

# **ECOSOC Dialogue on the longer-term positioning of the UN development system in the context of the post-2015 development agenda**

## **Background Note**

### **Retreat (29-30 May 2015)**

**Interlinkages between alignment of functions, funding practices, governance structures, organizational arrangements capacity, impact, and partnership approaches**

**Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination  
Department for Economic and Social Affairs  
United Nations**

**27 May 2015**

## 1. Introduction

The objective of this background note is twofold: firstly, to review the evolution of the interlinkages between the alignment of functions and funding practices, governance structures, organizational arrangements, capacity and impact and partnerships approaches in the UN development system, and, secondly, to examine the likely implications of the post-2015 development agenda and other major drivers of change.

A particular focus of this analysis is to inform deliberations of Member States and other relevant stakeholders on whether the interlinkages between the six areas that are the focus of the ECOSOC Dialogue have been coherent and consistent over time. The basic premise of discussions on interlinkages is that form should follow functions. In other words, what the system should or should not be doing comes first and then how it should be performing those tasks.

This initial DESA analysis will be further refined following the ECOSOC Dialogue retreat to take place on 29-30 May 2015, with a view to contributing to the substantive preparations for the second phase of this process.

## 2. Responding to change: *continuous evolution of UN development system*

Table 1 provides an analytical framework to examine the relationship between the key drivers of change and the strategic transformations that have taken place over time in each of the six areas that are the focus of the ECOSOC Dialogue. The information contained in Table 1 shows that the six areas have regularly been subject to change in the past six decades or so in response to evolving mandates, agency-specific and system-wide reform and specific changes in the broader development landscape.

The analysis of the coherence and consistency of interlinkages between alignment of functions and the other five areas that are the focus of the ECOSOC Dialogue is organized around three time periods: (a) the early years (1945-50s), (b) the era of decolonization and the Cold War (1960-80s) and (c) the global conferences and Millennium Development Goals (1990s-2015).

### (a) The early years (1945-50s)

It was not envisaged at the outset that the United Nations would become a major actor in the provision of operational activities in developing countries. By the late 1940s, however, the concept of development assistance had begun to attract greater attention, which translated mostly into focus on the transfer of knowledge and skills to promote industrialization, large-scale pre-investment surveys and feasibility studies on major national development projects that would lay the groundwork for subsequent investment of capital.

In the early years, the technical assistance priorities of programme countries were determined by the specialized agencies of the UN system, which also executed the respective country cooperation programmes. During the colonial era, the direction of support was mostly North-North and UN entities were all located in developed countries. As a result, entities involved in the delivery of operational activities were located far away

from where the actual action took place, which called for a decentralized organizational model in the UN development system.

Funding was mainly in the form of core resources, but was agency-based, which meant that the specialized agencies served as the primary unit of allocation, not the programme countries themselves. The focus of partnerships efforts of UN entities in these early years was primarily on leveraging expertise in donor countries for the delivery of technical assistance in programme countries.

### Assessment of interlinkages

The original decentralized design of the Organization created a gap between agency and system-wide interests in the delivery of UN operational activities. Over the years, Member States have pursued different strategies to foster alignment between the two perspectives. In the early years, governance and funding were particularly important instruments in this regard. The interlinkages in the work of a UN development system that was much less complex than today, as a result, were generally coherent and consistent.

Operational activities of the UN system as a whole were subject to formal governance review by the Governing Council of the Expanded Programme for Technical Assistance at the intergovernmental level, with a Technical Assistance Board, under the authority of a Technical Assistance Committee of ECOSOC, providing inter-agency coordination of programme delivery at the global level and the Resident Representatives of the TAB at the country level. This governance arrangement, which placed emphasis on intergovernmental coordination at the central level, however, came under growing pressure towards the end of this period as programme countries began to demand greater national ownership of country programming. Funding of operational activities and the capacities of the specialized agencies, in these early years, were also generally aligned with programme priorities identified at the country level and approved by the Governing Council of EPTA.

### **(b) The era of decolonization and Cold War (1960s-80s)**

The success of assistance programmes in post-war Europe spearheaded by the Marshall Plan fuelled the belief among many policy-makers that the UN system could have an important role to play in advancing socio-economic development in the newly independent states during the decolonization period. During the Cold War era, the UN development system was also considered to be a neutral platform for providing technical assistance to developing countries.

