
The China RC office needs additional funding to perform its coordination duties effectively. Please support them.
No
No
I have never seen such lack of leadership in my 22 years in the UN. It is more like destructive leadership - dangerous, vindictive, manipulative... destructive. The RC turned down an invitation to a national launch of an immunization campaign extended by the President. The Government was horrified and they knew the RC was in town and free. My experts say this was the biggest insult that could be made to the country. I can only think he did not come because UNDP does not work in health... but I cannot image why. He simply does not care and is not interested in the work. The UN system in [country] would be better off if the current RC were removed and agencies took turns serving as RC a.i. I have initiated contact with NY to ask the system to report abusive and unethical behaviour... but I do fear retaliation.
Not sure that a UN common premises is a good thing nowadays because of various threats from extremists.
The importance of reinforcing the RC office
Middle Income Countries offer a unique opportunity for all UN agencies to mulgimate at country level into one large body with small internal units representing specific agency mandates.
No

There is more room for the UN to be effective at country level. This will only happen if the UNCT works as a team. The selection of Representatives by the various agencies that in the final analysis constitute the UNCT is very important.
No
Move away from heavy processes which are what we see when harmonizing the UN family. We need results; we need more flexibility UNDAF takes one full year! UNDAF action plan another year! Every country needs to accelerate development results not keeping the UN locked into Processes!
Any UN coherence will have to come with a strong RC office, able to provide leadership, to uphold UN values which are to provide support to countries for socio economic development of the more vulnerable among other things. This is not always the case. New RCs that are not from UNDP or “exo agencies” (used to be called that way) do not have enough background to effectively manage the RC system. It is also important to provide them with special assistants that know what they are doing especially when adequate Human Resource is not available locally.
UNPAF should be more promoted with the govt, private sector, etc. Likewise, UN should start discussion with the international community about establishing a donor forum in [country].
Thank you
The UN agencies' coordination should be done at the HQs level. Why create so many different agencies while ask to be one at country level?
We all need to work with the spirit of one UN to address challenging humanitarian and development needs during the current financial difficulty.
Just to note Guyana's request to be a DaO country. The UNCT needs to determine the country's expectations regarding this model, and then collaborate in developing and implementing a model that is appropriate to the national situation.
NO
Balance the role of UNDP comparing to the rest of the agencies in managing UN activities at country level. RC position must be clearly opened and promoted to other UN agencies staff
N/A
The role of the World Bank and IMF in the UNCT business remains unclear and varied in different countries.
Afaf
UNRC roles and function should be rotated among heads of resident UN agencies for better effectiveness and better cooperation of UN agencies.
None.
No
No.
Important to align funding procedures among UN Agencies and to clearly define the leadership role of RC.
If expectation is there for UN agencies to work together on the ground, first we need to get the HQs to be able to work together and come up with strong signal, clearer guidance and clear implementation strategy for collaboration. We feel like we were pushed to work together but all solutions have to be found locally while HQs are making it difficult for us to work together!

Delivery as One should be because of added value and not just for the process. DaO & speaking with one voice does not mean the same voice always. Agencies should be able to speak on their particular mandate based on their comparative advantages. Ensuring that the firewall works enhances trust and motivation to contribute to the process. RC's office needs to be provided enough funds to function effectively. The dwindling resources to RC's office over the past 3 years are not encouraging.
Important to remember that one size does not fit all and seeking country experiences for any change management at the centre.
not at this time
UNCT members have to have more inspiration and motivation to work together as one team. When it comes to programs and projects there is a call to work as One UN, however when it comes to solve for instance tax-exempt issues all agencies are left alone to deal with the Government. No support from the UNDP OM is provided.
Fix the Firewall This country has an excellent RC and an excellent UNDP Res Rep. But because the two roles have to be implemented by same person there is inherent conflict in implementing role as biggest resident agency and coordinating the same organization as one of many.
We need to be more critical & candid in our internal conversations about respective mandates and allocation of resources within joint programmes.
Self-starters have suffered because they have not had access to resources that were made available to pilot countries. UN agencies were expected to front the funds to drive self-starting which slowed the process of innovation.
UN Agencies need sustainable core funding at the country level for better functioning and their mandate realization
This questionnaire should contain variation designed to capture specifics among MICs.
No
The turnover of RCs in a relatively short time is affecting the overall coordination of the UNCT
None
NIL
It would seem that the divergence in business models and in development views held by agencies impede effective UN collaboration in a number of thematic areas
The role of UNRC can only be improved if the position is not paid by one single agency in this case UNDP.
To some extent the RC offices tend to be involved in detailed programming and leading implementation on some interventions rather than doing the coordination. To some extent competing with specialist agencies and requesting funds from them to implement activities. This causes confusion to some agencies that are involved.
The RCO should spend more time on coordinating the development and humanitarian agendas of the UNCT - less time responding unilaterally. There seems to be a sense in the RCO that the RC represents the UN agencies rather than facilitates coordinated activities. Also a blur between the political and development/humanitarian role with the latter not getting sufficient focus.
The highest problem in this country is the sustainability of the UNRC, for at least 3-4 years period of work in the country. There's no stability in this country & the Government is not very enthusiastic to deal with the UN as one single UN but

separately sometime.
There is much too much investment of time and money in guidelines and processes. In a small country like Azerbaijan, all we need is to work together collegially and constructively, which will not come from frameworks, matrices, guidance notes 180-degree assessments. It will come with goodwill, training in how to be collaborators and competitors simultaneously, and proper supervision by our regional directors.
Stronger separation between UN RC and UNDP RR functions and roles
Further simplify programming tools and procedures. The National leadership will be critical to coordinating both UN and other actors in development
None
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High level UN visits to the Pacific Region should be coordinated to ensure some regularity. Now, UNSG as well as one USG and one ASG have visited the Pacific in 2010/2011, but previously there was no UN VIP for as long as people remember!</li> <li>2. The Asia &amp; Pacific grouping of countries is seen by Pacific countries as to their disadvantage, as the 'P' gets overshadowed by the Asian countries.</li> </ol>