



**United Nations System-wide Coherence: The Next Steps**  
**March 4-5, 2008**  
**Vienna, Austria**

**Summary of Main Points**

1. As its contribution to advancing system-wide coherence, UNIDO organized a high-level dialogue on the subject on 4-5 March 2008 at its headquarters in Vienna. The main objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of the development aspects of system-wide coherence and the “Delivering as One” initiative, identify the main issues and challenges and ways of moving forward.

2. The two-day meeting brought together more than three hundred participants led by the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General and the Co-Chairs of the United Nations General Assembly Consultations on System-wide Coherence. In attendance as well were high representatives of UNIDO Member States, including from the pilot countries, officials from donor countries and senior officials from sixteen United Nations system organizations, the Secretariat of the United Nations system chief executives board (CEB) and United Nations Development Group (UNDG) Office. The dialogue was organized into six sessions: Session 1 – Intergovernmental process on system-wide coherence: Progress and next steps; Session 2: Perspectives on Advancing United Nations system-wide Coherence; Session 3 – Ensuring a comprehensive and strategically focused United Nations system response to national development priorities; Session 4 – Funding the pilots for coherence; Session 5 – Empowering the Resident Coordinator; and Session 6 – Harmonizing business models and practices.

3. The Director-General welcomed the participants and said that UNIDO decided to convene the dialogue to gain a better understanding of the system-wide coherence process and the “Delivering as One” pilot initiative in order to contribute further to ongoing efforts to achieve coherence for greater development results. He stressed that much was at stake in the coherence process and that failure to deliver on the high expectations would risk marginalizing the United Nations family. But the real tragedy, he said, would be the missed opportunity to do more together and make a greater difference in the lives of the people that the United Nations system serves.

4. In her keynote address, the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General noted the significant progress achieved in “Delivering as One” initiative. She highlighted the remaining challenges, including the slow pace of reform and change at headquarters, the need to ensure that global tools and processes are in place to support and strengthen a more efficient United Nations at the country level and the need for increased clarity in the authority of the Resident Coordinator and mutual accountability within the UNCT. As the next steps in the coherence process, the Deputy Secretary-General stressed the importance for organizations of the United Nations system to work together on the implementation of the One Programme in the eight pilots and show results. The system needed to distil the lessons learned from the pilots and apply them to other UNCTs - where it is appropriate and requested by Member States. Headquarters should provide more support and flexibility to UNCTs to respond to national requests and requirements. In particular, business practices should be harmonized more quickly and effectively and the essential role of the specialized agencies and non-resident agencies in the United Nations system's overall effort to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness and coherence should be recognized.

### **Session 1: Intergovernmental process on system-wide coherence: Progress and next steps**

5. Ambassador Juan Manuel Gomez Robledo, Vice-Minister for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, chaired the session on the intergovernmental process on system-wide coherence. He recalled the report and recommendations of the High-level Panel as providing the context of the intergovernmental deliberations on system-wide coherence and the “Delivering as One” pilot initiative. He also touched on the relevance of the initiative for a country like Mexico.

6. In his statement, Ambassador Paul Kavanagh, Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations and Co-Chair of the United Nations General Assembly Consultations on System-wide Coherence, recalled the recent history of the intergovernmental consultations on system-wide coherence and outlined the pragmatic, empirical and transparent approach the Co-Chairs intended to take to move the consultative process forward. They would build on those areas where progress has been made, namely on “Delivering as One” at country level, and in the harmonization of business practices at the CEB. In addition, issues of funding, governance and gender would be addressed. Outlining the next round of consultations, Ambassador Kavanagh indicated that informal consultations were scheduled to take place as follows: “Delivering as One” (28 March); Funding (7 April), Governance (17 April) and, in due course, Gender. The Secretary-General or his senior colleague will be invited to brief Member States on progress underway at the CEB in early May.

7. Ambassador Augustine Mahiga, Permanent Representative of Tanzania to the United Nations, Co-Chair of the United Nations General Assembly Consultations on System-wide Coherence, reported that in the pilot countries they visited (Cape Verde, Mozambique and Tanzania), significant progress has already been made in advancing the “Delivering as One” process. He noted that several government and United Nations system representatives now considered the process “irreversible”. As the pilot initiative moved into the implementation phase, greater flexibility would have to be given by headquarters to their representatives in the UNCTs. Such flexibility was needed particularly in the various aspects of the One Office - in procurement, travel, office infrastructure and facilities, in building national capacities to execute/implement programmes and projects and pooling of resources. Savings resulting from improved operational efficiency should be channelled to development activities. Ambassador Mahiga stressed that “Delivering as One” would have to strike a balance between the oneness of UN delivery and the diversity of the system which was an enormous asset for the international community. At the same time, reform and renewal of the United Nations system could not co-exist with a ‘business as usual’ approach.

8. The Group of 77 and China stated its high priority for the reform of the United Nations, but reiterated that reform is not intended to change the inter-governmental nature of the decision-making, oversight, and monitoring processes, nor to reduce budget levels or to fund more activities with the same funding. The objective of system-wide coherence is not cost cutting, and savings from administrative reductions and harmonized cost recovery principles should be redirected to programmes in each country. Further, the Group strongly supports the roles and mandates of United Nations humanitarian and development organizations, stresses the importance of industrialization for developing countries, and calls for enhancing the role and maintaining the institutional integrity of UNIDO in the context of UN reform.

9. Both the G-77 and the Non-Aligned Movement prefer an integrated process rather than a divided one, though this position could evolve further, depending on the results of the consultations. Funding, development, and governance will be areas of priority interest for both Groups and no artificial deadlines should be set regarding decisions on the Panel report. The G-77 believes that the pilots in the “Delivering as One” should remain voluntary, be government owned and led, and take into account national particularities and conditions. There should be no restrictions on the ability and sovereignty of national governments to determine their own development priorities, to select their development partners, or to decide themselves the type of relationship they wish to establish with the United Nations development entities.

10. The European Union (EU) offered its full support to the co-Chairs in steering the system-wide coherence discussion in the General Assembly session. The discussions so far show the complexity of the issues, with differing opinions on the High-level Panel report, despite widespread agreement on the goal of better delivery at the country level. The experience of the pilot country efforts, so far, shows that the design of the “Delivering as One” programme is in line with defined national development strategies, and that government leadership has been strengthened. The reforms are changing the way United Nations organizations work with governments, and this is helping to increase the impact of projects and deliver them in a more cohesive manner, increasing transparency, and decreasing overlap and transaction costs.