By the end of the 1960s, a wide range of UN bodies such as specialized agencies, funds, programmes, regional commissions and Secretariat entities were engaged in operational activities for development, with UNEP (1972) the first one located in a developing country.<sup>1</sup> The 1960s also marked a major change in the definition of country priorities for development assistance. Previously, the specialized agencies had performed that role, but governments in the newly emerging states now demanded to set technical assistance

---

<sup>1</sup> Among the new entities was UNCTAD, established in 1964, to discuss issues related to international trade, an institutional development which subsequently led to the creation of the Group of 77 (today, the Group has 131 members).

priorities themselves. EPTA and the Special Fund were also merged in 1965 in a new organization, UNDP, which became operational the following year.

The UNDP Governing Council took over the responsibilities of the governing bodies of EPTA and the Special Fund to review and approve projects and programmes for the UNDP as a whole and for UN regular programmes of technical cooperation, with the Inter-agency Consultative Board providing inter-agency coordination of programme delivery at the global level and the UNDP Resident Representatives at the country level.

The vast majority of funding for UN operational activities at this time was still in the form of core/un-earmarked contributions and subject to formal governance review at the intergovernmental level.

### Assessment of interlinkages

During this period, which was characterized by central funding and coordination, all “executing agencies” that received UNDP funding were required to use a single administrative/financial rule book established by UNDP. These measures helped ensure that the interlinkages between the six above areas were generally coherent and consistent in this period.

Advantages derived from the merger of EPTA and the Special Fund, included: pooling of resources, simplification of procedures, improvements in overall planning, elimination of duplication, reduction in administrative costs, and general strengthening of UN development aid.<sup>2</sup> Inter-agency coordination was shifted from the Technical Assistance Board to an Inter-agency Consultative Board.

The late 1980s, however, saw the weakening of the alignment between the six above-cited areas, which meant that the delivery of operational activities of the specialized agencies and other entities was no longer guided by a unified vision and a single rule book, while each entity also increasingly had to mobilize resources directly from donor countries.

### (c) Global conferences and Millennium Development Goals (1990s-2015)

The 1990s marked a significant departure for the UN system following the end of the Cold War. A series of major UN conferences and summits helped establish a new global development vision, culminating in the Millennium Declaration in 2000, which laid the foundation for the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals two years later. Another important milestone was the 2005 World Summit where world leaders reaffirmed that development is a central goal in itself and that sustainable development constitutes an important overarching framework for UN activities.

The practice of specialized agencies executing UNDP-funded development cooperation projects came to an end in 1995. The functions of most UN entities expanded considerably during this period in response to new normative mandates and commitments, as well as other drivers of change in the broader development environment<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Encyclopedia of the Nations, Technical Cooperation Programmes – Evolution of UNDP.

<sup>3</sup> The role of many UN entities was redefined in this period, e.g. UNFPA<sup>3</sup>, UN-Habitat and WFP, and most recently, WHO, and new entities were established, such as UNAIDS in 1994, in response to

The end of the Cold War also led to significant increase in intrastate conflicts, which created high demand for support by the UN development system in the areas of conflict prevention, post-conflict recovery and humanitarian assistance. At the same time, the UN development system was increasingly requested to assist in mitigating the impact of natural disasters, including recovery and resilience-building. By 2013, humanitarian assistance accounted for 34 per cent of total operational activities of the UN system.

Furthermore, support for operational activities involved a broader range of funding sources, including local resources, South-South and triangular cooperation flows. In the latter years of this period, funding for development cooperation experienced for the first time in many decades negative real growth. The UN development system, however, experienced increased funding in this period, entirely due to significant increase in non-core resources, often attributed to growing number of intra-state conflicts following the end of the Cold War, including humanitarian assistance. This trend is also attributed to the introduction of the MDGs.

Significant changes also took place in the area of governance, including the creation of the Executive Boards of the funds and programmes in 1993. In 1997, in response to Member States requests, progress was made in advancing system-wide coherence with the establishment of UNDG; the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Common Country Assessment (CCA); One UN House; the post of Deputy Secretary-General; and further strengthening of the role of the UN resident coordinator. After the 2005 Summit, the process for system wide coherence was launched and the delivering-as-one pilots were established in 2007 and UN-Women in 2010. This DaO is still going on has been embraced by a significant number of developing countries.

