



UNITED NATIONS DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

**Expert Group Meeting on
Strengthening the NVP Process through the Development of an
Analytical Framework and Regional Knowledge-Sharing
30 November - 1 December 2011, UNHQ, New York**

**Organized by the
Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, UNDESA**

SUMMARY REPORT

Introduction

The Expert Group Meeting on “Strengthening the NVP Process through the Development of an Analytical Framework and Regional Knowledge-Sharing” brought together government officials and national experts from the NVP community, as well as representatives from UN agencies and other international organizations, to examine the current national voluntary presentation (NVP) process. The meeting aimed to assess progress in the ECOSOC national voluntary presentations (NVP), review proposals for a standardized analytical framework, and discuss modalities and arrangements for establishing regional knowledge networks.

The EGM was organized by the Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination (OESC) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) on 30 November and 1 December 2011 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

The meeting was chaired by **Mr. Neil Pierre**, Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC.

Opening Session

Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Secretary General for Economic Development of UNDESA, delivered opening remarks and spoke about the need to evaluate the existing methods and practices for the NVP, including its analytical framework, the quality and reliability of data and indicators used for reporting, and ECOSOC’s review process. He noted the absence of a standard analytical framework for the national voluntary presentation and that the data and indicators used to report on progress vary from country to country, preventing a comparable assessment among the NVP countries. He also added that the review process for the NVP should ensure appropriate feedback and follow-up mechanisms for the volunteering countries.

Mr. Sundaram underscored the importance of continuing to provide enhanced support to countries in aligning their national development strategies with the internationally-agreed development goals (IADGs). He said that much needed to be done to ensure wider sharing of existing knowledge and expertise regarding policies and strategies to promote the achievement of the United Nations development agenda and the MDGs. Towards that end, UNDESA’s project on “*Strengthening regional knowledge networks to promote the effective implementation of the United Nations development agenda and to assess progress*”, funded by the Development Account, would facilitate regional-sharing of experiences and good practices in the formulation and implementation of national development strategies.

Following Mr. Sundaram’s opening and welcome remarks, Mr. Neil Pierre, EGM Chair, provided an overview of the two-day EGM and elaborated on the expected outcomes of the meeting.

I. Presentation of the study on harmonized review mechanism and IADG analytical framework for the NVP

Mr. Vanus James, UNDESA consultant, presented the main findings of the study on harmonized review mechanism and analytical framework for the national voluntary presentation. Based on his review of report outlines and content of NVPs from 2007 to 2010, he observed that past presentations did not adopt a standard framework with regard to report structure, data presented, and use of metadata. Many presentations also did not comply with the general guidelines provided by UNDESA.

The consultant recommended that UNDESA should build on and strengthen the current NVP process, starting with more detailed standard reporting guidelines. In addition to the broad guidelines it provides to NVP countries, UNDESA should also include the main targets and indicators that characterize progress on the theme chosen for the year.

On the content of the national voluntary presentations, the report recommended that NVP countries should include and distinguish between development indicators that are common to all countries and indicators that are specific or unique to each volunteering country, where these define its well-being and development, assess its main successes, and specify its most urgent challenges and constraints. This approach makes comparison more meaningful in that it enables proper comparison of countries based on common indicators, and at the same time, takes into account those factors that are unique to the volunteering country.

Countries should provide inter-temporal data on the core human development indicators (i.e. national income, means years of schooling, life expectancy at birth) and on one or more of the human development indicators adjusted for inequality (i.e. inequality-adjusted human development index, gender inequality index, multi-dimensional human poverty index). NVP countries are also encouraged to provide complementary indicators as well as country-specific indicators, particularly on the theme of the AMR for the year. These country-specific data will help inform ECOSOC and the reviewers on country-specific challenges that are not likely to be known if only internationally-comparable indicators are reported.

To ensure compliance by volunteering countries with the NVP guidelines and to have a detailed reporting and assessment of challenges and progress in implementing the IADGs/MDGs, UNDESA – working in collaboration with UN Country Teams – should request the NVP country to complete and submit a standard form that gathers country data and metadata on the relevant indicators for the presentation to ECOSOC (*see Form 1*). In improving the ECOSOC review process, the consultant recommended that all reviewers also complete a standard report indicating their independent opinion on the quality and coverage of issues reported by the NVP country (*see Form 2*).

Following the presentation to ECOSOC and as an annual follow up exercise, UNDESA, in collaboration with the UN Country Teams, should collect from the NVP country annual data related to those indicators that were reported by the countries in their presentations. A follow-up data request form (*see Form 3*) should be completed and submitted to UNDESA by the NVP country.

The DESA consultant underscored the need to assist countries in building capacity for assessing progress on the IADGs/MDGs based on reporting of core, complementary, and country-specific indicators and in analyzing the data reported. Various stakeholders, such as the national statistical agencies, policymakers and analysts of government ministries, officials and staff of UN Country Teams, and experts from academia and civil society should be assisted through a variety of training and technical support. He also cited activities such as regular stakeholder consultations, data fairs involving the national statistical system, and participation in international conferences on data collection and measurements as useful in building capacities and in improving the quality and reliability of data reported by countries.

Highlights of the discussion

- Dialogue and coordination among statistical agencies should be improved in order to ensure comparability and reliability of data. Conduct of national dialogues (e.g. annual data fairs) can help address coordination issues.

- The quality and validity of data are critical. However, improving data collection and reliability requires a much more comprehensive effort both at the national and international levels.
- Selection of national experts for the national voluntary presentations should be made well in advance to ensure adequate preparation and quality reporting.
- Governments should ensure the availability and accessibility of national data to support report preparation. Challenges of bureaucracy and lack of support from government departments in providing relevant data information must be overcome.
- Need to strengthen the participation of UNDP Country Offices and other UN agencies in the preparation for the NVP. Their representatives should participate in the national consultation workshops and provide appropriate feedback to enrich the content of national reports. UNDESA should facilitate the coordination between national experts and the UN country offices.
- Need to take advantage of the accumulated knowledge from studies carried by other UN agencies at the regional and global levels as well as those conducted by other international organizations such as the World Bank, the IMF, and the regional development banks. UNDESA should coordinate the participation of these international and regional organizations, so as to complement the perspectives of various stakeholders, including civil society, in the reports.
- Reviewers' comments should be made available online along with the national reports.
- Guidelines provided to NVP countries should be strengthened to ensure a multi-stakeholder approach in the reporting process.

II. Country-level experiences, challenges, and lessons-learned in the NVP Process

The objective of the session was to examine an NVP country's experience in preparing for its presentation to ECOSOC, in particular the challenges encountered and lessons learned, and any follow-up actions undertaken after the NVP. Panellists also shared their insights on ways to improve the NVP content, guidelines, and analyses, to ensure a more effective assessment of progress on the IADGs/MDGs at the national level.