11. The EU noted that many challenges remain, including adequately enhancing the role of the Resident Coordinator (RC), continued fragmentation of projects, and the need for more strategic and integrated joint agency programming, with greater efforts required from specialized agencies and other United Nations entities. The “firewall”, separating the coordination functions of the RC and the operational activities of UNDP, needs to be developed. Funding is a challenge, and the EU believes Member States need to be fully involved in achieving the objective of ensuring adequate, predictable, and timely core funding to United Nations organizations committed to reform. At the same time, the balance between core and non-core resources needs to be improved, strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations at country level.

12. The EU noted the importance of UNCTs developing a coherent approach to cross-cutting issues, reiterated its strong commitment to human rights and gender, reiterated that gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment should be given higher priority within United Nations organizations, and recalled that promotion of gender equality is one of the agreed steps for the achievement of the MDG’s. It also recommended that United Nations system processes, such as the CEB, UNDG, and the United Nations Evaluation Group be better used reduce duplication and increase coherence in issues such as harmonizing and simplifying business practices. The EU also noted that while efforts so far have concentrated on planning and programming, the coming stage must focus on implementation, and this will require continuing dedication of governments to the process and the support of donors.

## **Session 2: Perspectives on Advancing UN System-wide Coherence**

13. Session 2 was chaired by Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro, the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General, and panellists included Mr. Kandeh Yumkella, Director-General, UNIDO; Mr. Bruce Jenks, Assistant Secretary-General, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, UNDP; Ms. Maria Angelica Ducci, Executive Director of the Office of the Director-General, ILO; Ms. Annika Söder, Assistant Director-General, Office of United Nations Coordination and MDGs Follow-up, FAO; Mr. Hans D’Orville, Assistant Director-General for Strategic Planning, UNESCO; Mr. Denis Aitken, Assistant Director-General and Representative of the Director-General for Partnerships and UN Reform, WHO; Ms. Mari Simonen, Deputy Executive Director for External Relations, United Nations Affairs and Management, UNFPA; Mr. Uday Abhyankar, Director, Office of the President, IFAD. Statements and interventions were made by representatives of the Member States of Colombia, Japan, Sudan, and Iran.

14. The Director General of UNIDO said that he was encouraged by the positive information that has so far come out of the Co-Chairs’ visits to the pilot countries. He noted their call for agency headquarters to provide more flexibility to the field, and said that a change in the “mind set” at headquarters was needed; he assured Member States that he would pay close attention to this necessity. One way of improving the mindset is by strengthening the agency mobility policy to insure the constant flow of staff, including senior staff, between headquarters and the field. A

change was also needed in order to strengthen the RC as the One Leader. The RC must be impartial and able to facilitate the entire United Nations system, including those United Nations organizations not resident in a country. Adequate training of the RCs is important.

15. The Assistant Secretary-General of UNDP noted that the findings of the co-Chairs in their visits to the pilot countries was very positive, and shows that the “Delivering as One” process is bringing new energy to, and resulting in real momentum for, a new way of doing business. It cannot be business as usual now. He also noted that the process is resulting in an extraordinary convergence between country level reports and the main thrust of the TCPR. He mentioned particularly the crucial role of leadership in the process, the importance of more inclusive forms of behaviour, the need to harmonize business practices, the use of savings for programmes in developing countries, and the role of RCs in all of this. However, there are constraints that need to be addressed. There is a need to support increased flexibility of the country teams and for staff mobility, and the United Nations system needs to carefully consider the internal division of labour in the “Delivering as One” process. Finally, work still needs to be done on the “firewall” and UNDP is committed to developing a “firewall” that works.

16. The Executive Director of the Office of the Director-General of ILO reported that ILO had supported UN reform efforts since the High-level Panel’s work, and though it is a challenge to participate closely without a presence in every country, much has been learned as a result. She noted that in addition to strengthening cooperation at the country level, attention needs to be given to global policies as well. On the issue of coherence in business practices, she noted that ILO had come late to this issue, but was re-doubling its effort as a result. She also recalled that the review of the CEB, led by the Executive Heads of ILO and WTO, is leading to a re-invigorated CEB that will be instrumental in pushing the reform efforts. Finally, because the United Nations portion of ODA is so small, other actors such as WTO and the Bretton Woods Institutions need to be involved in the overall efforts.

17. The Assistant Director-General of FAO stated that her organization was undertaking the biggest reform in the United Nations system, both in the field and at headquarters, and that they see synergies from their “Delivering as One” participation, where they are taking part in all 8 of the pilot countries. FAO is also forging partnerships with other United Nations organizations, international financing institutions, private sector entities, and civil society organizations to increase its impact and get the full potential of its policy advice in economic sectors. The “Delivering as One” exercise highlights the importance of involving non-resident agencies in the process, and as a result of the cooperative efforts so far, the split between the ex-com organizations and the specialized agencies is now “history.” Challenges remain, including the need to enhance ownership of the process, avoiding new layers of United Nations bureaucracy, taking advantage of the synergies that are available from coherence, completing the “firewall”, and developing new methods at headquarters to facilitate work in the field.

18. The Assistant Director-General of UNESCO stated that the United Nations was at a crossroads in shaping the UNDAFs and country programmes, and that there were many positive signs. The new TCPR embraces the spirit of the “Delivering as One” initiative even if it does not mention it by name, and the stocktaking exercise shows positive results, including more integration of the specialized agencies in the process. The United Nations system must now deliver – especially given that in addition to implementation of programmes underway, there will be 15 new UNDAFs developed in parallel this year. He noted the importance of increasing national ownership and inclusiveness, to include line ministries as well as all United Nations organizations, the completion of the firewall, and further enhancing non-resident agency contributions to country programmes. He noted that while harmonization of business practices is

important, not much has yet been accomplished in this regard, and that the skills of RCs are the key to future success. On change management, he felt that too much was being left to outside consultants and that more needs to be done by the UNCTs. He also warned against allowing the gender agenda to fall victim to the process; gender needs to be recognized as bedrock of the development exercise.

