

Joint Programme Mechanism Review

Consolidated Final Report – Annexes

Charles Downs

4 February 2013

FINAL REPORT – ANNEXES

Annexes

1. Terms of Reference.....	1
2. HQ Staff Interviewed during Initial Phase.....	5
3. Persons Interviewed in Three Case Countries	6
4. Agencies Contacted for Discussion of HQ Perspective	11
5. Documents Consulted.....	12
6. Joint Programme Listings Received from Agencies	13
7. Methodological Notes.....	14
8. Master Dataset of Joint Programmes: 1998 – 2012 (separate file).....	19
9. E-Survey Questionnaire (separate file)	20
10. Support required from Agency HQ, identified by Survey Respondents	21
11. Obstacles to JP Success, identified by Survey Respondents	29
12. Specific JP Mechanism Improvements, Identified by Survey Respondents	41

1. Terms of Reference

REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMMES FUNDING MODALITIES

Background

With the aim of improving UN coherence, effectiveness and efficiency in supporting the realization of national goals and outcomes, a number of reforms have been introduced to simplify and harmonize programming at the country level. These measures are intended to reduce transaction costs for governments, donors, and the UN, and strengthen how UN organizations programme jointly with governments of programme countries. The Secretary-General's 2002 agenda for further UN reform calls for increased joint programming to further enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations system in developing countries, and to ensure the system's combined resources are put to best use. Increasingly, national governments are requesting more efficient and effective work processes from the UN and partners, and enhanced development impact for the benefit of stakeholders.

The introduction of a common country programming process in 2003 (the CCA/UNDAF process) set the framework for joint programming – i.e. the collective effort of the United Nations and national partners to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate activities to support countries in their achievement of the MDGs and other international commitments. Before 2004 a number of challenges to joint programming and the development of joint programmes had been identified, including limited enablement of joint programmes through the country programming process; donor interest or availability of funds driving joint programmes rather than the country programming process; different approaches among UN organizations to results-based management; and different methodologies applied by UN organizations to calculate cost recovery rates. It was expected that the introduction of the Guidance Note on Joint Programming issued in 2004, together with the roll-out of the common country programming process as of 2003, would help overcome these challenges and would maximize opportunities for joint programmes. This was the first time that efforts had been made to ensure that collaborative actions between United Nations organizations and national partners at the country level were linked specifically to the country programming process.

The UNDG Guidance Note provides standard tools for implementing the actions identified in the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review, 2004 and 2007, including “harmonization and simplification measures, with a view to achieving a significant reduction in the administrative and procedural burden on the organizations and their national partners...”. Additionally, the TCPR notes that the UNDAF brings with it opportunities for joint initiatives, including joint programmes and urges the UN to use such opportunities “in the interest of enhancing aid efficiency and aid effectiveness”. In adopting these new ways of working, the fundamental objective of the UN programming at country level remains the achievement of results in line with the national development priorities and in a more effective way — in that sense joint programmes are no different from other programme activities.

In 2006, a review was undertaken of 19 joint programmes being implemented in 14 countries. The review was not conclusive on the impact of joint programmes in terms of efficiency,

effectiveness or transaction costs. Some of the findings of the review suggest that joint programmes are not realizing the potential that partnerships can bring to bear – e.g. increased resources and leveraging of additional resources, and potentially more sustainable development impact through collective efforts.

In addition to the above review, several assessments and evaluations of Joint Programmes were undertaken either at country level (e.g. Viet Nam, Liberia, Afghanistan, Botswana, etc.) or at global level (e.g. evaluations of Joint Programmes supported through the MDG Achievement Fund, UN Women evaluation of Joint Programmes from gender perspective, agency-specific reviews). However, since 2005, no UNDG-wide review of functioning of Joint Programme modalities was undertaken.

Against this background, as well as considering the high demand from Country Offices on the application of joint programme modalities, the UNDG Joint Funding and Business Operations Network (JFBO Network) requested the Joint Funding Sub-Committee to undertake a review of UNDG Joint Programme modalities, specifically focusing on funding approaches. This review study will complement the study that the UNDG Joint Funding Sub-Committee carried out in 2011 on the operational effectiveness of the UN MDTF mechanism.

Purpose:

The purpose of the Review is to examine the application of joint programme modalities in various contexts (both at global and country levels) and to inform the revision of the 2003 UNDG Guidance on Joint Programming (which will be undertaken separately from this review). The Review will assess efficiency and effectiveness of administrative, managerial and accountability arrangements for various funding modalities of JPs, their management procedures and systems, as well as their impact on transaction costs. Its findings and recommendations will inform further refinement of JP related policies and tools, as appropriate.

Duties and Responsibilities

Scope:

The scope of the Review will be on issues related to operational functioning of Joint Programme funding modalities. It should, however, be noted that considering direct inter-linkages with operational aspects, programmatic aspects would also need to be taken into account.

Within this scope, the Review will focus on, but not limited to, the following key issues:

Trends in Application of Joint Programmes:

- Analysis of trends in the UN's use of JPs: overall interest in use of JP concept 2004-2011; primary purpose for establishment; trends in size, location (country and global), purpose of established;

- The MDG-F Secretariat has established an M&E strategy that identifies some key indicators to allow obtaining a comprehensive overview of the MDG-F. The main elements of this strategy consist of:
 - (i) Joint programme biannual monitoring reports that provide information against a set of indicators relevant to specific programme areas, collaborative “ONE UN” efforts and on development effectiveness as seen in the Paris Declaration;
 - (ii) Mid-term (formative) evaluations of all 128 joint programmes which aim to improve programmes during their implementation period;
 - (iii) Final Evaluation upon completion of each of the (128) JP, which assesses the final performance of the Programme;
 - (iv) 9 country evaluations consisting of an in depth and detailed evaluation exercise, using a participatory case study methodology focusing on MDGs advances, One UN efforts and the implementation of the Paris Declaration Principles at country level;
 - (v) 8 Meta-evaluations, 1 for thematic area; and
 - (vi) An evaluation of the MDG-F as cooperation for development instrument;
- "Operational Effectiveness of the UN MDTF Mechanism”, Final Report, May 2011;
- JPs (within DAO context, with support from MDG-F and other MDTFs, country-specific, etc.); size of JPs being funded; governance mechanisms used for JPs; Use of various JP funding modalities and determining factors for the application of one or another modality, including funding relationship to country-level or global MDTFs.