### [Assessment of interlinkages](#)

In this period, the UN development system, was no longer guided by a central coordination and funding mechanism, and the establishment of the Executive Boards of the funds and programmes in 1993 was primarily aimed at enhancing the efficiency of governance of operational activities of the respective entities.

Member States opted for an important change in the approach used to foster alignment between the six areas, focusing in particular, on improving inter-agency coordination; introducing “delivering-as-one” as a new organizational model, and the standard operating procedures to foster efficiencies.

The high growth rate of non-core contributions posed new challenges for the UN development system. In response, governing bodies of many UN entities have established integrated budgetary frameworks to consolidate core and non-core funding around priorities determined in the respective strategic plan.

The experience gained during this period has also demonstrated the importance of underpinning the realization of strategic intergovernmental objectives like ‘system-wide

---

the magnitude of the global AIDS pandemic and the need for multi-sector partnerships and coordinated approach among UN organizations<sup>3</sup> in this effort, and UN-Women in 2010, to consolidate and strengthen action on gender equality and the empowerment of women.

coherence' by the necessary funding, governance and organizational arrangements, including results-based management.

For the past decade, efforts at coherence and organizational reform have largely focused on improving coherence and efficiencies at the country level, through the Delivering as One model, through simplification and harmonization of business practices and through a number of coordination efforts. At regional and global level, coordination and efficiencies were mostly pursued through a number of task forces and working groups, mechanisms and instruments. These major efforts have undoubtedly made important contributions to improve coordination and efficiencies.

Notwithstanding these major efforts, impact level evidence in terms of both organizational and functional synergies that are expected from these investments at system-wide level is hard to come by.

While enhanced coordination, at reasonable costs, and further work on the harmonization of policies, procedures, rules and regulations continue to have the potential to reduce the workload of programme countries and improve efficiencies, a high degree of focus on efficiencies alone does not guarantee effectiveness. A better understanding of the costs and benefits of such efforts is needed to avoid excessive focus on harmonization that could lead to involvement in detailed areas where it is both expensive and difficult to harmonize practices.

There are three questions that need to be asked. The first is whether these intensive efforts have resulted in commensurate effectiveness in terms of the results. And the second is whether all these efforts at coordination and efficiencies have reached their limit in terms of ensuring coherence and maximizing results in the context of existing organizational structures and arrangements. These are contingent upon the way an organization is funded and governed. Third, are these changes sufficient for making the system fit for the post-2015 development agenda, which is complex, integrated and universal. It is time to examine the implications of the agenda for the UNDS.

### **3. The post-2015 era: likely implications for the UN development system**

A universal post-2015 development agenda is expected to mark another major new departure in the work of the UN development system.

The proposed SDGs signify the growing interdependence of country, regional and global action inherent in the broadening of the post-2015 development agenda to include what is sometimes referred to as global development challenges requiring collective action. This interdependence of development action will require UN entities to further enhance synergy between the normative and operational support functions in the post-2015 era.

The functions of the UNDS in each country would need to be differentiated, based on national priorities, needs and capacities. In that regard, functions could be grouped in the following broad sets:

- *Direct operational support*: which include service delivery, monitoring progress towards the SDGs, technical assistance and evidence-based, strategic policy advice;
- *Transfers*: capital transfers and financing, technology, innovation and knowledge transfers including data & statistics, thought leadership, normative transfer;
- *Indirect functionality*: capacity development; support to South-South , South-North and triangular cooperation; integration (both functional integration, and market integration); and influencing other actors' behaviour (partnerships, leveraging and engagements of all stakeholders);
- *Broad Protection Function*: protection, promotion of human rights, functions in the context of vulnerabilities, and protection in the context of global development challenges

The broadening and deepening of the substantive scope of the UN development system will likely require a more integrated and flexible delivery of the Organization's functions. The diversity and areas of specialization of the UN system, as well as its ability to provide support in complex contexts is a key strength, while focusing to deliver results in a multi-sectoral, integrated and coordinated manner.

Drawing on discussions in the ECOSOC Dialogue workshops to date, the below elements have been identified as critical to fostering coherence and consistency in the alignment between the emerging functions of the UN development system in the post-2015 era and the five other areas that are the focus of the ECOSOC Dialogue process.