19. The Assistant Director-General of WHO posed the question “Do you want us to give up being specialized agencies?” He answered this himself, in the negative, but noted that, in a sense, specialized agencies were being asked to do so at the country level. This may be acceptable, he noted, for some development issues, but not for others such as global health and security, or governance. Further, even if agencies relinquish some activities traditionally undertaken by them, they are still responsible for the respective funds. The question was which was more important, national ownership or United Nations harmonization. He also opined that there is a need for all actors to be harmonized, not just the United Nations system.

20. The Deputy Executive Director of UNFPA said that the first year’s experience with United Nations reform was positive, but that these reforms require constant investment, in terms of both money and staff time. A challenge is to find the balance between the process and the strategy and results. She noted that UNFPA had been able to develop a more meaningful dialogue with central ministries than was the case prior to the “Delivering as One” initiative, and that this had resulted in more strategic process work. She emphasized the need to make processes less time-consuming and less costly. The pilots are a good start, but there is a need to build on common sense agreements that exist and implement the High-level Committee on Management business practices initiative.

21. The Director of the IFAD President’s Office noted that some results in the pilots have been impressive, and that there has been a sea change in attitudes regarding operational activities and business practices. Lessons need to be learned from the evaluations that will take place, and clear indicators need to be drawn from them. He felt that the United Nations system would continue to extend the spirit of the “Delivering as One” initiative to other countries, even if officially they are not pilot countries. Finally, he noted that it was futile to have a coherent United Nations with no larger coherence around it.

### **Session 3: Ensuring a comprehensive and strategically focused United Nations system response to national development priorities**

22. The panel Chair was Mr. Hans D’Orville, Assistant Director-General for Strategic Planning, UNESCO. The other panellists were Mr. Henrique Banze, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Mozambique; Ms. Joyce K. G. Mapunjo, Co-Chair of the Joint Steering Committee, Ministry of Finance, Tanzania; Dr. Jean Francois Ruhashyankiko, Senior Economic Advisor to the Minister of Finance and Economic Planning, Rwanda; Mr. Jostein Leiro, Deputy Director General, UN Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway, and Ms. Sally Fegan-Wyles, Director, United Nations Development Group Office (UNDGO). A government representative of the pilot experience in Vietnam made a statement from the floor. Interventions from the floor were also made by representatives from Member States of Colombia, Japan, the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Iran, and Slovenia.

23. The pilot country government representative from Mozambique provided a background on the UNCT’s support for developing the country’s revised poverty reduction strategy. He noted that the current UNDAF is now aligned with that poverty reduction strategy, and that the One Programme insures strategic inclusiveness by focussing on the contribution of all United Nations

organizations, resident and non-resident, in areas of United Nations comparative advantage to achieve greater impact in the context of Mozambique's development priorities and the new aid environment. Strategic focus was achieved by selecting UNDAF priorities in four areas: policy and advocacy, normative and technical support, capacity development, and civil society partnership. 11 joint programmes were developed within these four areas.

24. The pilot country government representative from Tanzania explained that the One Programme is aligned with two strategies, one national and one for Zanzibar, for growth and reduction of poverty. A Joint Government-United Nations Steering Committee oversees the process. She emphasized the importance of effective dialogue, having a strategic focus, and insuring inclusiveness to make the process efficient and effective. She also noted the importance of Government commitment, and pointed out that in Tanzania the Government commitment extends to all levels of Government. She noted that in Tanzania the reform extended to using national procedures and systems, in many cases, and that they were seeing many achievements from this. She also noted that United Nations organizations needed to review their financial practices to see how they could more closely link to national systems and procedures, such as the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT).

25. The pilot country representative from Rwanda explained that the country was unique among the pilots in being the only one where the "Delivering as One" process actually started at the "beginning" (with the preparation of a completely new UNDAF). As a result, the UNDAF is fully aligned with national priorities, and the Common Operational Document (COD) covers 100% of the normal activities of United Nations organizations in Rwanda. The One Budgetary Framework includes core funds, vertical funds, and the One Fund; the firewall is in place, with UNDP having a Country Director, and a Code of Conduct agreed on between the RC and UNCT; and work on the One Office is progressing, including allocation of land for a future United Nations House. Challenges include the need to mobilize enough resources for the One Fund, including the risk that United Nations organizations may revert back to vertical funds, if pooled funding is inadequate. Inertia to change can be a problem, hence the need for change management workshops. Other challenges include the possibility of getting joint programmes rather than true joint programming; the need to refine monitoring and evaluation tools and ensuring useful evaluations; and the need for review and reform at headquarters level. He also noted that management of the One Fund is a complex issue and it is crucial that it be managed well, including strict application of the resource allocation criteria.

26. The Government representative from Norway began by posing the question "Why would donors be interested in a more strategic focus, rather than working directly with the United Nations?" His answer was that, based on 60 years of development experience, they have learned that without national priorities and leadership, there is no lasting impact from development. Traditional donor funding also leads to a poorly aligned and unfocussed United Nations. He pointed out that there are often no linkages between decisions in the governing bodies and funding at national levels, that most funding is earmarked, for countries, areas, or priorities, and that this, in turn, encourages United Nations organizations to go after donor priorities and funding. As a result, United Nations organizations are becoming marginalized and competing among themselves, focussing on money rather than on what can be done, and with too little attention paid to national priorities. The experiences of the pilots seem to make for a more coherent approach, and they allow governments to establish strong joint steering mechanisms to insure priorities and coherence. His view is that the pilots will ultimately be successful, but there are challenges: governments must take the lead in the process; donor financing must be predictable, with less earmarking; there must be stronger support for reform at headquarters level; and there must be a greater trust for, and increased functions of, the One Leader.