Panellists of the session included: **Ms. Maria Elena Arzola**, Economist, Ministry of Social Development (Chile); **Dr. Tapera Chirawu**, Director, Policy Matrix and Development (Namibia); and **Dr. Hamda Hassan Al-Sulaiti**, Director of Evaluation, Supreme Education Council (Qatar). The session was moderated by **Ms. Patience Stephens**, Director, Intergovernmental Support Division, UN-Women (Moderator)

Ms. Arzola began by describing Chile's NVP experience. It offered an opportunity to evaluate the work of Chile's Millennium Development Network. This network brought together ministers and experts from across sectors – including education, environment, health, housing, labour and planning – for the purpose of pursuing nationally coherent policies for the achievement of the MDGs.

In addition, the national consultation process for the NVP brought the network together with other relevant stakeholders, including UN actors, civil society and government representatives. Stakeholders convened in seminars and working groups in order to provide inputs into the NVP. This participatory approach ensured that policies were critically analysed from a variety of perspectives, thereby improving the accountability of both the network's strategy, as well as Chile's participation in the NVP.

Ms. Arzola said that there had been improvements in inter-sectoral coordination and data analysis for better follow-up and monitoring, as a result of Chile's participation in the NVP.

Dr. Al-Sulaiti shared Qatar's experience with the NVP process, which also drew on consultations with various national stakeholders. The first draft of the report was informed by initial consultations with stakeholders. This was then circulated to partners for feedback and redrafted according to comments and suggestions received. National media were also treated as important stakeholders in the process, and the findings were successfully disseminated once the final report had been completed.

Dr. Al-Sulaiti described several challenges and lessons learned throughout the NVP process. First, data collection for the report was difficult due to variations in the type and validity of data available from different sectors. Second, the analysis could have benefited from a more specific set of questions or indicators proposed within UNDESA's guidelines. Third, the national consultations offered an opportunity to improve the quality of the final report and presentation.

She asked whether it would be possible to improve the NVP process in regard to feedback and follow-up. Regarding the feedback process, she suggested the possibility of expanding opportunities for mutual dialogue and review for NVP participants. In regard to follow-up, she referred to the example of the annual MDG reports as one possible model, and also suggested the possibility of broadening the NVP process to include all ECOSOC members.

Dr. Chiwaru spoke about Namibia's NVP experience in regard to education, gender and poverty. Namibia still faced a variety of development challenges, and the NVP offered the opportunity to express its commitment to the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs, and to inform the international development community of its seriousness in pursuing inclusive human development.

Namibia's well-established system of participatory development mechanisms at the village, regional and national levels helped to facilitate broad stakeholder engagement with the NVP process. One specific priority was ensuring the involvement of the various Ministries with portfolios relevant to the NVP topic. In terms of follow-up, Namibia has both a parliamentary oversight mechanism which will monitor implementation of the policies relevant to the NVP, and will continue to involve citizens in monitoring through its participatory mechanisms.

A specific challenge Namibia faced with the NVP was the availability and quality of data. He said that good data collection and analysis required an understanding of the purpose for which that data will be used. In terms of the logistics of the NVP process, Dr. Chiwaru suggested that the presentations at the high-level segment should be less rushed, which would facilitate a better, more interactive question-and-answer session. He also suggested that UNDESA define guidelines more clearly, emphasising the potential benefit of including a common approach or instrument within the NVP process in order to tie the NVPs together (while recognizing distinctive country contexts). He also questioned whether it would be possible to authenticate data as a form of quality control.

Highlights of the discussion

- The NVP experiences discussed had a highly consultative nature and experienced similar data challenges. The NVP process could potentially benefit from increased opportunities for dialogue and lesson-sharing among participants.
- One participant questioned whether the consultative, multi-stakeholder processes made it difficult to maintain high quality reports and presentations. Another also asked whether the feedback from the consultative process posed challenges to ensuring high levels of technical and analytical quality in the reports. One panellist responded that the analysis was actually improved by the

consultative process, since it reflected a more thorough, inclusive view of the progress being made on the country's national development strategy. Another panellist responded by indicating the importance of taking a balanced approach to reflecting the views of stakeholders in the national report.

- The presenters were asked if there were concrete examples of the policy impact of the NVP process. One presenter responded by saying that reports from previous NVPs had been reviewed to identify development strategies that worked elsewhere which could be implemented in Namibia. Another presenter gave the example of the Ministry of Health's (Chile) consultations with NGOs working on HIV/AIDS issues, which informed improvements to HIV/AIDS treatment within the public health system.
- There was a need to identify synergies between the NVP and other parallel national-review processes, such as the annual MDG reports or the African Peer Review Mechanism. A multitude of stand-alone initiatives such as these, which are not inter-linked, is inefficient and confusing for participating countries.
- The NVP should serve to better promote national policy coherence and should be made more conceptual and analytical, rather than descriptive. This would require adopting a clearer conceptual framework.

III. Working group sessions

The session, moderated by **Mr. Alberto Padova**, Deputy Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA, opened with a brief explanation of the AMR and NVP processes. Mr. Padova noted that the objective of this session, along with the entirety of the Expert Group Meeting, was to listen to the perspectives of the experts on the NVPs and discuss how it could be improved. Mr. Padova acknowledged the need for standardizing the analytical framework for the NVPs in order to increase their effectiveness.

The expert group was divided into two working groups: *Working Group 1 on National level gaps and challenges*; and *Working Group 2 on Promoting regional and global level linkages*.

Highlights of Working Group 1

- Participants recognized a fundamental problem concerning the coordination of analytical methods. A challenge for acquiring data for analysis was not only its availability, but its quality.
- There was a capacity gap between the strategic objectives toward economic goals and the practical abilities of States. Current indicators focus too heavily on outcomes and not on progress.
- Countries needed a framework which allowed them not only to identify national goals, but also comparability on an international level. The objectivity of assessments would be difficult to ensure. Ultimately, the Government owned the assessment in its final stage prior to submission, but most Governments would be reluctant to identify weaknesses in their social and economic performances.
- Assessments were not monitoring mechanisms and were merely a restrictive snapshot in time of outcomes and performances. Monitoring and reporting should be ongoing in order to address challenges in a timely manner. Existing assessment mechanisms needed to be systematized so that both processes and outcomes were assessed.

- A recommendation was put forward that timeframes for assessment and reporting should coincide with national election cycles. However, since assessments could portray weaknesses, this notion could be a “double-edged sword”. It was felt that the reports were unknown to most stakeholders and that the press should be used to bolster the recognition and availability of the reports in order to stimulate the necessary political will and accountability. Discussions were essential and should focus on the progress identified in reports and not on the reports themselves.
- The involvement of UN country teams and other agencies should be increased to assist in data acquisition and for reporting-back purposes.