Effectiveness and Efficiency:

- Analysis of the value for money of JPs funding modalities (i.e. pooled, pass-through and parallel) with a specific cost structure (AA fee, Participating Organization’s indirect costs, direct costs), and effectiveness and efficiency gains specific to these funding modalities, in comparison with single UN agency programmes; and/or whether funded directly by donors or through MDTFs;
- Lessons learnt from the application of existing tools and instruments, with particular focus on the (i) establishment, (ii) management, (iii) extension, and (iv) closure of joint programmes;
- Analysis of transaction costs for national partners, donors and UN agencies as a result of participating in JPs based on review of existing trends and analysis (no new data collection or methodology will be explored). More specifically, do joint programmes (with particular specificities related to pooled, pass-through and parallel modalities) require more efforts (coordination, etc.) from national partners and donors as compared to regular operations? How these impact effectiveness of delivering programme results?
- What are the costs and impact of a JP receiving contributions in installments/ tranches from a variety of donors rather than a full contribution at the beginning? Are there ways to improve efficiencies and reduce transaction costs related to small contributions?
- Do joint programmes result in more effective use and mobilization of resources, thus ensuring value for money?
- Are UN agencies better able to leverage

Governance Structures:

- Lessons learnt with regard to key elements of JP governance structures established at country level (including Steering Committee, Participating Agency, Administrative Agent, Managing Agent, RC Office), and main functions of the respective bodies;
- Review of various oversight, management and coordination structures set at country level in support of JP implementation;
- Allocation processes agreed at country level for transfer of funds within the JP funding modalities;
- Reporting practices employed at country level;
- Lessons learnt from multiple governance structures when MDTFs fund JPs.

Methodology and Working Arrangements:

The Review will be focused on two levels:

1. Lessons Learnt at Country Level – identification of lessons learnt with regard to the application of Joint Programme concept, the corresponding UNDG guidelines and, specifically, JP funding modalities (to be conducted by an external consultant);
2. Lessons Learnt at Global Level – identification of lessons learnt regarding JP practices employed by various agencies at global level, as well as key observations and lessons learnt at HQ level (to be led by the UNDG Joint Funding Sub-Committee).

The Review will be based on the analysis/desk review of the available information, lessons and experiences of various countries. It should take into account (i) country context, i.e. low-income or middle-income country, (ii) development context, i.e. developing or transition country, and (iii) funding base, i.e. JPs supported through MDG-F and other MDTFs, or funded bilaterally. To adequately reflect on the perspective of key stakeholders the Review will also include interviews with representatives of host governments, UN agencies at headquarters, regional and country level, and the donors, including through a web-based survey to be developed by the consultant. No field visits are envisaged within the review.

As such, the Review should result in mapping, synthesizing and analysis of available information and lessons learnt on application of JP funding modalities, as well as recommendations on the required revisions in the current UNDG Guidance on JPs. Thereafter, areas where further work can add value and, thus, would require the revision of particular aspects of the UNDG Guidelines will be determined.

The Review will be led by the Joint Funding Sub-Committee (composed of UNFPA, UNDP, UNIDO, WFP, UNDP MPTF Office, UNICEF, and DOCO), which will be the main counterpart of the independent consultant. Contractual arrangements will be made by DOCO.

2. HQ Staff Interviewed during Initial Phase

Aiko Kado, MPTFO
Amy Horton, WFP
Anita Hirsch, UNDP/OIA
Anne Marie Sloth Carlson, UNDP
Asoka Hasturiarchchi, UNDP
Dawn del Rio, MPTFO
Emma Barredo, UNDP
Giulia Vallese, UNFPA
Henriette Keijzers, MPTFO
Lina Fernandez, UNDP
Lisa Doughten, UNICEF
Liudmila Barcari, DOCO
Nalinee Nippita, UNICEF
Olga Abramova, DOCO
Paula Paelez, UNDP/MDG-F
Philippe Grandet, UNFPA
Sara Ferrer Olivella, UNDP/MDG-F
Sebastiano Bagnasco, UNOPS
Yvonne Helle, UNDP

3. Persons Interviewed in Three Case Countries

Persons Interviewed: Ecuador		
Organization	Name	Position/Role
Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)	Maria Morazo	Responsible for Programmes
FAO	Jorge Samaniego	Programme Officer UNREDD); ex-national director (Yasuni)
Programme Coordination Unit, Water and Sanitation Governance	Jordi Sanchez	National Coordinator
Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (MIDUVI – Water)	Edgar Rodriguez	Technical Officer
Ministry of the Environment (UNREDD)	Carola Borja	Subsecretary of Climate Change
Ministry of the Environment (UNREDD)	Patricia Velasco	National Director of Climate Change Mitigation
Programme Coordination Unit, Yasuni	Zornitza Aguilar	National Coordinator
Ministry of the Environment (Yasuni)	Tania Villegas Segovia	Subsecretary of Natural Patrimony
Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)	Jose Giraldo	Advisor to the Minister
Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)	Yadira Carpio	Director of Culture of Water
Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)	German Rodriguez	Director of Social Participation
Secretaria Tecnica de Cooperacion Internacional (SETECI)	Silvia Albuja	Technical Officer
UN Resident Coordinator Office	Diego Zorrilla	Resident Coordinator
UN Resident Coordinator Office	Patricio Jarrin	Coordination Officer
UN Resident Coordinator Office	Pablo Galarza	MDG-F M&E Officer
UNDP	Fernando Pachano	Programme Specialist (Governance and Poverty Reduction)
UNDP	Gabriel Jaramillo	Programme Specialist (Environment and Risk)
RCO Consultant	Miguel Angel Lombardo	Country Evaluation (MDG-F)