27. The Director of UNDOG noted that all pilots are very different, but need to be understood in order to draw lessons from their experiences. Vietnam and Cape Verde started their reform efforts two years before the “Delivering as One” initiative began; of the other six pilots, five had already completed UNDAFs, which were revised for the “Delivering as One” exercise. Only Rwanda began the process from the very beginning, that is, with the preparation of a new UNDAF, making this the only “ideal” country pilot.” She emphasized the importance of new UNDAFs starting with national priorities and with strong Government leadership, because it must be the Government that makes the difficult choices on selecting among United Nations services. She also highlighted the importance of involving all ministries, including sectoral ministries, and civil society organizations in the process, and stressed the significance of wider participation of United Nations organizations. Another requirement is for the RCs to have the proper incentives to work for the entire United Nations system. She noted that the programmes were changing as a result of the more coherent process, that there was now a greater emphasis on the trade, productive sectors, and environment, as well as more alignment with national priorities, and the greater involvement of United Nations organizations, including specialized and non-resident agencies. She pointed out that so far, the process has led to programmes, but now they need to be implemented, and that there are important lessons learned from the pilots that should be mainstreamed into the new UNDAFs that will start in 2008. She concluded with two challenges: there needs to be more trust in order to reduce the process-intensive approach that the pilots have thus far involved, and we need to find ways of maintaining the new energy and momentum that the pilots have created.

28. The representative of the Vietnam pilot experience stated that finding the balance between strategic focus and inclusiveness had not been difficult in that country, because the Government assumes the leading role in cooperation in the country, and the basis for the cooperation is the Socio-Economic Development Plan of the Government. As a result, the UNDAF is aligned with this plan. He also noted the importance in the Vietnam pilot experience of the development of Common Management Guidelines to facilitate cooperation and coherence in United Nations activities in the country.

29. The general discussion focussed primarily on how the “Delivering as One” process could be improved, especially regarding the use of savings from efficiency for development purposes, increasing the inclusiveness of the process, mainstreaming the lessons learned, and supporting governments to select priorities and make choices. It was noted that both Cape Verde and Rwanda have shown that savings from reduced transaction costs were possible and that they demonstrated that savings could be channelled back into development programmes. For inclusiveness, it was suggested that the role of the private sector and of civil society organizations should be taken into consideration in the preparation of the UNDAF, that the One Leader was a key element, and that the development of an effective Code of Conduct was a useful tool. To ensure that lessons learned are mainstreamed in future UNDAFs and One Programmes, a systematic process of all United Nations organizations, led by UNDOG, is underway. A listing of documents related to this process is available at [www.undg.org](http://www.undg.org). Finally, it was pointed out that the United Nations provides an assortment of programmes and tools to build capacities of governments, including the capacity for leadership of the UNDAF and One Programme exercises. An example is “DevInfo”, which allows governments to apply information on development to their own planning needs.

#### **Session 4: Funding the pilots for coherence**

30. The panel members included Mr. Thomas Stelzer, Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations (Chair); Mr. Michael Schultz, Deputy Director for United Nations Strategy, DFID, United Kingdom; Prof. Nelson Villareal, Advisor, Direction of the Planning and Budget Office of the Presidency and One United Nations Coordinator for Uruguay; Ms. Valbona Kuko, Acting Director, Department of Strategy and Donor Coordination, Council of Ministers, Albania; and Mr. Adrie De Groot, Director, Resource Mobilization and Quality Assurance, UNIDO. Interventions from the floor were made by Spain, Guatemala, the Co-Chair from Ireland, Tanzania, Japan, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

31. The Assistant Secretary-General noted that the session was to focus on funding, which is a critical aspect of “Delivering as One”. He posed four questions that should be addressed in the consideration of this issue: How and to what extent has the “Delivering as One” initiative influenced the policies and priorities of the donor countries? To what extent are the donors pooling their voluntary contributions and making non-earmarked contributions to fund the unfunded portion of the One Programmes? How are the funds under the One Fund to be allocated and administered? What should be done to avoid adding interventions to the One Programmes for the sake of accessing the coherence funds and diluting the strategic focus of the One Programmes?

32. The DFID representative recalled that the High-level Panel had recommended a single budgetary framework, managed by the RC, in line with the priorities of the Government, and with all funding in a common pool. He noted that what we want to see are fewer, larger flows, where higher priorities get funding first, in predictable, flexible, and adequate amounts. “We also need to build coherence around aligned funding periods.” To accomplish this, there is a need for a single plan, with clear outcomes, with priorities agreed, with all available programmable funds in the common pool, and with an RC having the authority to manage the programme. This will require that the United Nations end its fragmented fundraising, that donors pool their funds, that the United Nations and its partners align their planning timetables, and that all actors practice discipline in setting priorities. He concluded by asking three questions that needed to be answered: How much of a country’s programme should be included in “Delivering as One”? (DFID’s answer would be “as much as possible”). What is the core funding of the United Nations organizations for? How long before a central fund is needed?

33. The Government representative for the Uruguayan pilot exercise described “Delivering as One” activities to date, noting that Uruguay is a middle-income country. He emphasized the importance of ownership by the country, and the need to ensure that institutions are close to the people they serve. He also emphasized that the exercise must be seen as an ongoing process, not one that is cast in stone, and that new types of governance need to be designed. He also highlighted the importance of involvement of all parties in the process, including the private sector, civil society organizations, and others. He identified challenges that remain, including the need to identify indicators and to monitor results, the need to establish a long-term evaluation structure to provide lessons learned, and the need to identify the appropriate role of United Nations organizations in the process, which he suggested should be the provision of policy advice. Finally, he questioned why the 7% charge by United Nations organizations was not transferred to the field.

34. The Government representative for the Albanian pilot described the process undertaken and said that good progress had been made to date. A \$75 million One Programme was developed, of which \$41 million has been obtained, leaving a gap of \$34 million, a portion of which is needed for 2008 activities. Only one donor has committed to multi-year financing, and

others to annual financing, so more predictable funding is needed. The focus this year will be on timely implementation. Challenges include maintaining a continuing high level of commitment from the Government, and commitment to reform by the United Nations at all levels, including at the country level, with strong leadership by the RC.

35. The UNIDO representative noted that “Delivering as One” should respond to national priorities, create synergies within the United Nations, and increase the volume and effectiveness of assistance given to the pilot countries. So far, pilots have focussed on two elements: One Plan and One Fund. The One Fund provides funding for local programming, with the rest to be mobilized by United Nations organizations wherever they can. Everyone agrees that the One Fund funding should increase, but there are different business models among both specialized agencies and among donors. Specialized agencies use in many cases special purpose funding from various donors, and these funds do not always reflect the highest national priorities. In addition, these funds are often accessed only after the activities have been identified. These are funds that cannot be included in the One Fund and ways needed to be found to include them in the One Plan. There are also regional activities that are funded, but which are not reflected in the One Plan of many of the pilot countries. In short, there is a need for broadening the One Plan to focus on areas where other resources are available, and the programming process should take this into account for the benefit of country-level coherence.