Highlights of Working Group 2

- Participants mentioned that the Regional Knowledge Networks (RKN) could be used as a forum for discussion on the preparations for the NVPs, including the national reports.
- Participants recognized that the role of the RKN in the AMR process would be important in the follow up to the NVP.
- Participants also mentioned that it would be important to include in the network other UN agencies (like UNDP, UNICEF, and UNESCO) so that they could contribute to the discussion. Participants noted the importance of selecting “good” experts, since this would give legitimacy to the discussion process in the RKN. They also noted that the participation of civil society was of great importance for the success and usefulness of the networks.
- The experts emphasized the importance of linking the regional knowledge networks with other regional mechanisms (e.g. CARICOM).
- Participants also noted some of the challenges of regional networks, including selection of participants, balancing public and private sector participation, and themes for discussion – focused or broad themes.

IV. Consideration of availability and reliability of data for MDG indicators

The session featured the following panellists: **Ms. Francesca Perucci**, Chief, Statistical Planning and Development Section, UNDESA Statistics Division; **Ms. Amie Gaye**, Policy Specialist, Statistics Unit, Human Development Report Office, UNDP; and **Mr. Marco Fernandez**, Research Fellow, Center for US-Mexican Studies. It was moderated by **Ms. Barbara Reynolds**, Senior Advisor, UNICEF.

Ms. Perucci began her presentation by describing the activities of the UNDESA Statistics Division in the areas of global monitoring; assisting countries to improve coordination of national statistical systems; building capacity in line ministries to analyse and use data and coordinate with NSOs; and improving the reporting mechanisms from national to international statistical systems.

She said that strengthening national monitoring would entail improving monitoring at the sub-national level; assessing progress in the most vulnerable groups; and reconciling national and international data and assessment results. She stated that various tools were developed to improve monitoring, including development of manuals, best practice sharing, and platforms for data exchange.

In strengthening the NVP process, Ms. Perucci provided the following recommendations: establishing close collaboration with NSOs and national statistical systems; following international guidelines for the compilation of indicators; adopting to the extent possible the agreed indicators and/or

recommendations on supplementary and proxy indicators; using a minimum set of indicators commonly available in countries and supplementing with country-specific indicators; using a common benchmark year; and presenting detailed metadata.

In her presentation, **Ms. Gaye** stressed the importance of coordinating data collection among various agencies. UNDP's Human Development Report Office is both a user and disseminator of social and economic statistics produced by international data agencies. Key issues in data collection were inconsistency (between national and international data, international sources, and MDGs vs HDRs) and differences arising from timing of updates and definition/concepts.

She stated that the Human Development Report Office of UNDP shared data with stakeholders to check and ensure transparency of data and estimates used. She also explained that since the HDI measured past achievements, UNDP was often criticized for not taking into account current efforts made by Governments.

Ms. Gaye underscored the need for improving coordination between national and international data agencies; improving coordination among international data agencies; and improving coordination among international data users to strengthen data collection and reliability.

In his presentation, **Mr. Fernandez** shared the case of Mexico with respect to data reporting on MDG Goal 2: Achieving universal primary education. He said that Mexico had already achieved universal coverage for primary education, if only the net enrolment ratio was used as the indicator.

However, other complementary indicators were also useful, such as enrolment on time, completion on time, drop rates, and education trajectories, and which can provide a more accurate assessment of educational outcomes. Quality of education, for example, was important.

Mr. Fernandez also stressed the need to address differences within countries and between educational options (public and the private schools). He recommended going beyond traditional indicators in order to have a better understanding of the advances and challenges for the Millennium Development Goals. One challenge, however, would be how to make the complementary indicators comparable across countries.

Highlights of the discussion

- Understanding the discrepancies/differences in country data was as important as attempting to reconcile them.
- On capacity-building, UNDESA brings together various partners, including line ministers involved in the production of data and national statistical offices. Facilitating dialogue on meta-data and how the data is used would be important.
- The production and availability of statistics should be demand-driven, especially at the country-level.
- Looking only at enrolment of children in primary education was not a sufficient basis for assessing progress on the MDG on education. Measures reflecting attendance and completion, as well as the quality of education, were equally crucial.
- Provision of meta-data would be as important as the actual data, as these help in explaining the data/indicator measures as well as the collection methods.

V. Strengthening the Role of Reviewers

Moderated by **Ms. Jane Stewart**, Director, ILO New York Office, the session had as panellists the following: **Mr. Jean Francois Dauphin**, Division Chief in Charge, Surveillance Policy Division (IMF); **Ms. Jennifer Jones**, NVP National Expert, Jamaica; and **Mr. Vanus James**, UNDESA Consultant. In this session the panellists shared their experience on review processes and surveillance and provided suggestions on improving the review process of the NVP.

Mr. Dauphin gave an overview on the IMF's approach to surveillance. The Fund conducts both multilateral and bilateral surveillance. The former serves to identify and observe global economic and financial developments and interdependencies; the latter scrutinizes individual countries' internal and external economic stability. IMF members have certain obligations in the conduct of their economic policies to foster economic stability, and bilateral surveillance, is – technically – the IMF oversight of compliance. In contrast to the NVPs, IMF bilateral surveillance is mandatory for member countries. In addition to policy obligation, members also have obligations for data provision and collaboration.

The surveillance process involved several steps: first, the IMF monitors and analyzes the received data followed by an internal discussion. Then, IMF staff visits (“missions”) the country and engages in a dialogue with the authorities and other stakeholders (e.g., private sectors, civil society). This information gathering leads to the preparation of a report which is the basis for the IMF executive board's discussion on policy recommendations. Mr. Dauphin emphasized that a crucial problem for the IMF was data quality (e.g. financial sector data).

Ms. Jones addressed the issues of the review process and the follow-up to the NVPs in her presentation. She argued that the choice and composition of reviewers were crucial. To underline her point, she brought up the example of Jamaica's NVP in 2009. The reviewers were Canada (industrialised country that knows Jamaica well), Namibia (within the same income class), and Brazil (newly industrialised country). This composition made a balanced review possible that incorporated different perspectives.

Ms. Jones argued that the reviewers' reports should be made available online and that reviewers should be integrated in the preparation of the final report. There should be continuous communication between ECOSOC and the presenting countries, through a feed-back mechanism. She also highlighted the importance of media coverage to make people in the country and abroad aware of the NVP.