### Funding practices

The effective support of the UN development system to the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda may require:

- “variable geometry” in funding sources to respond to differentiated development needs of countries and global development challenges;
- core funding as instrument to strengthen the ability of UN development system to deliver on its core mandates and functions and leverage internal and external partnerships, with the introduction of indicative scale of core funding at agency and system-wide levels;
- a strong focus on results including through balanced use of agency-specific and inter-agency pooled and global/vertical/thematic funding mechanisms and soft earmarking at the thematic/outcome level;
- A major push to make data on funding more transparent, and a better mapping and matching at country level;
- innovative and practical approaches to system-wide planning and budgeting options to facilitate integrated programme delivery at country, regional and global levels;
- strengthened financial skills and knowledge-sharing platforms on innovative financing, and a new lexicon on funding

### Governance structures

The establishment of governance arrangements is always the prerogative of Member States, States and should be approached with a lens that is practical, efficient, and effective. The

adoption of the post-2015 development agenda can be expected to have implications for governance of the UN development system. The following are particularly highlighted:

- diversity of national development experiences, actors and funding sources will need effective accountability mechanisms and instruments at country, regional and global levels;
- better integrated approaches to planning, budgeting and delivery of UN activities will require balancing of and complementarity between agency-specific and system-wide governance;
- a more equitable representation should be considered that better reflect the organization's constituencies and the current geo-economic realities;
- more effective governance through enhanced capacities and working methods of governing bodies;
- improved system-wide governance of UN activities must be fostered through high levels of transparency and of quality system-wide data, statistics, analysis and reporting;
- strengthened horizontal coordination and accountability at inter-governmental and inter-agency level will be required to deliver an integrated and universal agenda.

### **Organizational arrangements**

Integration requirements of the post-2015 development agenda call for a broader range of options in terms of organizational arrangements at country, regional and global levels.

These would likely involve:

- differentiated forms of support, with and without physical country presence, depending on the contexts. Several entities are already implementing a differentiated approach in their country, regional and global operations, and their experiences, in particular those of specialized agencies, merit serious review. These could guide the next generation of organizational arrangements of the UN development system.
- exploring further the next generation of UNDAFs, DaO and other instruments in terms of organizational arrangements at country level that are better adapted to the current. There is also a need to go beyond these instruments and look at some fundamental changes that can help the UNDS deliver the new agenda.
- rethinking the regional platforms for system wide work and collaboration. Integration happens at the regional level and the system should move beyond information sharing and joint meetings.
- redesigning the global organizational arrangements to not only make these more responsive to the country level but also aligned with the demands of the new integrated agenda.

### **Capacity and impact**

The following elements will need to be addresses in terms of capacity and impact:

- The UN development system will need to attract, retain and build a modern workforce for the changing environment, grounded in a stronger common UN identity and shared values.
- Staff and leadership must be able to work with mandates that are increasingly cross-programmatic and encompass the main pillars of the UN.



- Competencies such as systems-thinking, teamwork, cultural sensitivity, and respect for diversity will be increasingly important.
- There is need for a shift of gravity from multiple representation to integrated expertise across policy, technical and management competencies by leveraging the institutional assets of each entity to match the needs of country contexts realities.
- In terms of impact, instilling an effective results-oriented culture rooted in results-based management within the UN development system will be vital.
- A shift from the emphasis of the past few years on efficiencies, to more of a focus on effectiveness.
- Developing and sustaining a more strategic and coherent results culture, including for cross-agency collaboration, is essential. It requires strong leadership, adequate capacities and skills and an enabling environment to discuss both good and poor results, not only within UN organizations but also their governing bodies.

### Partnership approaches

The UN development system will need to maximize its comparative advantage as convener of multi-sectoral, issue-based partnerships, aligned to normative values and common standards and good governance principles. In this regard:

- The configuration and scope of these partnerships may well vary depending on the issue being addressed, the comparative advantage of different actors, and the specific country and global context.
- National ownership and inclusiveness are of the essence. There is scope to adapt policies, rules and regulations to make the UN more “user-friendly” for external players, facilitate participation of non-state actors in the work of the UN development system, and ensure transparency of efforts.
- New types of transformational partnerships are needed, where the UN development system plays a leveraging rather than an implementing role.
- The UN development system will need to define parameters and criteria for multi-stakeholder partnerships that link global change to local impact, while ensuring ethics, standards and accountability.
- The capacity of the UN development system to deliver on the calls for partnership at scale in a transparent and accountable manner, with system-wide coherence and strategic approach, should be addressed. There have been calls for inter-governmental oversight of these partnerships. Such a platform could be built around ECOSOC and the HLPF.