36. A number of issues related to funding were addressed in interventions during the general discussion, several of them related to special purpose funding. One suggestion was to channel specialized funds through the One Plan, whenever possible. Another was to recognize that some funds are earmarked and that this will continue, raising the question of how to access those funds and include them in the One Plan. There is also a need to recognize that some decisions about funding can be made at the local level while others must be made at headquarters. Another comment was a reminder that while local programming is important, regional and global interests/programmes/mandates also need to be looked after, even if they may not be a priority for a particular country. There was an explanation as to the overhead charges involved in the One Fund, specifically that the administrative agent receives 1% and the managing agent receives 7%, all of which goes to headquarters to cover the indirect costs of the United Nations organizations. Other points made include the fact that we need to look more closely at the core resources of United Nations organizations in light of the One United Nations environment, and the fact that the One United Nations was not necessarily supposed to lead to more money, but to more efficient and effective use of existing funds.

#### **Session 5: Empowering the Resident Coordinator**

37. The panel consisted of Mr. Bruce Jenks, Assistant Secretary-General, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, UNDP (Chair); Mr. Olivier Chave, Head, United Nations Development Section, Development Policy and Multilateral Cooperation Division, Directorate for Development and Cooperation, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland; Mr. Kees Rade, Director, Department of the United Nations and International Financial Institutions, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands; Ms. Manuela Tortora, Chief, Technical Cooperation Service, UNCTAD; and Mr. Alexander Zouev, Head, Office of United Nations and Intergovernmental Affairs, UNICEF. Interventions were made by representatives of UNESCO, UNFPA, WHO, UNHCR, the co-Chair from Ireland, and representatives of Member States of Guatemala, Norway, Iran, Uruguay, Colombia, and the Philippines.

38. The Chairman provided some comments to help frame the interventions of the panelists. He noted that two dimensions have to be considered in addressing the issue of the empowerment

of the RC. The first is the enabling environment or preconditions that enable the RC to function in a way that fosters confidence by the entire United Nations family and the second relates to the terms of reference of the RC. He mentioned that on the first dimension, some of the issues where work is in progress include: recruitment, performance management, training, dispute resolution, availability of a knowledge management system, integration of UNDG within the CEB, and integration of non-resident agencies. As to what the RCs are empowered to do, he lists the following: final sign-off with the Government on the UNDAFs and UN Programmes; representation of the United Nations when one voice is required; final sign-off on allocation of resources from the One Fund; and bringing to the attention of United Nations organizations any behaviour or issues occurring at the country level that do not meet the highest United Nations standards.

39. The representative of SDC stated that the RC was the “hottest issue” in the “Delivering as One” initiative and, while there were emotional arguments pro and con, the RC needed to be the “CEO”, as in any organization. He said that improving the current situation would require a number of measures, including educating the RCs to be leaders; fixing incentives for all to achieve development effectiveness; making sure that decisions on priorities and the allocation of financial resources are done by the Government; having all specialized agencies sign Memoranda of Understanding with UNDP, as UNIDO has done; having UNDP demonstrate more visibly its commitment to withdraw from areas in the mandates of the specialized agencies; having the specialized agencies abandon their project approach, provide field staff the tools to do more at the country level, and delegate to the RCs the authority necessary to assure the effective delivery of development results at the country level; and making the RC accountable to the partner Government. Finally, he suggested a study on creating a position of Assistant Administrator solely to oversee the functions performed by UNDP on behalf of the system.

40. The representative of The Netherlands noted that it is important to have one visible leader, who represents the United Nations system, and it is up to the United Nations to find solutions for strengthening the position of the RC. However, one solution might be found in the Code of Conduct along the lines of “trying to get consensus, but if there are conflicts, the RC decides”. The RC is key and he needs the skills and authority to lead the joint programming process and make sure that the United Nations system is supporting the priorities of the Government. The RC system will only work if the firewall is 100% effective. He felt that the appointment of a UNDP Country Director is an effective measure, but he noted that some countries refuse to provide the United Nations with a second diplomatic representational post. At headquarters level, however, the firewall is proving to be more challenging. He suggested that the part of the UNDG managing the RC system should be separated from that dealing with UNDP matters. He also suggested that it should be considered how the RC could function without relying so much on UNDP, though this would raise the issue of increasing United Nations staff, and the related cost.

41. The representative from UNCTAD pointed out that UNCTAD was a subsidiary body of the United Nations, and a non-resident agency but was firmly committed to the “Delivering as One” initiative. She stated that the empowerment of the RC determines UNCTAD’s capacity to compensate for its lack of a physical presence at the country level, its role in the decisions taken at the country level, and the extent to which trade and related issues are taken into account in the United Nations country programmes. Because of the importance of the RC’s role, especially for non-resident agencies, it is imperative for the RC to identify what the United Nations system can do, understand the expertise of the entire United Nations system, and ensure policy coherence. In close coordination with the Government, the RC should play his role with objectivity, free from institutional interests and by taking transparent decisions. This means that the training of the RCs

in the substantive aspects of what the United Nations system offers is crucial. She concluded by noting that there was still confusion related to UNDP's role as both manager of the system and as an implementing agency, and that this issue needs to be resolved.

42. The Head of the Office of United Nations and Intergovernmental Affairs of UNICEF stated that there has been considerable progress made in establishing RCs as empowered and accountable United Nations team leaders at the country level, and that UNDP has already made considerable efforts to ensure that the RC is able to act on behalf of the entire United Nations system. He sees the best proof of ongoing changes as the expanding interagency pool of candidates for the RC assessment, the increasing share of the RCs coming from different United Nations entities, the establishment of UNDP Country Directors and the assessment of RC performance being extended to the whole Regional Directors Team (RDT) rather than just UNDP. However, he noted that some work needed to be done to fight the perception of conflict of interests resulting from the dual roles often still played by the RCs. On the issue of how much authority should be delegated to the RC, given the accountabilities of individual United Nations organizations representatives, he stated that the ideal is not so much to delegate more and more responsibility to the RC, but rather to enable him to represent the United Nations at a higher and stronger level, strategically leading the UNCT to be more effective, efficient and coherent in its actions to support national development.