Mr Vanus James stressed that often qualitative evaluation was more important than quantitative measures. He also argued that involvement of the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWI) should be improved since the IMF and the World Bank could provide high quality expertise.

Highlights of the discussion

- In addressing the issue of data quality, Mr. Dauphin argued that the Fund has in place a strong legal framework to enforce compliance with existing data provision obligation, including possible sanctions. But the problem is that the data that would be necessary for effective surveillance is not always produced (e.g., data on shadow banking), or in some cases may not be requested by the Fund (e.g., data on individual institutions).
- For the IMF, key qualities for effective surveillance are candor, even-handedness, and keeping a multilateral perspective in mind. Multi-disciplinary experts conduct surveillance based on a continuous dialogue with public authorities, private sector, civil society, and other stakeholders.
- IMF has very strict transparency policies so that no changes were possible to the outcome of surveillance for political or reasons other than a narrow set of predefined criteria (e.g., corrections

of factual errors, or deletions from the reports before their publication of highly market sensitive material).

- In improving the review process, an NVP country should select “critical” Friends.
- Review and follow-up processes should be able to assist a country’s internal processes (e.g. UNDAF)
- Reviewers should also examine the idiosyncratic factors that could derail or undermine a country’s progress.
- The communication between ECOSOC and the NVP country should continue after the presentation. A report-back mechanism must be in place to track progress of the NVP country and to determine if the recommendations emanating from the review were followed up.
- Report back and follow-up mechanisms apply to both the NVP country and the ECOSOC. While the NVP country is expected to take on board and follow up on the recommendations made by the reviewers, ECOSOC should likewise follow up on the recommendations made to it.
- UNDP country offices should play a more active role in the follow-up to a country’s NVP.

VI. Establishing Regional Knowledge Networks

In leading-off the discussion on this topic, **Mr. Neil Pierre** observed that there were many existing regional knowledge networks but none of them focused on the NVP process. He stressed that UNDESA’s objective was to build on existing networks that were rich knowledge resources.

Mr. Pierre stressed that RKN could play an important role in the follow up mechanism for the NVP. By bringing together UNDESA and regional partners, existing information would be enriched, shared, and considered for action at national and regional levels through policy makers.

Ms. Monica Nogara, Economic Affairs Officer, UNDESA/OESC stated that during the first review of the NVP exercise in January 2010, many experts suggested the creation of expert communities to help build national capacity for developing national strategies and assessing progress. She pointed out that there was a need to have an NVP follow up mechanism which would translate the analytical work of the Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) into country level policies and strategies.

She presented the objectives of the RKN which were: 1) to contribute to strengthening the capacity of government officials responsible for the formulation of national development strategies to assess progress towards the implementation of IADGs/MDGs; and 2) to increase knowledge-sharing among policy makers and development experts on development strategies.

She cited three elements which could be useful tools, namely: the virtual regional knowledge networks; regional workshops; and online training module on monitoring and evaluation modalities/techniques. She added that other tools for data collection and analysis could be relevant as well. One of the expected outcomes was that RKNs would provide better dissemination of lessons learned from the NVP exercise. However, the main challenge was to ensure the continued and sustained engagement of national experts involved in the review and formulation of NDS, at the national and regional levels.

Ms. Nogara reiterated that the RKN would build on existing knowledge networks and tap into UNDESA policy guidance instruments which would be adapted to specific circumstances and

challenges of each region. On the status of implementation, she informed participants that the project had been finalized, with joint UNDESA - UN regional commissions implementation plans developed. She further stated that implementation would commence immediately for completion in the 2012-2013 budget biennium.

Highlights of the discussion

- Regional knowledge networks can provide an important mechanism to address key development challenges by offering an opportunity to disseminate knowledge and expertise, as well as enabling region and country-specific and demand-driven support for the formulation, implementation, and assessment of development strategies. These networks are incubators of ideas and thinking, synthesizing knowledge and sharing them.
- The main actors in establishing the Regional Knowledge Networks will be UNDESA and the various regional commissions. Countries to be involved in RKN are principally the NVP countries, although other countries may join as well.
- The core group for the RKN would include government officials and national experts involved in preparation of NVP national reports. Regional commissions would also bring their knowledge and expertise to the network.
- Capacity-building regional workshops would be organized by the various regional commissions; RKN should be promoted as part of a communication strategy.
- The thematic areas of focus for the RKN would be identified by UNDESA and the regional commissions, and could be modified based on the specific needs of the regions. One possible theme that was suggested was how to foster the acceleration of economic growth through technology transfer.
- The RKN was also intended as an instrument to identify the technical needs of Governments and the development partners who could help fill these needs.
- ECLAC will spearhead the sharing of NVP-related knowledge in the Caribbean region and the establishment of the RKN will be extended to other regional commissions.

VII. Experience Sharing from the Regions

In this session, representatives from the regional commissions and UNDESA shared with the participants how their respective organizations have leveraged knowledge/expert networks and communities of practice to foster development. Moderated by **Ms. Leslie Wade** (UNDESA/OESC/EICB), the session included as panellists the following: **Mr. Bartholomew Armah** (ECA); **Mr. Simone Cecchini** (ECLAC); **Mr. Ipo Survo** (ESCAP); and **Mr. Deniz Susar** (UNDESA/DPADM).

Mr. Armah presented the knowledge management (KM) strategy of ECA. He stated that ECA's effectiveness depended on a clear articulation and analysis of its key business processes and the knowledge flows necessary to make these processes operate efficiently. He said that enhanced knowledge sharing made a vital contribution to the achievement of ECA's mission and the effectiveness of its business processes, and that ECA used KM to leverage the value of its collective intelligence by capturing, evaluating, synthesizing, organizing, distributing and applying its knowledge capital.

Mr. Armah highlighted that an important aspect of KM was making individual knowledge collective knowledge, and that this could be made through connecting people and synthesizing knowledge, and not solely collecting documents. He said that building effective Communities of Practice (COPs) would require planning (identify focus area, formulate broad preliminary objectives, identify potential members); common understanding (face-to-face workshop for agreed vision, objective and working modalities); implementation (e-mail distribution list and invitation, facilitating discussions); consolidation (learning from experience and understanding the benefits); and evaluation (review of results against set objectives). Regarding the recruitment of COP members, he mentioned that ECA has targeted internet research, EGM & training workshops, experts from member states; and that membership is through invitation and acceptance only.

Mr. Armah mentioned that ECA used KM in various ways including e-discussions, online questionnaires, dissemination of knowledge products, advocacy, and e-training. He concluded by saying that peer learning had been largely intra-regional and, therefore, promotion of inter-regional discussion was important. He also emphasized the need to explore innovative ways to involve private sector in peer learning.