#### 4. Selected discussion questions

1. What are some of the implications of stronger focus on the provision of integrated policy advice and normative support at the country level for funding practices, organizational arrangements, including field presence models, capacity, impact and partnership approaches of the UN development system in the post-2015 era?
2. What are some of the potential implications of the principle of universality for the work of the UN development system? What lessons can be learned from specialized agencies in that regard?
3. What should be the role of the UN Resident Coordinator System in delivering an increasingly integrated agenda in a coherent manner? How can the role of the UN Resident Coordinator be further enhanced to deliver on the integration requirements of the post-2015 development agenda?
4. What funding modalities best support the emerging functions of the UN development system in the post-2015 development agenda? Is it feasible to consider universal core assessed contributions for core functions of the UN development system? Could wider application of voluntary indicative scale of funding or voluntary negotiated pledges stimulate more predictable and flexible voluntary contributions to UN entities? What are the lessons to be drawn from the recent financing dialogues of WHO, IFAD, UNEP, UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF etc.?
5. What financial instruments are best suited to promote South-South cooperation?
6. What kind of organizational arrangements could be adopted in programme countries where the UN development system is a small player from a funding perspective, e.g. where the Organization accounts for less than 10 per cent of total ODA? Similarly, what kind of organizational arrangements are needed in MICs? How to improve the regional level arrangements for delivering the new agenda?

**Table 1: UN Development System**

Preliminary analysis of interlinkages of drivers of change, functions, funding, governance, organizational arrangements, capacity, impact, and partnership approaches

	1945-50s	1960s-80s	1990s-2015	2015-
Important drivers of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Post WWII</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Limited number of states</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Increased political support for international cooperation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Human rights agenda (e.g. Universal Declaration on Human Rights)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Interests of major colonial states</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Marshall Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (EPTA)<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Some 100 newly emerged states in need of support</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Cold War; bipolar political system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development of international human rights instruments</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Aid as instrument of foreign policy, real politik and superpower rivalry</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Creation of OECD/DAC ('63)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Rise of state development cooperation actors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Aid becomes an international obligation ('70)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1970 Consensus<sup>5</sup></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Concern about duplication of UN country activities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Growing economic and political tension in 80s<sup>6</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> End of Cold War; multi-polar political system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Increased number of intrastate conflicts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Globalization</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable development</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Global conferences</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Millennium Development Goals</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Human rights mainstreaming agenda</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paradigm of "humane internationalism"</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> DAC countries become main sources of funding</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Recognition of state as key development factor</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Rise of non-state actors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demand for UN system-wide coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Post-2015 sustainable development agenda and Financing for Development III</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities &amp; threats of globalization including inequality, exclusion &amp; systemic risks</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Country-level technical cooperation demands emanating from globalization and interdependence, and climate change</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Intergovernmental level demand for norm- and standard-setting and other policy cooperation demands emanating from globalization and interdependence, and climate change</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Global development challenges</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Changing poverty profile</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evolving humanitarian landscape</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Increasing protracted crises</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Diversification of country development needs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Interdependence of domestic and global development action</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Changing balance of global economic power</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Demands for more effective and participatory decision-making in UN development system at intergovernmental level</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> South-South and triangular cooperation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Rise of new development cooperation actors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technological innovation &amp; data revolution including pressures for increased transparency</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Need for issue coherence in delivery of UN activities at all levels</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Established by the General Assembly in 1949.

<sup>5</sup> The basic design that emerged from the 1970 Consensus was an integrated system of country programming based on national development plans.

<sup>6</sup> Including collapse of NIEO, Latin American debt crisis, emergence of neo-liberalism in a number of economically powerful countries.