43. In the first intervention from the floor, the UNESCO representative noted that the framework laid out by the UNDP representative makes much sense, but that the RC issues have taken too long to resolve. He noted that there are several different Codes of Conduct and that a global solution and standardization was needed very quickly. Concerning the firewall, he believed that the nomination of UNDP Country Directors is good, but that, as suggested by the Swiss representative, UNDP should demonstrate more visibly its withdrawal from substantive areas where other organizations have a clear mandate and expertise. Finally, he noted that UNESCO is a little at variance with the emphasis put on joint programming as the apogee of the joint engagement of the UNCT. While joint programming is feasible, the jury is still out on joint programmes and the notion of joint programmes should not be dismissed.

44. The representative from UNFPA said that the main problem is the firewall, and while progress has been made there is an inherent problem in having an RC representing another organization. She highlighted the need to prepare middle managers from the younger generation to fill these key roles, and proposed that RCs should rely on the competencies and capacities of other United Nations organizations and UNCT members, rather than turning the RC office into a large bureaucracy.

45. The representative from WHO noted that there has been much progress in cooperation among UNCT members, though more needs to be done. He also pointed that the issue of full inclusiveness is very important and that the UNDAFs should be converted into the One Programmes. He asked whether the RC should be a "CEO" or a "strategic lead coordinator", and said that the issue of the firewall is less critical if RCs act as coordinators rather than CEOs.

46. The representative of UNHCR said that the broader the experience and knowledge of the RCs, the better it is for the system; the broader the firewall is, the better will be the management of the transition from humanitarian to development activities, and the more unbiased will be the funds allocation and administration. She also pointed out that the RC appraisal process was a regional exercise that many agencies do not take part in because they do not have this type of regional representation. Finally, she stressed that training of RCs in the whole range of sectors that United Nations organizations work in is crucial.

47. Member state representatives made several interventions. One noted that the RC system should not be micro-managed by Member States, but they were asking that the issues be resolved by the United Nations organizations. Other suggestions included the need to develop knowledge management systems. It was also mentioned that it was not a question of whether RCs or UNCTs should be strengthened: both needed to be strengthened. Finally, it was noted that substantial experience was no guarantee that an RC was impartial, so in addition to having a good firewall, there was a need for diversity in the backgrounds of the RCs.

48. The Chairman concluded the panel by speaking as the UNDP representative, and said that the big story line that is coming out of this meeting is that progress is being made on “Delivering as One”. He noted that UNDP is committed to developing a total package for the firewall, and noted the shift of RC appraisals from being an internal UNDP activity to one undertaken by the regional teams. He noted that there have also been proposals made to create a senior UNDP post to represent the United Nations system and monitor the firewall. He closed by noting the need for improved division of labour within the United Nations system to compete against non-United Nations players, and that this will require a real knowledge management system and finding ways to better involve the non-resident agencies in the work.

#### **Session 6 – Harmonizing business models and practices**

49. The panel participants included Ms. Mari Simonen, Deputy Executive Director for External Relations, United Nations Affairs and Management, UNFPA (Chair); Mr. Jorge Borges, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Economy, Growth and Competitiveness, Cape Verde; Mr. Adnan Amin, Director, United Nations System Chief Executives Board Secretariat; Mr. Hans Page, Field Programme, Monitoring and Coordination, Technical Cooperation Department, FAO, and Mr. Jan Mattson, Executive Director, United Nations Office of Project Services.

50. The Deputy Executive Director from UNFPA mentioned in her introductory comments the efforts that have been underway for several years to establish common premises and common services. She noted that progress has been made and within the existing guidance and legislation, the United Nations system can do much to harmonize business practices. She highlighted the United Nations system implementation of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards, which will be completed by 2010 and which will help harmonizing many of the areas of accountability related to issues of finance and budgeting. Finally, she noted that there has been a major effort on harmonization of business practices under the auspices of the High-level Committee on Management (HLCM) of CEB, covering human resources, ICT, and budgeting and finance, among other issues, and that proposals will be ready for adoption very soon.

51. The Deputy Minister of Cape Verde emphasized the importance of the Government’s commitment to the process, the need for a clear vision about what it wants and an internal consensus within the Government and among all ministries. He noted that the development process could not be outsourced. He then gave a comprehensive illustration of the achievements made in Cape Verde. Finally, he stated the strong hope that “Delivering as One” will end “business as usual”, and expressed the conviction that it is a major advance over the past. He also stressed that challenges remain, including the requirement for all partners to understand their respective roles, and the need for support and backing of donor countries.

52. The Director of the CEB Secretariat pointed out that the difference in business practices of the United Nations system is a major problem for coherence, and that the existing 17 specialized agencies, 14 programmes and funds, 17 departments and offices of the United Nations

Secretariat, 5 regional commissions, 5 research and training institutions and a plethora of regional and country level structures have each implemented their own administrative practices. Although United Nations General Assembly resolution 32/197 in 1977 called for harmonization of business practices, progress over the last 30 years has been very limited. He noted, however, that a comprehensive and ambitious approach to harmonization of business practices is being developed in HLCM. He briefly explained some of the plans for harmonization and improvement of business practices and noted that this could significantly increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations system in the future.

53. The representative from FAO expressed the need to look carefully at the different business models that support the One United Nations Programme. Funds, programmes and specialized agencies have optimized business models for their traditional work and the challenge now is to work with those business models in a new environment. He noted that the ideal situation was to have expertise in the field to support the One Programme but this was not feasible for technical experts since there is rarely enough work in one country to justify the costs of stationing them there full-time. He recommended an open, flexible and dynamic UNCT model, taking into consideration the expertise requirements and the need to rely on different business models to provide that expertise in the most cost-effective manner. He concluded by emphasizing that in addition to the United Nations system's role in supporting national development under national ownership and leadership in response to national priorities, the United Nations system has a role to support achievement of internationally agreed norms and standards resulting from internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs, in relation to global public goods.