Persons Interviewed: Nepal		
Organization	Name	Position/Role
FAO	Mandip Rai	REACH focal Point
Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction	Naresh Chapagain	Under Secretary
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Bodh Raj Niroula	National Programme Director
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Dinesh Koirala	LGCDP District Facilitator, Kavre District
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Ganga Datta Awasthi	Consultant, former Secretary
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Gobinda Bahadur Karkee	Local Development Officer, Kavre District
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Gopi Khanal	National Programme Manager
Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare: Dept of Women and Children	Mamta Bista	Women Development Officer
Norwegian Embassy	Bibek Chapagain	Energy Advisor
Norwegian Embassy	Camilla Rosaak	Deputy Chief of Mission
RC/HC Office	Caroline Vandenabeele	Head of RC/HC Office
RC/HC Office	Robert Piper	Resident Coordinator / Humanitarian Coordinator
UK DFID	Simon Lucas	Climate Change and Inclusive Growth Advisor
UN Peace Fund - Nepal	Hemlata Rai	Programme Analyst
UN Peace Fund - Nepal	Lach Fergusson	Peace Building Advisor
UN Women	Purna Shrestha	EVAW focal person
UNCDF	Rojee Joshi	LGCDP focal person
UNDP	Michael Brown	Head, PeaceBuilding and Recovery Unit
UNDP	Pragyan Joshi	LGCDP focal person
UNDP	Rafeeqe Siddiqui	LGCDP Focal Person
UNDP	Shantam Khadka	UNIRP focal Person
UNFPA	Aruna Pant	UNIRP Project Coordinator
UNFPA	Balkrishna Sharma	National Gender Advisor
UNFPA	Bijay Thapa	LGCDP focal person
UNFPA	Sudha Pant	EVAW focal person
UNICEF	Beth Verhey	LGCDP Chair /Chief Social Policy
UNICEF	Parbati Shrestha	UNIRP Education Case Manager
UNICEF	Patrizia Benvenuti	EVAW - Child Protection Specialist

UNICEF	Pratisha Dewan	EVAW focal person
UNICEF	Saba Mebrahtu	REACH focal Point
UNV	Christian Simmelkiaer	LGCDP focal person
WFP	Jhabindra Bhandari	REACH National Facilitator
WHO	Ashok Bhurtyal	REACH focal Point
World Bank	Dr. Manav Bhattarai	REACH Health Specialist

Persons Interviewed: Uganda		
Organization	Name	Position/Role
DFID	Agnes Ndamata	Program Manager
DFID	Irene Among	Social Development Advisor
Embassy of Ireland	Caroline Kego Laker	Social Development Advisor
Embassy of Ireland	Mary Oduka-Ochan	Senior Advisor, Social Service Delivery
Embassy of Norway	Kamilla Kohshus	First Secretary
FAO	Martin Ameu	National Agric/HIV Officer
IOM	Bernadette Ssebadduka	Migration Health Officer
IOM	Mariela Guajardo	Programme Coordinator
JPGE	Judy Kamanyi	Consultant
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Connie Acayo	Principal Information Specialist
Ministry of Education and Sport	Roland Bnyahwaho	HIV/AIDS Technical Specialist
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	Margaret Kakande	Head, Budget Monitoring and Accountability
Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Christine Guwatudde	Permanent Secretary, SC Chair
Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Jane Ekapu	Principal Gender Officer
Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Juliana Namno	Commissioner, Culture and Family Affairs
Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Mabuya Mubarak	Principal Gender Officer and Gender Programme Component Manager
Ministry of Health	Dr Ario Alex Riolexus	Ag Programme Manager, AIDS Control Programme
Ministry of Health	Dr Collins Tusingwire	Ag. Assistant Commissioner, Reproductive Health
Ministry of Health	Dr Joshua Musinguzi	Ag PM SID/HCP
Ministry of Health	Miriam Namugeere	Reproductive Health Division
Ministry of Local Government	Assumpta Tibamwenda	Local Economic Development Specialist
National Planning Authority	Kareem Buyana	Gender Planning Expert
Uganda Aids Commission	Dr David Apuuli	Director General
Uganda Bureau of Statistics	Charles Zirarema	Ag Director
Uganda Bureau of Statistics	Rosemary Nalwadda	Gender Statistics Expert
Uganda Registration Services Bureau	Charles Nsimbi	Manager Civil Registration
UN Resident Coordinator Office	Ahunna Eziakonwa-Onochie	Resident Coordinator
UN Women	Agnes Kitembo	Programme Specialist JPGE