In his presentation, **Mr. Cecchini** spoke about the Network of Social Institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean (RISALC), which shared statistics, publications, videos and information on a broad range of social programs and projects. The content was provided by registered users, as well as by ECLAC staff. The key knowledge sharing tools of the network included a monthly electronic bulletin, webcasts (live transmission of seminars), and virtual forums (20 forums conducted on social innovation, youth, children, family, education, etc.).

Mr. Cecchini highlighted the work of ECLAC on knowledge-sharing in the areas of social protection and cash transfer programs. He mentioned that a number of expert group meetings and seminars had been organized in collaboration with FAO and OHCHR. ECLAC created a database of non-contributory social protection programs (<http://dds.cepal.org/bdptc/>) in collaboration with UNDP IPC-IG and OAS, and with funding from Sida and GIZ. In addition, ECLAC published books on social protection, employment and CCTs in the region as well as papers on national experiences in conditional cash transfers.

Mr. Cecchini concluded by noting some lessons and challenges for knowledge-sharing activities. These included the importance of making available content and platforms in different languages; the importance of establishing partnerships with other UN entities; and the importance of addressing the sustainability of the network (issue of funding) and whether the regional network need to be devoted to a specific topic or to a broad range of issues.

In the Asia and the Pacific region, **Mr. Survo** mentioned that expert networks are frequently used by ESCAP, but usually for limited duration. He said that each of ESCAP's substantive division had expert groups, working groups and advisory groups on technical aspects, and that group members were senior civil servants and experts from partner agencies. Some groups involved NGOs and CSOs. ESCAP also set up communities of practice, but the collaborative tools were not systematically used. Most communities of practice in ESCAP worked through e-mail, combined with periodic meetings. He said that that it had been difficult to obtain the commitment of members and to build momentum. Good practices within the communities had been compiled in many ways, but no common or standard approach was used.

Mr. Survo gave some examples in which networks of experts had been used in ESCAP, including the "Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade", which was successful due to the strong commitment of its secretariat to the network's initiatives and the active contributions of the members.

Mr. Susar shared the experience of DPADM in setting up and maintaining the United Nations Public Administration Network (UNPAN). The objectives of UNPAN were establishing an internet-based network that linked regional and national institutions devoted to public administration and building the capacities of regional and national institutions. Mr. Susar highlighted some of the lessons that DPADM learned with UNPAN, including the importance of knowing the audience to be able to provide the relevant content; giving ownership to partners to foster participation; monitoring and reporting; and giving the right incentives to network members to encourage participation.

Highlights of the discussion

- Knowledge-sharing was important particularly to developing countries. The RKN initiative should take into account the different political and socio-economic conditions among countries. It should be expanded to include the participation of the Economic Commission for Europe.
- The RKN should be able to address the issue of comparability of data among countries.
- Incentives should be in place to encourage membership in the regional knowledge networks.
- In every knowledge network, what matters is content, and to be specific in focus, rather than to be very broad.
- Regional knowledge networks should provide a platform for cross-fertilization and for supporting evidence-based policymaking.
- A regional knowledge network should be open, but it must begin with a core group of members and expand thereafter.
- In expanding a knowledge network, it is necessary to make quick actions, build gradually the membership, and take advantage of the network effect.
- Technology provided useful and necessary tools to assist networking. However, the mere setting up of a collaborative platform did not guarantee participation. Some of the networks could be time-bound while others could be sustained for years.

VIII. Creating Effective Regional Knowledge Networks

Participants were divided into two working groups: Working Group 1 on “Ways to create effective regional knowledge networks”; and Working Group 2 on “Ways to facilitate policy discussion, monitoring, reporting, and identification of substantive inputs for the RKN”.

Highlights of Working Group 1

- The RKN should be transparent, all discussions open to members, and to some degree to the public.
- The RKN should be neutral and non-partisan. It should be about assisting governments with evidence-based policymaking. Members are expected to be technical persons with a high degree of objectivity and scholarship and who can provide evidence and advice to support effective policymaking.

- The members of the network would be policy analysts within government ministries; academics; and depending on the issue, other individuals who are considered to be objective and can provide expert information on a particular topic.
- Civil society organizations and the private sector should be included in the dialogue as they may have insights and solutions based on experience on the ground that may not be available to many at the policymaking level.
- Civil society organizations, as members of the network, can help provide objectivity in assessing the viability of national development strategies. Capacity-building programmes to reinforce the analytical techniques of civil society organizations should be explored by UNDESA.
- The RKN should be a forum for distilling policy and technical advice for governments; advice that is neutral. It should foster a two-way communication between technical experts, UN agencies, and governments. It must be a demand-driven network.
- Discussions in the network should be documented in a format that is accessible to ensure continuity in the discussions.
- The RKN should provide a mechanism for policy discussion and for strengthening evidence-based policymaking.
- A collaborative working culture could not be easily planted among policymakers and planners. Their authority to share information and knowledge with experts from other countries was a key challenge to overcome.
- For knowledge networks and communities of practice to succeed, they also needed to be moderated and to have unique content and contacts not available elsewhere. Participants need to have a reason to become and stay active in the network.
- Given its presence in most countries, UNDP should be engaged in establishing the regional knowledge networks. It can help identify policy analysts within government ministries, academics, and depending on the issue, other individuals who are considered to be objective and can provide expert information on a particular topic.

Highlights of Working Group 2

- Incentives should be in place to motivate individuals/institutions to be members of the network and encourage their participation in the discussions. Some incentives should include: 1) intersperse the network with face-to-face meeting (i.e. travel incentive); 2) involve the members in the choice of topics to be discussed; 3) recognize their participation and contribution in the discussion (e.g. acknowledge their contribution in publications and reports); and 4) linking participation in discussions to invitations to follow-up international fora/meetings.
- Topics to be discussed should also be informed by the knowledge products developed by the UN regional commissions (such as those dealing with methods, strategies; toolkits).
- Information shared/exchanged in the network should be customized in the local context. Toolkits, for example, should be retooled to take into account country-specific aspects.
- The exchange of information should be complemented by discussions that unmask why things work in particular context. It is not enough to talk about lessons learned, but also why these lessons work in one country. Focus not only on what works, but also on why it works.

- The composition of the regional knowledge networks should be diverse and rich enough to ensure and facilitate critical dialogue. They may associate themselves with high-profile individuals to attract a critical mass of members. It is important to have a diverse representation across different stakeholders to ensure critical thinking.
- There should be a two-way dialogue between the RKN and ECOSOC. It should not be a one-way street. Regional network should also be able to influence what ECOSOC discusses. There should also be a mechanism to unpack the discussions in ECOSOC and disseminate them to the network.
- The RKN can also function as mechanism for transmitting regional and national feedback to ECOSOC.
- The networks can be ECOSOC's communication link to the public. At the same time, the networks can feedback relevant and emerging issues that may not be in ECOSOC's purview.