54. The Executive Director of UNOPS noted that there were some success stories in improving common services, for instance in travel, but that there has been little scaling-up of these successes. Though there is now a United Nations-wide procurement portal, there is still very little collaboration among United Nations organizations to get volume discounts and economies of scale in operations. He traced the problem to the lack of incentives for decision-makers to undertake the needed changes, perhaps assuming that Member States, governing bodies and top management are primarily focused on effectiveness of programmes and other measures of success, rather than cost savings. He expressed the opinion that there may be too much centralization in the specialized agencies, while the Funds and Programmes may be too decentralized. Decentralization of procurement helps responsiveness when speed is important, but centralized procurement may make more sense when purchases are specialized or volume discounts are possible.

55. In the general discussion, the Director-General of UNIDO noted that procurement of specialized equipment, such as that for projects that reduce ozone-depleting substances, is very different from the procurement of vehicles, for instance. In the case of specialized equipment, procurement is an integral part of implementation. "How can the field be empowered to do this type of procurement?" The Executive Director of UNOPS replied that, for specialized procurement that is part of an organization's core mandate and delivery, it may not be prudent to delegate to others but for many other types of procurement, the United Nations system would benefit from having a small unit managing this on behalf of others.

56. The Deputy Director-General of United Nations Office in Geneva noted that the issue of harmonization of business practices is particularly complicated when it comes to Human resources because one needs to find the right balance between the increased decentralization through delegation of authority to the field for reaching flexibility to meet country conditions, and the need for equity and transparency in the treatment of staff. She pointed out that there are over 36,000 United Nations staff and over 2/3 of them are in non-headquarter duty station. It is

important to ensure that the conditions of service of staff are harmonized across the system for reason of equity, to help achieve mobility in the system and to ensure their safety and security. On the issue of leadership, she stressed that the United Nations is not only looking for substantive expertise, which obviously is key, but also for managerial and leadership qualities and team-building skills.

### **Wrap-up and closing remarks**

57. In his closing statement, the Director-General of UNIDO recalled the message of the High-level Panel's report on the urgency of reforming the United Nations if it is to play a pivotal role in today's globalized world. Ambassador Mahiga noted that the dialogue was a great learning opportunity on advancing system-wide coherence but that the challenges remained complex. He reminded participants of the need to invest and re-invest in the United Nations. Ambassador Kavanagh expressed his appreciation for the discussions and noted the need to keep the momentum of the "Delivering as One" pilots going, and underlined his sense of optimism for the future.

\*\*\*\*\*

## “United Nations System-wide Coherence: The Next Steps”

4-5 March 2008

UNIDO Board Room  
Vienna International Centre  
Vienna, Austria

### Provisional Agenda and Programme

Tuesday, 4 March

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Welcome remarks – Mr. Kandeh Yumkella, UNIDO  
Director-General

Keynote Speech -- Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro  
United Nations Deputy Secretary-General

10:00 a.m. – 11:30 p.m. **Session 1 – Intergovernmental process on system-wide  
coherence: Progress and next steps**

*Following the General Assembly debate on the report of the High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence (16-17 April 2007), the UNGA President established an intergovernmental process to consider the recommendations of the Panel. A series of informal debates and briefings (June - August 2007) led by the Permanent Representatives of Barbados and Luxembourg as Co-Chairs culminated in a report recommending, inter alia, the continuation of consultations. The Permanent Representatives of Ireland and Tanzania to the United Nations were requested to take the consultations forward during the 63<sup>rd</sup> session of the Assembly. They will provide an overview of where the process stands, what the challenges are and what they see as the next steps in the intergovernmental consultative process.*

Chair: H.E. Mr. Juan Manuel Gomez Robledo  
Vice-Minister for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico

Statements by:  
H.E. Ambassador Paul Kavanagh, Permanent  
Representative of Ireland to the United Nations, New York

H.E. Ambassador Augustine P. Mahiga, Permanent  
Representative of Tanzania to the United Nations, New  
York

The presentations will be followed by comments and questions from the floor.

11:30 a.m. – 1:00 pm.            **Session 2: Perspectives on Advancing UN System-wide Coherence**

*Since the launching of the “Delivering as One” pilot initiative in December 2006 – January 2007, the United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes have been actively involved in shaping a collective approach to country-level coherence. This proved to be challenging with the multiplicity and diversity of mandates, governance structures, financing modalities, management structures, programming methodologies, and work cultures of the different organizations involved. The session will provide an opportunity for heads of organizations of the system or their representatives, to share their experiences and perspectives on how they have worked to meet this challenge while maintaining their organizational identity and autonomy. They will also present their views on how they see the system-wide coherence and “Delivering as One” processes unfolding in the future.*

Chairperson: Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro  
United Nations Deputy Secretary-General

Statements: Mr. Kandeh Yumkella, Director-General, UNIDO  
Mr. Bruce Jenks, Assistant Secretary-General, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, UNDP  
Ms. Mari Simonen, Deputy Executive Director for External Relations, UN Affairs and Management, UNFPA  
Ms. Maria Angelica Ducci, Executive Director of the Office of the Director-General, ILO  
Ms. Annika Söder, Assistant Director-General, Office of UN Coordination and MDGs Follow-up, FAO  
Mr. Hans D’Orville, Assistant Director-General for Strategic Planning, UNESCO  
Mr. Denis Aitken, Assistant Director-General and Representative of the Director-General for Partnerships and UN Reform, WHO  
Mr. Uday Abhyankar, Director, Office of the President, IFAD

1:00 – 2:30 p.m.            Lunch break

2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

**Session 3 – Ensuring a comprehensive and strategically focused UN system response to national development priorities**

*A key goal of the “Delivering as One” pilot initiative is to achieve greater strategic focus and coherence in the United Nations system’s programmatic response to country-level needs while making the full range of capacities and expertise available in the system to the governments concerned. The session will examine the experience of the pilot countries in achieving an appropriate balance between strategic focus and inclusiveness. It will also assess the extent to which the “One Programmes”, as currently formulated, constitute a strategic, integrated and well-prioritized response by the United Nations system to national priorities.*

Chair: Mr. Hans D’Orville, Assistant Director-General for Strategic Planning, UNESCO