UN Women	Brian Mwinamura	Finance Associate JPGE
UN Women	Paulina Chiwangu	JPGE Coordinator
UN Women	Sandra Huesser	Gender & Economic Programme Officer, JPGE
UN Women	Thaddeus Sserukeera	UNV M&E for JPGE
UN Women (attached to MGLSD)	Adjaratou Fatou Ndiaye	Programme Coordinator
UNAIDS	Emebet Admassu	Human Rights and Gender Adviser Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania
UNAIDS	Dr James Guwani	Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor
UNAIDS	Faridah Saleh	JUPSA Program Assistant
UNAIDS	Jotham Mubangizi	JUPSA Coordinator
UNAIDS	Musa Bungudu	Uganda Country Coordinator
UNAIDS	Sarah Nakku	Gender and HIV Fellow
UNAIDS	Dirk Van Hove	Programme Analyst, UNAIDS Geneva
UNCDF	Jenifer Bukokhe	Senior Officer
UNDP	Olivia Nyakarungi	Programme Associate
UNFPA	Betty Kyaddondo	JPP Consultant
UNFPA	Cecile Compaore	Deputy Representative
UNFPA	Florence Apuri Auma	SNPO / Team Leader Gender
UNFPA	Florence Tagoola	Team Leader P&D
UNFPA	Janet Jackson	Representative
UNFPA	Jhamba Tapiwa	Focal Person JPP
UNFPA	Patrick Orotin	JPP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
UNFPA	Roselidah Ondeko	Focal Person GBV
UNFPA	Rosemary Kindyomunda	National program officer HIV/AIDS
UNFPA	Tapiwa Jhamba	JPP Coordinator
WHO	Dr Kaggwa Mugagga	NPO- Non-communicable diseases
WHO	Rita Nalwada	National Program Officer HIV

4. Agencies Contacted for Discussion of HQ Perspective

Agency	Interview	Written Input
FAO		Yes
ILO		No input
MDG-F Secretariat	Interview	Yes
MPTF Office	Interview	Yes
OHCHR		No input
UNAIDS		No input
UNDP	Interviewed	Yes
UNEP		Yes
UNESCO		No input
UNFPA	Interview	Yes
UN-HABITAT		No input
UNHCR		No input
UNICEF	Interview	Yes
UNIDO		No input
UNOPS		No input
WFP		Yes
WHO		Yes

5. Documents Consulted

- Downs, Charles, 2011. Review of the Operational Effectiveness of the UNDG MDTF Mechanism, May 2011.
- Dyce, Tim and Nguyen Van Phuc, 2011. Final Report of the Independent Review of Joint Programmes under the Delivering as One (DaO) Initiative in Viet Nam, July 2011.
- John Snow Inc, 2008. Report of Findings of the Thematic Evaluation of UNFPA Experience in Joint Programmes in the Area of Reproductive Health, August 2008.
- MDG-F, 2009a. Minutes of the First Regional Meeting in Latin America of the UN/Spain Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund, July 2009.
- MDG-F, 2009b. UN Participating Organisations Briefing, January 2009, no date.
- MDG-F, 2011a. Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes, February 2011.
- MDG-F, 2011b. MDG Achievement Fund Lessons Learned, Report of Montevideo Meeting, Nov 2011.
- MDG-F, 2011c. MDG-F Regional Workshop for Africa, Arab States, Asia and Eastern Europe, June 11.
- MDG-F, 2011d. Minutes of the Second Regional Meeting in Latin America of the MDG-F, June 2011.
- MDG-F, 2012a. An evidence-based Review of MDG-F Experiences to Date: A Contribution to the QCPR Process, April 2012.
- MDG-F, 2012b. MDG-F Secretariat Report to the Steering Committee, June 2012.
- MDG-F, n.d. Monitoring and Evaluation System: Learning to Improve.
- PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2011. United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund Lessons Learned Exercise, June 2011.
- OCHA, 2010. Cluster Approach Evaluation, 2010.
- UN Report of the Secretary General, 2002. Strengthening of the United Nations: An Agenda for further Change, A/57/387, 9 September 2002, NY: United Nations UNDG, 2003. Guidance Note on Joint Programming, 19 December 2003.
- UNDG, 2000. Guidance Note on Preparing Joint Programmes/Projects, June 2000.
- UNDG, 2006a. Enhancing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Joint Programmes: Lessons Learned from a United Nations Development Group Review, 17 March 2006.
- UNDG, 2006b. Harmonized Financial Reporting to Donors in Joint Programmes, September 2006.
- UNDG, 2008a. 2007 RC Synthesis Report on Strengthening Implementation: Joint Programmes, 25 April 2008
- UNDG, 2008b. Evaluation of Joint Programmes: Preparatory Review of Joint Programme Database of UNDG, 3 October 2007.
- UNDG, 2008c. Joint Programme Database: Current Status and Recommendations for Improvement, 8 September 2008
- UNDG, 2011. Training Workshop Materials on UNDG Joint Funding Mechanisms, Rwanda 2011.
- UNDG, 2012. Final Report of the Independent Evaluation of Lessons Learned from Delivering as One, June 2012.
- UNDP, 2012. Lessons Learned from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD), June 2012
- UNDP/BDP, 2012. Key Findings regarding UNDP-UNEP Typologies of Collaboration. Draft, July 2012
- UNFPA, 2011. UNFPA RMB Guidance Note on Managing Joint Programmes Resources, June 2011.

6. Joint Programme Listings Received from Agencies

Agency Joint Programme Lists	
Agency	Cases
DOCO-2005	244
DOCO-2007	507
UNFPA	255
UNICEF	223
MPTFO	439
MDG-F	130
UNOPS	24
UNDP	182
UNWOMEN	113
Total	2117

7. Methodological Notes

Master dataset of Joint Programmes

A working master dataset of Joint Programmes was compiled from: data from the MPTFO website; “old” DOCO dataset of JPs from 2005 and 2007; (c) JP listings provided by UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP and UNOPS. Other UN agencies were contacted for their lists, if any, but no additional responses were received. The 2117 individual listings have been consolidated into a single working dataset of 1028 joint programmes, with all identifiable duplicates eliminated. The working dataset has been established starting with the combination of the MPTFO, UNICEF and UNFPA datasets. The UNDP dataset was then incorporated based on the assumptions that (a) all JPs identified by UNDP as ones where it is AA for a pass-through JP are duplicates of MPTFO funds; (b) all JPs with UNDP identified as PUNO in a pooled fund are accounted for by UNFPA and UNICEF; (c) JPs identified with UNDP as MA for pooled funds are new; and (d) JPs identified by UNDP as parallel are new. Finally, the UNWOMEN datasets was included with the same criteria. These assumptions may understate the number of pooled funds, while slightly overstating the number of parallel funds. The distribution of joint programmes by type, according to the cumulative working dataset of JPs, is:

Total of each Modality of Joint Programme				
Modality of JP	Quantity		Value	
	Number	Percent	USD	Percent
Parallel	263	26%	183,941,139	6%
Pooled	178	17%	351,710,764	11%
Pass-through	539	52%	2,390,573,065	77%
Combination	40	4%	163,145,546	5%
Blank	11	1%	6,107,377	0%
Total	1031	100%	3,095,477,891	100%

Note: All JP data used in this Report are drawn from the dataset developed for this consultancy as of 15 November 2012.