IX. Closing Remarks by the Chair

Mr. Neil Pierre closed the meeting by thanking the participants for their active engagement and contributions during the two-day meeting. He stated that the comments and inputs received will be valuable in making the NVP process stronger and more effective, in moving forward towards setting up the regional knowledge networks (RKN), and in linking the RKN and the NVP process.

Improvements will be made to the NVP process and to make it more effective and inclusive. National experts, for example, from the NVP community will be invited to be members of the knowledge networks that UNDESA, in collaboration with the regional commissions, will establish.

He also emphasized the potential role for the regional knowledge networks to function as important feedback mechanisms from ECOSOC and to ECOSOC. ECOSOC should, in turn, build on its body of normative work on the basis of inputs from national and regional levels and other fora and mechanisms.

Key Recommendations

The expert group meeting attracted a broad range of perspectives from independent experts, government officials and UN staff on the strengths and gaps in the NVP process. While acknowledging diverse points of view, the meeting facilitated discussion on key recommendations of the consultant stemming from the independent review of the NVP process, particularly with respect to the need to achieve a measure of comparability through data collection, monitoring of progress using concrete indicators and allowing for a feedback mechanism. The meeting also facilitated alignment of the NVP process and the RKN initiative. The following recommendations were drawn:

1. The NVP analytical framework should include and emphasize the distinction between indicators that are common to all countries and indicators that are unique to each volunteering country. This will enable a more meaningful comparison of countries on common indicators that also take into account factors that are specific to each country.
2. UN Country Teams (i.e. UNDP and other UN agency country offices) must be engaged in a country's NVP process. Their participation in preparatory meetings must be strengthened; they should partner with the Government in meeting the data needs of the IADG/MDG assessment and reporting.
3. NVP countries should ensure that their national reports have clearly specified and complete outlines, aligning with the standard practice and guidelines provided by UNDESA. The use of standard reporting templates, to be completed by the NVP country and submitted to UNDESA, can help ensure proper compliance with the NVP guidelines.
4. To improve the ECOSOC review and add value to the NVP process, NVP countries should select "critical" friends or reviewers that can provide independent opinions on the quality and coverage of issues reported by the NVP country.
5. Feedback/report-back mechanisms must be in place to establish proper monitoring and ensure follow-up by the NVP countries on the recommendations made by ECOSOC. There should be continuous communication and dialogue between the NVP country and ECOSOC.
6. Regional knowledge networks would play an important role in the follow up mechanism for the AMR and NVP. They can also facilitate continuous dialogue between ECOSOC and the NVP countries.
7. Regional knowledge networks can provide a mechanism to address key development challenges by disseminating knowledge and expertise and providing region and country-specific and demand-driven support for the formulation, implementation, and assessment of development strategies.
8. The composition of the regional knowledge networks should be diverse and rich enough to ensure and facilitate critical dialogue. In addition to representatives from government, UN organizations, and academia, civil society and the private sector should also be invited to share their insights and solutions based on experience on the ground.
9. Incentives should be put in place to encourage membership in the networks and participation in the discussions.
10. The thematic areas of focus for the networks will be identified by UNDESA and the regional commissions and modified based on the specific needs of the regions. Information shared/exchanged in the network should be customized in the local context.

Annexes

Form 1: UNDESA Data Request Form for NVP Countries

NVP Country: _____ Year: _____

Explanatory note to the volunteering country:

This form is to be completed by the volunteering country. It seeks to gather information aimed at enhancing your country's national voluntary presentation. Please provide a response to each question and where you consider necessary you may give additional comments. The template should be completed and returned by <date>.

1. Quality of Data

Code	Description	Data Baseline Year	Data Most Recent Year?	Period of Data	Metadata Provided?
	<i>Core Indicators</i>				
HDI1	National income				
HDI2	Mean years of schooling				
HDI3	Life expectancy at birth				
	<i>Complementary Indicators</i>				
OCI1					
OCI2					
OCI3					
	<i>Country-specific Indicators</i>				
OCSI1					
OCSI2					
OCSI3					

2. Main Successes on Targets of Year's Theme (insert targets as necessary)

Target Number 1:			
Base Year Measured:		Most recent year measured:	
Strategies and policies that have worked, by target:			

Target Number 2:			
Base Year Measured:		Most recent year measured:	
Strategies and policies that have worked, by target:			

3. Most Urgent Challenges Faced

Data challenges in light of Paris21 and the Istanbul Declaration, with respect to:			
Core indicators and indexes:		Practical measures used:	
Complementary indicators selected:		Practical measures used:	
Country-specific indicator selected:		What has been done to address the constraints identified in each case:	

Other challenges:			
Challenge 1:		What has been done to address these challenges?	
Challenge 2:		What has been done to address these challenges?	
Challenge 3:		What has been done to address these challenges?	

4. How can the international community best plan its support to achieve the IADGs?

Priority targeting of Aid resources (areas targeted) under the year's Theme (list in order desired):

Target 1: _____
 Target 2: _____
 Target 3: _____

Delivery mode (Type of assistance)

Budget support
 NGO support
 Development of performance assessment framework
 Upgrade of planning systems
 Other: _____

Extent of alignment with the following:

Country priorities:	1	2	3	4	5
Systems and procedures:	1	2	3	4	5
Capacity-building:	1	2	3	4	5
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5

Accountability arrangements to citizens and parliament with respect to:

Development strategies: _____
 Policies: _____
 Performance: _____
 Other: _____

Reforming and simplifying donor policies

Measures and standards of performance

Financial management _____
 Fiduciary safe guard _____
 Environmental assessments _____
 Other _____

5. Policies and initiatives which merit scaling up / could be replicated

Policies that merit scaling up: _____
Policies that could be replicated: _____

6. Policies and experiences that offer learning tools

Policy	Learning tools
Policy 1	
Policy 2	

Form 2: NVP Reviewers Evaluation Form

NVP Country: _____ Year: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

To the Reviewer:

This form is to be completed by each Reviewer. Please provide a response to each question. Where you consider it necessary you may give additional comments. Refer to the instruction manual for detailed description of categories and the information requested in any questions. Also refer the Paris Agreement on Aid Effectiveness as relevant. The form should be completed and returned to UNDESA by <date>.