Panelists: Mr. Henrique Banze, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Mozambique  
Mrs. Joyce K. G. Mapunjo, Co-Chair of the Joint Steering Committee, Ministry of Finance, Tanzania  
Dr. Jean Francois Ruhashyankiko, Senior Economic Advisor to the Minister of Finance and Economic Planning, Rwanda  
Mr. Jostein Leiro, Deputy Director General, UN Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway  
Ms. Sally Fegan-Wyles, Director, UN Development Group Office (UNDG)

**General discussion (45 minutes)**

**4:00 – 4:20 p.m.**

**Coffee Break**

**4:20 – 6:00 p.m.**

**Session 4 – Funding the pilots for coherence**

*Funding is a critical part of the “Delivering as One” initiative. The “One Budgetary Framework” lists the core and non-core resources, i.e., regular budget and extra-budgetary resources, of the participating United Nations system organizations in the country. Local coherence funds – the “One Fund” – are intended to finance the unfunded requirements of the “One Programme”. The session will address the following questions: (i) How and to what extent has the “Delivering as One” pilot initiative*

*influenced the policies and priorities of the donor countries? (ii) To what extent are the donors pooling their voluntary contributions and making unearmarked contributions to fund the unfunded portion of the “One Programmes”? (iii) How are the funds under the “One Fund” to be allocated and administered? (iv) What should be done to avoid adding interventions to the “One Programmes” for the sake of accessing the coherence funds and diluting the strategic focus of the “One Programmes”?*

Chair: Mr. Thomas Stelzer, Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations

Panelists: Prof. Nelson Villareal, Advisor, Direction of the Planning and Budget Office of the Presidency and One UN Coordinator for Uruguay

Mrs. Valbona Kuko, Acting Director, Department of Strategy and Donor Coordination, Council of Ministers, Albania

Mr. Michael Schultz, Deputy Director for UN Strategy, DFID, United Kingdom

Mr. Adrie De Groot, Director, Resource Mobilization and Quality Assurance, UNIDO

**General discussion (45 minutes)**

**6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. Reception by the Director-General of UNIDO, VIC Restaurant – Mozart Saal**

**Wednesday, 5 March**

**9:30 a.m. – 11:00 p.m. Session 5 – Empowering the Resident Coordinator**

*The United Nations system is often criticized for speaking with many voices at the country level. Not only is this seen as a sign of fragmentation but also as a burden to host governments who find themselves having to deal with a large number of organizations. The prescribed solution is to empower the Resident Coordinator to speak on behalf of the United Nations system, lead the country teams (composed of the representatives of United Nations system organizations present in the country) in shaping and allocating resources to the “One Programme” and hold members of the country team accountable*

*for achieving the results/outcomes agreed upon in the “One Programme”. However, the ability of the Resident Coordinator to lead the country teams effectively hinges on his/her independence and impartiality. Most Resident Coordinators are also Resident Representatives of UNDP and since UNDP is the manager of the Resident Coordinator system, there is a perception of conflict of interest in the dual role performed by the Resident Coordinators. UNDP has, however, started to put an “institutional firewall” in place by, among others, appointing UNDP Country Directors in a number of countries to assume responsibility for UNDP programmes, leaving the Resident Coordinator free to focus on his/her coordination responsibilities.*

*The session will examine the nature of this “institutional firewall”, how it is expected to operate and what further steps UNDP is taking to separate its programme implementation functions from its role as manager of the Resident Coordinator system. The session will also address the following questions: (i) What authority are the participating United Nations system organizations expected to delegate to the Resident Coordinator? (ii) What would be the role and responsibilities of the representatives of the participating United Nations organizations vis-à-vis the Resident Coordinator? (iii) To whom will the Resident Coordinator be accountable? What would be his/her accountability to the Government, to the donors, UNDP and to United Nations system organizations represented in the country?*

Chair: Mr. Bruce Jenks, Assistant Secretary-General, Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships, UNDP

Panelists: Mr. Amir Tariq Zaman, Joint Secretary, Economics Affairs Division, Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs, Revenue and Statistics, Pakistan (proposed)

Mr. Olivier Chave, Head, UN Development Section, Development Policy and Multilateral Cooperation Division, Directorate for Development and Cooperation, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland

Mr. Kees Rade, Director, Department of the United Nations and International Financial Institutions, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Ms. Manuela Tortora, Chief, Technical Cooperation Service, UNCTAD

Mr. Alexander Zouev, Head, Office of UN and Intergovernmental Affairs, UNICEF

**General discussion (45 minutes)**

## 11:00 – 12:30 p.m. Session 6 – Harmonizing business models and practices

*A major challenge that has emerged from the experience of the pilot countries is the difficulty of harmonizing the business practices and procedures of the participating United Nations organizations. The funds and programmes have increasingly harmonized their programme and project management guidelines and their administrative policies and procedures. The specialized agencies, on the other hand, continue to apply a different “business model”, i.e., operating modality, based primarily on policies and implementing rules adopted by their governing bodies. In addition, they are required to conform to donor-mandated guidelines and conditions in implementing donor-funded programmes and projects. The plethora of business practices resulting from this welter of policies and requirements has made it particularly difficult to harmonize business models and practices at the country level. But there is a widely held view that this difficulty should not be allowed to block progress towards the “Delivering as One” in the pilot countries. There is also the issue of sharing administrative services and operating from common premises, i.e., One UN House, to minimize operating costs and provide an environment more conducive to inter-agency cooperation. Against this background, the session will take stock of the work being done by the High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) of CEB and by UNDG to harmonize business practices across the United Nations system. It will also address the key question: What decisions on business practices are required of the governing bodies of the system, system-wide inter-agency bodies, i.e., CEB/HLCM, and from headquarters of United Nations system organizations to support continued progress towards the “Delivering as One” in the pilot countries?*

Chair: Ms. Mari Simonen, Deputy Executive Director for External Relations, UN Affairs and Management, UNFPA

Panelists: Mr. Jorge Borges, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Economy, Growth and Competitiveness, Cape Verde

Mr. Adnan Amin, Director, UN System Chief Executives Board Secretariat

Mr. Hans Page, Field Programme, Monitoring and Coordination, Technical Cooperation Department, FAO

Mr. Jan Mattson, Executive Director, UNOPS

### **Wrap-up and closing remarks**

\*\*\*\*\*