There are four significant sources of uncertainty in the working dataset. First, the older DOCO datasets are of uncertain quality and the assumptions used in entering data may have been different than those of today, but there is no documentation available to confirm this. This uncertainty is mainly related to the extent of use of the three JP modalities before 2007 – fully 80% of reported parallel and nearly 60% of pooled-fund JPs are from this earlier period; 392 of those JPs are not included in any of the current agency datasets. With those earlier funds removed, 80% of current JPs are pass-through, 10% are pooled, and fully 90% are managed as pass-through or parallel joint programmes. Second, most agencies have not reported systematically on use of parallel funding modalities, and thus the number of such cases is probably underestimated. Third, all except two of the JPs classified as “combination” and one “blank” are from the old datasets; only UNWOMEN has reported any current joint programmes as “combination,” although it is likely that in many “pooled” cases one or more agency also manages some funding and related project activities outside the pooled framework. The rest of the “blank” cases are gender JPs that are missing data on the fund management modality. Fourth, UNDP has identified 26 pooled funds in which it participates, but it has not identified which agency is MA. If the MA is not UNDP, then this probably represents a duplicate of a pooled fund already identified by UNICEF or UNFPA

as one where it is MA. There is a need for further work (primarily with UNDP and UNWOMEN) to complete the current dataset, and for an agreement with the agencies to maintain it up-to-date.

Survey of current country-level experience and lessons

An on-line survey was circulated to approximately 950 contacts provided by the agencies involved. The survey was open from 24 August to 6 September, supported by four reminders. There was a total response rate of roughly one-third of the individual invitees. The coverage of countries is perhaps more indicative of the successful reach of the survey, with responses from 20 UN agencies in 100 programme countries. Following is the breakdown of responses:

Country-Level Survey Responses by Agency			
Agency	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Countries
UNRCO	82	25%	82
UNDP	64	20%	64
UNICEF	70	22%	70
UNFPA	44	14%	44
Other	69	20%	42
Total	329	101%	100

Note 1: Those identifying their role as “UNRCO” are listed separately, although majority are UNDP
 Note 2: Twelve responses not included: 10 HQ UN staff and 2 government staff

Since any given country may have multiple JPs, and UN agency staff move regularly among countries each of which has a distinct combination of JPs, the experience which influences the learning of each respondent in the review e-survey has been influenced by varied combinations of JP models, as below:

JP Funding Source Contributions to Survey Respondent Experience	
Funding Source	Percentage of Respondents with Experience
MDG Achievement Fund	58%
Stand-alone joint programme funds	26%
DaO/One Country funds	25%
Human Security Trust Fund	14%
Health sector funds	14%
UN Peacebuilding Fund	10%
Common Humanitarian Funds	8%
Four other categories of funds	17%

Note: Total exceeds 100% because most respondents have experience with more than one category

Rating score

A rating score was automatically calculated for some of the questions and is reflected in the summary results table in Attachment 1 to the main Report, reflecting questions and respondent segments discussed in the Report. The rating weighted according to the percentage of responses received for each degree of agreement, based on the distribution of scores received with points assigned as follows: +2 = strongly agree; +1 = somewhat agree; -1 = somewhat disagree; and -2 = strongly disagree.

Thus a rating of 1.5 or higher reflects strong agreement; rating of about 1.0 reflects mild agreement; a rating of about 0.5 or lower tends to a neutral opinion; and a negative rating reflects disagreement.

Review of UN agency HQ experience with Joint Programmes

Headquarters offices at 17 UN agencies were contacted for their perspective on the JP mechanism and to identify issues to be considered in the revision of the UNDG Guidelines for Joint Programming. Open-ended interviews were conducted with five offices (UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, MPTF Office and MDG-F Secretariat) and written comments were received from five more (FAO, UNDP, UNEP, WFP and WHO) (see Annex 4 for list of persons contacted).

Following is the text of the email sent to agency HQs for their input:

I am conducting a review of the joint programme mechanism on behalf of DOCO, which has provided your names as the initial contact for your agency. The first phase of the Review focused on the country-level experience of UN agencies and now we would like to focus on the HQ perspective on the joint programme mechanism. The Review will provide input to revision of the 2003 UNDG Joint Programming Guidance Note.

I would appreciate your assistance to obtain the perspective of your agency, on the processes and transaction costs involved in dealing with donors, dealing with UN agency partners (whether as AA, MA or participating UN organization), dealing with your own country office and dealing with government counterparts. From the HQ perspective, and compared to other traditional arrangements, does the JP mechanism simplify or complicate the processes? For example, how do reporting and financial transfer process differ with JPs? Does the JP mechanism increase or decrease the transaction costs in any of these relationships? Based on experience accumulated over the past decade, are there aspects of the JP mechanism and its operationalization that those at HQ would recommend be clarified or modified, and if so what changes should be considered?

Could you also provide some context on handling of JP mechanism processes in your agency:

- What is the approximate total number of donor reports prepared each year and how many of these are for JPs?
- How many financial transfers are processed to the field each year and how many of these are for JPs?
- How many people are in the units handling donor reporting and transfers, and what is the staff Full Time Equivalent working on JPs?
- Are the HQ internal work processes for JPs significantly different than those for other arrangements?
- Do you have written standard procedures or guidance for handling JP processes, if so, could you send it to me?