7. Quality of Data

Code	Description	Was data provided?	Was the data source indicated?	Was the period of the data indicated (monthly, quarterly, annual)?	Was metadata provided?
	<i>Core Indicators</i>				
HDI1	National income	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
HDI2	Mean years of schooling	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
HDI3	Life expectancy at birth	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
	<i>Complementary Indicators</i>				
OCI1		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
OCI2		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
OCI3		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
	<i>Country-specific Indicators</i>				
OCSI1		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
OCSI2		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
OCSI3		Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No

Comment on the relevance and adequacy of the complementary indicators selected:	
Comment on the relevance and adequacy of the country-specific indicators selected:	

Coverage of issues related to the year's theme

8. Main successes

	Yes	No	Comment
Did the country indicate specific successes in relation to each of the targets of the year's Theme?			
Did the country indicate criteria or benchmarks by which successes are evaluated?			

9. Challenges

	Yes	No	Comment
Did the country indicate specific challenges affecting the achievement of each of the targets in the year's Theme?			

10. Strategies to address the challenges reported

	Yes	No	Comment
Did the country indicate the strategies proposed and/or implemented to address the challenges identified with respect to each theme?			

11. Effectiveness of the NVP as an advocacy tool

	Yes	No	Comment
Did the NVP provide unambiguous guidelines to the international community concerning the priorities for international support?			
Did the NVP offer adequate guidance on the modalities of allocation of development assistance?			
What is your assessment of the general effectiveness of the country's NVP as an advocacy tool?			

12. Ease of understanding

	Comment
Please comment on the ease of understanding of the country's presentation. Also comment on the adequacy of the metadata provided to facilitate understanding of the data in the presentation.	

Form 3: Follow-up NVP Data Request

NVP Country: _____ **Year:** _____

This form seeks to gather information on actions and achievements since your country's National Voluntary Presentation <date>. Please provide a response to each question. Where you consider necessary, you may add comments. The form should be completed and returned to the UN Resident Coordinator (UNRC) or UNDESA by <date>.

1. Improving data adequacy

Indicator Code	Indicator Description	Have there been any changes or updates to the methodology used to compile the indicator?	Have the data used for compiling the indicator been changed or updated?	Have the metadata been updated?
<i>Core Indicators</i>				
HDI1	National income	Yes / No Comment:	Yes / No Comment:	Yes / No Comment:
HDI2	Mean years of schooling	Yes/No Comment	Yes/No Comment	Yes/No Comment
HDI3	Life expectancy at birth	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
<i>Complementary Indicators</i>				
OCI1		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
OCI2		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
OCI3		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
<i>Other country-specific indicators</i>				
OCSI1		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
OCSI2		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:
OCSI3		Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:	Yes/No Comment:

Comment	
What progress has the country made with respect to data availability and accessibility on a predictable release calendar?	

Please provide an update on the status of successes reported in the NVP (insert other reported successes as necessary)

	Still on track?	No longer on track	Target achieved and sustained
Success, Target 1:			
Success, Target 2:			
Success, Target 3:			

Comment	
Highlight any areas in which there has been significant progress since the NVP <dated>	

Comment	
Highlight any areas in which there has been significant regress since the NVP <dated>.	

2. Addressing Challenges Reported

For each challenge reported in your NVP, please indicate what new strategies have been proposed or are being implemented to resolve the challenges and to achieve success.

Challenges	Strategies	Outcomes	Lead Implementing Agency
Challenge 1:			
Challenge 2:			
Challenge 3:			
Challenge 4:			

	Yes	No	Comment
Has any evaluation been done of the support needed/provided to successfully implement the strategy?			

3. Effectiveness as an advocacy tool

	Yes	No
Did the country seek Overseas Development Assistance to mitigate/address any of the challenges?		
Have any agreements been reached with donor agencies to provide the assistance needed?		

If yes, indicate mode of assistance and percentage allocated:

Mode of Assistance	Percentage Allocation
Budgetary Support	
NGO Support	
Development of Performance Assistance Framework	
Upgrade of Planning Systems	
Technical Assistance	
Other assistance, specify:	

Assess the alignment of support received/provided with country priorities: _____

4. Comments on the follow-up form

Do you have any suggestions for improving this form? _____

**Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the NVP Process through the
Development of an Analytical Framework and Regional Knowledge-Sharing**
30 November – 1 December 2011, United Nations Headquarters, New York

Programme

30 November 2011 (Wednesday) Strengthening the Analytical Framework for National Voluntary Presentations (NVP)	
9:00 am - 9:30 am	<i>Registration</i>
9:30 am - 9:45 am	<p>Opening and Welcome Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant-Secretary-General on Economic Development, UNDESA <p align="center">Mr. Neil Pierre Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC EGM Chair</p>
9:45 am - 10:15 am	<p>Session 1: Presentation of the study on harmonized review mechanism and IADG analytical framework for the NVP (NVP outlines, content, indicators, and review process)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Vanus James, UNDESA Consultant
10:15 am - 10:45 am	Interactive Discussion
10:45 am - 11:00 am	Break
11:00 am - 11:40	<p>Session 2: Country-level experiences, challenges, and lessons-learned in the NVP Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dr. Tapera Chirawu, Director, Policy Matrix and Development, Namibia ▪ Ms. Maria Elena Arzola, Economist, Ministry of Social Development, Chile ▪ Dr. Hamda Hassan Al-Sulaiti, Director of Evaluation, Supreme Education Council, Qatar <p align="center">Ms. Patience Stephens Director, Intergovernmental Support Division (IGSD), UN-Women Moderator</p>
11:40 am - 12:00 pm	Interactive Discussion

2:00 pm - 3:00 pm	<p>Session 3: Working group sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Following a brief presentation by the Moderator on the NVP process and the Annual Ministerial Review, participants will then be divided into the following working groups to identify challenges at the national level and to assess progress and enhance linkages at the regional and global levels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Working Group 1 – National level gaps and challenges ➢ Working Group 2 – Promoting regional level linkages ➢ Working Group 3 – Global level (addressing gaps and enhancing policy feedback) <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Alberto Padova UNDESA/OESC/PCB Moderator</p> <hr/> <p>Report Back</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A representative from each working group will report on the outcome of discussions.
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm	<p>Session 4: Consideration of availability and reliability of data for MDG indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Francesca Perucci, Chief, Statistical Planning and Development Section, UNDESA Statistics Division ▪ Ms. Amie Gaye, Policy Specialist, Statistics Unit, Human Development Report Office, UNDP ▪ Mr. Marco Fernandez, Research Fellow, Center for US-Mexican Studies <p style="text-align: center;">Ms. Barbara Reynolds UNICEF Moderator</p> <hr/> <p>Interactive Discussion</p>
4:00 pm – 4:10 pm	<p>Break</p>
4:10 pm – 5:10 pm	<p>Session 5: Strengthening the Role of Reviewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Jean François Dauphin, Division Chief in Charge, Surveillance Policy Division, Strategy, Policy and Review Department, IMF ▪ Ms. Jennifer Jones, NVP National Expert, Jamaica ▪ Mr. Vanus James, UNDESA Consultant <p style="text-align: center;">Ms. Jane Stewart Director, ILO New York Office Moderator</p> <hr/> <p>Interactive Discussion</p>