	1945-50s	1960s-80s	1990s-2015	2015-
Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technical assistance as transfer of knowledge and skills to promote industrialization in developing countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Support realization of national development plans in newly emerging states</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Poverty eradication, social development, including gender equality and women's empowerment and environmental protection, with particular focus on improving provision of basic needs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Conflict prevention, humanitarian assistance and recovery</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> State building and good governance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Normative support, policy advice/advocacy and data and evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Support to countries to respond to national development challenges in a wide range of areas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Normative and technical support to countries to ensure no one is left behind</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Support to countries address global development challenges</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Invest in conflict prevention, disaster-risk reduction, peace-building, humanitarian assistance, recovery and resilience-building</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Support to South-South and triangular cooperation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Leveraging and convening role</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership building and stakeholder engagement</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Integrated policy advice/advocacy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Strategic innovations in development</li> </ul>
Capacity and impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge transferred through expert reports</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Country priorities defined by UN entities, primarily specialized agencies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technical assistance implemented by specialized agencies and Secretariat departments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development planning advisory services</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Support for pre-investment activities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Institution building, human resources development, science &amp; technology</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Programme countries define priorities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transfer of resources to programme countries</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technical assistance implemented by specialized agencies and Secretariat departments</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Pilot national execution of projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development with focus on upstream policy support &amp; human resources development and institution building</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Emergency assistance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation services in programme countries</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Aid coordination</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Flagship reports</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> National ownership</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Aid effectiveness</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Results-based management</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> National execution of projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity with focus on upstream policy support, national statistics, human resources development and institution building</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to address the emergency-development continuum</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development for implementation of global norms and standards</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to support evidence-based policy cooperation in intergovernmental bodies (data disaggregation; flagship reports)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Strong system-wide planning and coordination capacity in delivery of UN activities at all levels</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to support inclusive and participatory progress monitoring of implementation of post-2015 agenda at all levels</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Full alignment of UN activities with national development plans and priorities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Full use of national systems and institutions in execution of UN activities at country level</li> </ul>

	1945-50s	1960s-80s	1990s-2015	2015-
Funding practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Agency-based funding system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> High share of core funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Country-based funding system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> UNDP becomes central funding mechanism ('66)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Non-core funding begins to increase in late '80s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> MDGs-based funding system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> UNDP central funding mechanism abolished</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian assistance increases significantly</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> High non-core funding, overwhelmingly single-donor, programme and project-specific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> "Variable geometry" in funding sources to respond to differentiated development needs of countries and global development challenges</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Funding system that facilitates integrated response to national and global development challenges by capitalizing on opportunities for synergy in programming and operations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Core/"as if" core funding for the platform of UNDS support in countries</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Core funding as instrument to strengthen ability of UN system to leverage internal and external partnerships to unlock human and financial resources</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Improved coherence of development and humanitarian financing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Integrated programme delivery at country, regional &amp; global levels underpinned by system-wide planning &amp; coordination</li> </ul>
Governance structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governing body of EPTA</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governing bodies of specialized agencies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance Board composed of SG and agency Heads charged with coordination under the authority of a standing Technical Assistance Committee of ECOSOC<sup>7</sup></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Limited coordination functions of ECOSOC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> UNDP Governing Council</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Inter-agency Consultative Board</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governing bodies of specialized agencies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Limited coordination functions of ECOSOC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Creation of Executive Boards of Fs/Ps with 36 members ('93)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Joint informal meeting of Executive Boards of Fs/Ps</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Constituency-based form of governance introduced in Global Environment Facility ('94) and UNAIDS Programme ('96)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governing bodies of specialized agencies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Limited coordination functions of ECOSOC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Balancing of agency-specific and system-wide governance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance capacity at country, regional and global levels to respond to diversity of national development experiences, actors and funding sources</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Equity and effectiveness in participation in governance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Improved system-wide governance of UN activities through quality system-wide data, statistics, analysis and reporting</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Coordination, monitoring and oversight role of ECOSOC will need to become more substantive, with due regard for the role of the respective Executive Boards</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> The TAB would remain the coordinator until UNDP was established at the end of 1965. If conflicts arose in TAB, a Technical Assistance Committee, composed of ECOSOC members, would be charged with reaching an agreement.