Finally, there has been some discussion about whether there should be indicative targets for minimum budget, minimum duration or maximum number of participants for joint programmes. Please summarize the view of staff based on HQ experience of your agency.

Review of Joint Programme Experience in three case countries, for government and donor perspectives

The Review included missions to three case countries – Ecuador, Nepal and Uganda – particularly to obtain government and donor perspectives on the joint programme mechanism. The countries were selected to provide insight into a range of joint programme types as well as geographic diversity. In each country the mission focused on stakeholders and experience gained with three to four joint programmes. Most JPs operate with the pass-through modality, with UNDP/MPTF Office or UNFPA serving as AA; several of the joint programmes included parallel funding components.

Prior to traveling to each country, background documentation on each JP was reviewed, both for general orientation and with specific attention to issues related to the JP mechanism. Briefings were held with the UN team from each JP, followed by meetings with government and donor stakeholders.

Group and individual meetings were held with stakeholders involved with specific Joint Programmes:

- Ecuador
 - JP Yasuni Programme (MDG-F)
 - JP Governance of Water and Sanitation Sector (MDG-F)
 - JP UN-REDD
- Nepal
 - JP End Violence Against Women (EVAW)
 - JP Integrated Rehabilitation Programme (UNIRP)
 - JP Local Government and Community Development (LGCDP)
 - REACH (not a country-level UNDG Joint Programme)
- Uganda
 - JP on Population (UNJPP)
 - JP of Support on AIDS (JUPSA)
 - JP on Gender Equality (JPGE)
 - JP on Gender Based Violence (JPGBV)

Discussions in each country centered around three broad topics:

- Policy and management coordination (steering committee and operational coordination)
- Comparison of interaction with UN agencies within the joint programmes and in other contexts
- Impact of joint programmes to increase or decrease transaction costs

8. Master Dataset of Joint Programmes: 1998 – 2012 (separate file)

- Excel file submitted separately

9. E-Survey Questionnaire (separate file)

- Separate pdf file

10. Support required from Agency HQ, identified by Survey Respondents

What support should agency HQ provide to develop and manage Joint Programmes?

- 1 Reiterate the spirit of UN Reforms and collective UN purview
Encourage agencies to look beyond generic agency mandates, and look towards collective UN results at the country level, while assisting the countries in achieving their national development plans.
Address harmonization issues at the HQs level
Create agency and collective level incentives for HoA and agency staff to contribute towards JPs
- 2 La simplification des outils de rapportage financiers, de suivi-évaluation
- 3 Make as a priority and either simplify or provide exemptions in addressing any bottleneck such as general support/admin costs of the existing system.
- 4 A more realistic and dully assessment has to be developed and implemented at the beginning of the project design with an inclusive and participatory approach with national counterparts
- 5 Oversight, funding and motivation.
- 6 More clarity to address the above challenges
- 7 Policy advisory and procedural guidance. Delegation enough to allow for flexibility to harmonise and DaO and to plan and report as One....not double plan and report for One Plan and for Agency AWP
- 8 Share more good practices from different regions
- 9 Oversight only
- 10 Clear JP initiatives quickly trusting that respective PUNOs have made appropriate decision at the country level
- 11 \$\$\$\$
- 12 Clarity on roles and responsibilities of MA, AA and participating agencies; flexibility for channel of support to national partners where clear gains can be seen, tailor to needs
- 13 Clear political mandate and simplification/ harmonization of procedures and reporting requirements.
- 14 Mayor apoyo y celeridad en la tramitación de los recursos financieros.
- 15 Complete managerial Tool kit, training and direct assistance to Programme Coordinators so that they can, on the other hand, assist governmental functionaries or authorities to improve their managerial functions.
- 16 Participation in JPs should be seen as part of the contribution of staff members and included as a requirement for critical staff members in performance appraisal systems. Heads of Agencies should also be assessed against the extent to which they supported delivering as one and the existing JPs.
- 17 Leadership and strategic guidance.
- 18 La experiencia de los programas conjuntos del MDG-F no ha sido difundida ni asumida por el sistema ONU. Programas conjuntos y Trust Funds posteriores (e.g. UN-REDD o el Fondo para Personas con Discapacidad) han repetido errores que pudieron evitarse o no han construido sobre los aprendizajes del MDG-F.
- 19 In the case of MDG-F, the presence, guidance and support given by the Secretariat are fundamental. I would recommend to sustain their approach of being accessible, simple, practical, and flexible and close to the JP's coordinator in the country offices.
- 20 Backstopping and bringing best practices from other countries
- 21 Permanent monitoring and evaluation
- 22 Substantive technical advice if needed during formulation process
- 23 It would be good to receive best practices in terms of management and coordination of JPs in other countries and ways in which JPs have worked and added value to programmes.
- 24 A clear message to insist on realism. Don't take on what you cannot deliver.
- 25 Peer review