Formatted: French (France)

5:10 pm - 5:15 pm	Summary of the day and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Neil Pierre, Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
-------------------	---

1 December 2011 (Thursday) Establishing Regional Knowledge Networks (RKN) to Support the NVP Process	
9:30 am - 10:15 am	Session 6: Introduction and Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The topics of discussion in this session will include description and goals of the RKN project; links between RKN, NVPs, and AMR; strengthening NVP review and analysis through the RKN. ▪ Mr. Neil Pierre, Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC ▪ Ms. Monica Nogara, Economic Affairs Officer, UNDESA/OESC
10:15 am - 10:45 am	Interactive Discussion
10:45 am - 11:00 am	Break
11:00 am - 12:00 pm	Session 7: Experience Sharing from Regions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each Regional Commission will hold a 15 minute presentation on ways in which regional commissions have used knowledge/expert networks and communities of practice in order to foster development; ways in which regional commissions have shared knowledge in the past. ▪ Mr. Bartholomew Armah, ECA ▪ Mr. Simone Cecchini, ECLAC ▪ Mr. Ilpo Survo, ESCAP ▪ Mr. Deniz Susar, DESA/DPADM <p style="text-align: center;"> Ms. Leslie Wade UNDESA/OESC/EICB Moderator </p>
12:00 pm - 12:30 pm	Interactive Discussion
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm	<i>Lunch Break</i>

2:00 pm - 3:00 pm	<p>Session 8: Working Group Session on Creating Effective RKN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants will then be divided into the following working groups to discuss Regional Knowledge Networks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Working Group 1 – Ways to create effective Regional Knowledge Networks ➢ Working Group 2 – Ways to facilitate policy discussion, monitoring, and reporting; Identification of substantive inputs for the RKN <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Eric Olson UNDESA/OESC/PCB Moderator</p>
3:00 pm - 3:30 pm	<p>Report Back and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A representative from each working group will report on the outcome of discussions.
3:30 pm - 3:45 pm	<p>Wrap up: Summary of the day’s discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This session will summarize the main issues and agreements discussed during the day. Next steps will be highlighted. ▪ Mr. Neil Pierre, Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
3:45 pm - 4:00 pm	<p>Break</p>
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm	<p>Session 9: Operational Issues (Session for representatives of RCs only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A representative from the Capacity Development Office (CDO) of UNDESA will present on issues related to the RKN including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Disbursement of funds ✓ Reporting of expenditures ✓ Reporting of progress ✓ Monitoring ▪ Mr. Curtis Hosang, Capacity Development Office, UNDESA/CDO

**Expert Group Meeting on Strengthening the NVP Process through the
Development of an Analytical Framework and Regional Knowledge-Sharing**
30 November – 1 December 2011, United Nations Headquarters, New York

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Country Participants

1. CHILE
Ms. Maria Elena Arzola
Economist
Ministry of Social Development
2. CHINA
Dr. Yan Guo
Professor
Peking University
3. ETHIOPIA
Mr. Bimerew Alemu Dessie
Development Planning and Research Senior Expert
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
4. GUATEMALA
Mr. Franco Domenicos Martínez Mont
Director of Strategic Studies
Secretary of Public Policy in Guatemala
5. JAMAICA
Ms. Jennifer Jones
Independent Consultant / National Expert
6. MALI
Mr. Ousmane Diallo
Planning Officer
National Department of Planning
7. MAURITIUS
Mr. H.B. Dansinghani
Chief Technical Officer
Ministry of Education and Human Resources
8. MEXICO
Mr. Marco Antonio Fernandez
Research Fellow
Center for US-Mexican Studies, UCSD
9. MOLDOVA
Mr. Andrei Paladi
Senior Consultant
Policies, Strategic Planning and Foreign Assistance Division
State Chancery of the Republic of Moldova

10. MONGOLIA

Mr. Nyamdavaa Batjargal
Deputy Director, Strategic Planning Department
Ministry of Social Welfare and Labour

11. NAMIBIA

Dr. Tapera Chirawu
Director
Policy Matrix and Development

12. QATAR

Dr. Hamda Hassan Al-Sulaiti
Director of Evaluation
Supreme Education Council

13. Trinidad and Tobago

Mr. Vanus James
UNDESA Consultant

B. United Nations Regional Commissions

1. Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)

Mr. Armah Bartholomew
Chief, MDGs Section

2. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

Mr. Simon Cecchini
Social Affairs Officer, Social Development Division

3. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)

Mr. Ilpo Survo
Knowledge Management Coordinator

4. **Mr. Amr Nour**

Director
Regional Commissions New York Office

5. **Mr. Srinivas Tata**

Regional Commissions New York Office

C. United Nations Agencies and other International Organizations

1. ILO New York Office

Ms. Jane Stewart
Director

2. IMF

Mr. Jean-François Dauphin
Division Chief in Charge
Surveillance Policy Division
Strategy, Policy and Review Department

3. UNDESA / Statistics Division
Ms. Francesca Perucci
Chief, Statistical Planning and Development Section
4. UNDESA / Division for Public Administration and Development Management
Mr. Wai Min Kwok, DESA/DPADM
Mr. Mr. Deniz Susar, DESA/DPADM
5. UN-Women
Ms. Patience Stephens
Director, Intergovernmental Support Division (IGSD)
6. UNDESA / Capacity Development Office
Mr. Curtis Hosang
Finance Officer
7. UNDP
Ms. Amie Gaye
Policy Specialist, Statistics Unit, Human Development Report Office
8. UNICEF
Ms. Barbara Reynolds
Senior Advisor

D. UNDESA / Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination

1. **Mr. Neil Pierre**
Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
2. **Ms. Leslie Wade**
Chief, ECOSOC and Interorganizational Cooperation Branch, UNDEA/OESC
3. **Mr. Alberto Padova**
Deputy Chief, Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
4. **Mr. Eric Olson**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDEA/OESC
5. **Ms. Monica Noga**
Development Cooperation Policy Branch, UNDESA/OESC
6. **Mr. Luis Chalico**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
7. **Mr. Greg Barrett**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
8. **Mr. Arlene Cezar**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC

9. **Ms. Cynthia Sicangco**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
10. **Mr. Robert de Jesus**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
11. **Ms. Josiane Koagne**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
12. **Mr. Elias Brumm**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC
13. **Mr. David Mariano**
Policy Coordination Branch, UNDESA/OESC