	1945-50s	1960s-80s	1990s-2015	2015-
Organizational arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Specialized agencies and Secretariat departments deliver country-level activities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Post of Resident Representative of EPTA, reporting to Head of Technical Assistance Board, established in select major programme countries to coordinate country-level activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Extensive system of field representatives in place in early 60s</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of activities established in early 60s</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> UNDP becomes central coordinator of operational activities ('66)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Country programmes become the primary coordination instrument</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Global-level coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> DG for DIEC ('77), Single Pledging Conference, QCPR</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Country-level coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Strengthening of RC function ('81)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Gradual erosion of UNDP coordination role in the '80s<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> UNDP central coordination abolished, becomes knowledge organization ('95)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SG reforms ('97): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Establishment of UNDG, including EC composed of Fs/Ps<sup>9</sup>, DOCA, UNDAF &amp; CCA, One UN House, stronger RC role, post of DSG</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> System-wide coherence process ('07-'10): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Launch of pilot DaO ('07), establishment of UN-Women ('10)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> QCPR process ('12)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Independent system-wide evaluation ('12)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-country RC representation introduced in small number of countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Organizational model options at country and global levels enabling UN system able to leverage capacity, knowledge and resources of different entities in a strategic and efficient manner</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Organizational model at country and global levels fostering balancing of agency-specific and system-wide planning and coordination of activities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Field presence models of UN system tailored to specific country context, Standard operating procedures will require substantial simplification and harmonization of rules, regulations, policies and procedures of entities involved in delivery of voluntarily-funded operational activities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Effective capacity development and use of national systems</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transition towards a more upstream policy-oriented organizational model wherever feasible</li> </ul>
Partnership approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The focus of partnerships in this period was primarily on leveraging expertise for delivery of technical assistance at country level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Continued focus on leveraging expertise for delivery of technical assistance. Leveraging funding from donor countries and NGOs to complement UNDP resources also becomes important in late 80s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The focus shifts to diversification of funding base with major expansion in partnerships with multilateral institutions, NGOs and private sector; innovative multi-stakeholder partnership models introduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Leveraging partnerships becomes comparative advantage of UN system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Strengthening of issue-based coalitions composed of public and private actors</li> </ul>

Source: UNDESA elaboration.

<sup>8</sup> As specialized agencies increasingly began to mobilize resources directly from donors.

<sup>9</sup> UNDG Executive Committee was later abolished and superseded by an Advisory Group, composed of 13 member entities.

## Table 2: UN Development System Definition and composition

The United Nations Development System is defined as the entities that receive contributions for operational activities for development.

In 2013, the following 34 entities engaged in operational activities for development.

*Funds and programmes:* UNDP (incl. UNCDF, UNV), UN-Women, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, UNAIDS, UNCTAD (incl. ITC), UNEP, UN-Habitat, UNODC, UNRWA

*Specialized agencies:* FAO, IAEA, UNESCO, ICAO, ILO, IMO, ITU, UNIDO, UPU, WIPO, WHO, WMO, UNWTO

*Regional commissions:* ECA, ECE, ECLAC, ESCAP, ESCWA

*Secretariat departments:* OCHA, DESA

*Other entities:* IFAD, OHCHR

Legislative mandates established in the *QCPR resolution* of the GA on operational activities for development are formally binding for those entities that report to the Assembly and ECOSOC. In 2012, these were 27 entities (30 if UNCDF, UNV (part of UNDP) and ITC (part of UNCTAD and WTO) are counted as specific entities):

- 12 funds and programmes: UNDP (including UNCDF, UNV), UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, UNODC, UNCTAD (including ITC), UNRWA, UN-Women, UNEP, UN Habitat, UNAIDS;
- 6 research and training institutions: UNICRI, UNIDIR, UNITAR, UNRISD, UNSSC, UNU (although none of them is involved in operational activities);
- 5 regional commissions which formally report to ECOSOC: ECLAC, ESCWA, ESCAP, ECA and ECE;
- 2 Secretariat departments: OCHA and UNDESA, and
- 2 other entities: UNISDR and UNOPS (UNISDR doesn't engage in operational activities and UNOPS only implements operational activities initiated by other entities).

Of the above 27 entities, 19 engaged in operational activities in 2013. The 8 entities that did not engage in such activities were: 6 above research and training institutions and UNISDR and UNOPS. Together, the 19 entities accounted for some 75 per cent of total operational activities for development in 2012 and the specialized agencies for the remaining 25 per cent.