- 26 Des ressources humaines suffisantes et stables
Des procédures harmonisées entre agences et avec le système de gestion des PC
Souplesse des procédures
- 27 Technical back up as well as reporting format to be in synergy with the existing reporting system to reduce the time of reporting
- 28 Technical support in developing the JPs
- 29 Documenting good examples
- 30 Simplifying processes
- 31 Allow "harmonization" of administrative practices in JPs.
- 32 Support to their respective agencies in country and show of coordination at HQ among agencies to ensure same messages are passed on to countries.
- 33 Policy support and encourage the agencies to work together.
- 34 The communication with other JP implementing country is totally absent. The HQ should link us so that we learn lessons from each country, especially if there is new innovative idea, so that we can pilot or implement
- 35 Funding opportunities
- 36 M and E support.
Procurement.
- 37 A commitment exhibited by (a) harmonization of reporting and financial procedures (b) performance appraisal of HoA at local level in terms of promoting and participating in the JPs (c) incentive mechanism to recognize and promote JPs
- 38 Agency HQ should ensure decisions can be made in country. It is difficult that HQ sometimes go against UNDAF priorities.
- 39 Agreement on processes and agency roles and accountabilities
- 40 Lessons learned and platform to share experiences at the regional and global levels.
- 41 RDT should engage the UNCT in an annual JP review exercise.
- 42 Continuous contact with focal points for knowledge sharing, so focal points can be facilitators with the actors
- 43 More awareness. HQ tends to focus on the agency's own workplans. More technical backup
- 44 Otorgar toda la capacidad de decisión a la Coordinadora Residente para liderar un programa conjunto. Otorgar directrices claras para asegurar el trabajo conjunto por los operadores, incorporando indicadores de desempeño de los funcionarios en función de acciones llevadas conjuntamente con otras agencias.
- 45 Facilitar puentes con donantes
- 46 Harmonized procedures and regulations
- 47
1. Revisar en detalle y ajustar la guía para Programas Conjuntos.
 2. Construir una guía no solo para el diseño sino para la implementación de PC.
 3. Facilitar y agilizar la comunicación entre las sedes de las Agencias del UN y sus oficinas en el país, reduciendo los tiempos de transferencia de recursos asignados dentro de los PC.
 4. Fomentar procedimientos comunes (administrativos, contrataciones, contables y de auditoría) que faciliten la implementación
- 48 More interaction with country offices and field level context and less designing from top-down, which sometimes is far from country context
- 49 Decentralized AA management.
- 50 Actually to provide real support to CO.
- 51 Liderazgo en la conducción, conocimiento y experiencia previa en el ámbito de intervención del Programa, asistencia técnica para la planificación conjunta, un buen soporte de monitoreo y evaluación y en materia comunicacional.

- 52 -La simplification des modalités de gestion / reporting.
- La documentation en français: les partenaires nationaux n'ont pas accès aux outils développés en anglais.
- 53 -Technical expertise in certain areas;
-With simplified guidelines and harmonizing business practices;
-Raising funds
- 54 Helping in identifying alignment between the JP and individual agency result frameworks, support during design and following up on funding especially if pooled funding is available.
- 55 Technical support and resource mobilization.
- 56 Agency HQs should re-enforce the importance of Joint Programmes to their Country Offices
- 57 Resources mobilization and consultants
- 58 RC should be facilitating more when there are problems
- 59 Harmonisation of procedures and for Agency HQ to be aware of UNDG guidelines.
- 60 Technical assistance in programme development and monitoring and evaluation
- 61 For example, it is not clear in the guidelines how funds can be best transferred to UN agencies which is not an executing agency. It is very complicated. Or how a core contribution from one UN agency to another as part of JP can be effected.
- 62 Respond to emails!
- 63 Coordination positions should ideally be appointed by HQ and report directly to them.
- 64 La tenue régulière des réunions du Comité Technique de Pilotage
- 65 Resource mobilization (initiatives such as MDG achievement funds could be enlarged).
Propose alternatives
HQ should accept joint reporting (not agency specific)
- 66 HQ should continue to have a JP Management unit to support JP implementation.
- 67 A focal point for UN agencies at HQ.
- 68 Learn from past mistakes to develop better guidelines.
- 69 Harmonization of administrative procedures among agencies. Support to mobilize funds
- 70 Simplified guidelines signed by all agency heads and sent to country level.
Support for funding for joint programmes, especially with the economic down turn.
- 71 Technical expertise, particularly if there is a need to verify the viability of the interventions.
- 72 Technical assistance in the formulation of JP, to implementation and M & E.
- 73 Clear guidelines as to the Agency's involvement on JPs and associated costs for it
- 74 Normative guidance on procedure
- 75 Work on the simplification of processes at the level of the agencies HQ
- 76 Strong involvement of the sr management
- 77 Model contracts
- 78 It is necessary the review of financial and administrative mechanisms to improve agility and avoid delays.
- 79 RC should play a leading and facilitating role
- 80 Support international partnership process (ex IHP+ on health domain)
- 81 Financial and technical support
- 82 Clear guidance and support throughout JP. Implementation. The support provided so far from the MDG-F Secretariat has been excellent. Prompt and very useful feedback for all practical aspects of project implementation has been provided.
- 83 Regular missions to sensitize and encourage UNCT to further utilize the JP modality, to minimize less efficient and effective, parallel approaches. "Programme Based Approaches" are at the core of the Aid Effectiveness agenda!
- 84 Share good practices/stories from other countries.
- 85 Technical expertise and reduce the amount of money charged to JP resources
- 86 Nothing particular, but moral blessing to DaO

- 87 The HQ should orient the regional offices on JP modality and its benefit and make it accepted by all. Since JP helps in proper utilization of fund or the effective usage of donors fund this should be highlighted during programme design. A common working modality should be introduced with common monitoring mechanism in place.
- 88 Algunas HQ no entienden la agilidad que se requiere para ejecutar estos programas y retienen los recursos más de lo esperado.
- 89 Technical support and cross-country learning
- 90 Clear guidelines and help desk.
- 91 Increase planning tools better user friendly. Develop staff capacity on their use and allocate enough time and resource to the JP
- 92 Flexibility in the management of the Joint Programmes
- 93 The technical support with lessons learned from countries who have successfully implemented as JP that experience can use to the current JPs in the country.
- 94 Frequent and committed involvement of UN agency Headquarters and on financial and substantive reporting.
- 95 HQ should capture, document and share lessons learned on how joint programmes in other countries have been successful and which ones have not. It should have case studies so the next joint programmes will be guided by recommendations.
Also, financial reporting and admin systems should be the same and aligned with each other. As a Focus Country Initiative, the UN Resident Coordinator's Office should be helping the joint programmes, and not giving them more work that is beyond the JP. They should be more facilitative rather than just planning and implementing their workplan without consulting the other joint programmes.
- 96 Many Agency HQs don't have a clue on what it means to be a partner in a UN JP and continue to send their own instructions on work programming, M&E that do not align with the DaO approach, thereby creating a lot of double work.
- 97 There should be a business harmonization among agency HQs, so that each Agency doesn't have to report to different bodies - donors, government, and then agency HQs.
- 98 Explain benefits and ensure that it forms part of checklist at the PAC stage
- 99 A strong message from HQ on importance of JP, particularly from specialized agencies.
- 100 Harmonized financial systems
- 101 Try to reduce differences in administrative and financial procedures between agencies. Policy support for the joint programming and executing become effective.
- 102 Facilitate common and harmonized set of rules and regulations. In their absence, accept the standards developed in the country as valid in lieu of their own.
- 103
1. TA for quality assurance
 2. Share best practice
 3. Conduit for channeling of funds from donor
- 104 Training in JP design for results. Measures to ensure that JP help shape policies. Some kind of design quality review. A standard for management, monitoring and evaluation. Measures against results becoming split in disparate products
- 105 Simplify procedures. Leave room for UNCTs to innovate and adapt to national context and needs.
- 106 We need to get serious about harmonizing the operational procedures of our agencies and our levels of decentralized authority!
- 107 Agency HQs should make every effort to support joint orientation and training in JP Guidelines at country level. It is important that staff at country level all receive the same introduction, in order to avoid misunderstandings during the design and implementation of Joint Programs at country level.
- 108 Provide direct policy and guidance to design and implement JPs
- 109 Alignment of financial, reporting and other procedures among all UN agencies and their HQs. Different agencies having different procedures becomes a challenge in harmonizing their work

- 110 Agency HQs should ensure that their representations at the country level do understand the benefit that JPs bring. Additionally the agency HQs should monitor at country level whether their representations are doing their best to explore possibilities for JPs. One of the ways to do that may be through looking at the development priorities of that country and the represented agencies in parallel. For example, if gender is one of the development priorities of that country an agency HQ should look at the UN profile of that country (which UN agencies are represented in the country) and if e.g. UNICEF or UNDP or UN Women is represented (or one of them could be an NRA) in that country and if there is no JP on gender in place then the agency HQ should ask its representation to justify why this is the case. The agency's justification should be endorsed by the RC.
- 111 Have stability in guidelines and policies in order for people to understand the routines and get accustomed to the process. Provide recognition to JPs and help with funding.
- 112 More incentives at the level of individual agencies; clearer guidelines; sharing of experiences
- 113 To facilitate and support the process to establish a UNDAF including dialogue amongst Agencies at HQ level.
- 114 A strengthened UN Resident Coordinator with a clear mandate over the JP an office and budget
- 115 It would be good to have a focal point for JPs at the HQ level who could assist the UNCTs in development and management of JPs, provide guidance based on experiences from different funds and countries.
- 116 Empower local representatives/delegate authority to get the work done
- 117
1. Share the best practices
 2. Unified the reporting format.
 3. Ensure the required staffing
- 118 Give the lead of JP to national counterparts and to do so reinforce their capacity to run a JP, with the support of UN agencies. The UN agencies should assist the Government and take not the lead
- 119 Take into consideration national/country realities and simplify their agency guidelines
- 120 A catalogue of good JP examples
- 121 Agreement should come from heads of agencies on harmonization of procedures.
- 122 HQ should have a better understanding on the reality of the project implementation.
- 123 Global lessons learned
- 124
- Technical support in developing JPs.
 - More follow up on reporting.
 - Timely operational and financial closure of JPs
- 125 Additional temporary staff or facilitators for the development of the programme
- 126 Support on RBM -practical part.
- 127 HQs need to provide more motivation, encouragement and instruction to their country offices to be more involved in JP and express clearly that this is an indicator for their performance in the implementation of the UN reform
- 128 Simplification of procurement processes within the programme. Joint rules in management of JP for all agencies.
- 129
1. Commitment to one single UN development framework, eliminating the need for separate UNDAF and CPAP documentation.
 2. Bring all UN development agencies to agree on one unified, simplified set of guidelines. (Note: there is a sense that at present harmonization is the antithesis of simplification)
- 130 Definir un sistema administrativo unificado y amigable.
Definir un rol de mayor decisión para el Coordinador, en mi caso las agencias respetaban mis sugerencias y criterios para tomar algunas decisiones, pero otras agencias no.
- 131 Better coordinated and more effective resource mobilisation strategy at the interagency level, as well as ensuring more robust communications on the processes.
- 132
- 1) participation in guidelines development: very practical aspects of implication at CO level
 - 2) strong voice to support CO in discussions/disputes with larger agencies
- 133 Guidance and funding

- 134 More oversight visits; not warm and fuzzy "support mission with "advice"
- 135 Simplified rules and guidelines.
- 136 To allow for flexibility in systems and processes that are needed to support JPs. Recognition that initially at least, the JP arrangement is going to need time and support before it becomes an established way of working.
- 137 Implementation of a communication plan in the very beginning of the programme.
- 138 Not much as [agency] is very much decentralised agency which helps to make the decision at the CO level. HQ has influence while preparing the guidelines at the HQ level
- 139 Planning and M&E tools to increase linkages with the UNDAF
- 140 Technical support, donor requirements.
- 141 More reporting, procurement and auditing flexibility
- 142 Unify administrative procedures
- 143 Empowering the Coordinator on the Focal Points of the agencies
- 144 HQs should provide more practical support and should revise their personnel evaluations to reflect contributions to JPs.
- 145 Resource mobilization at a global level and in policy decisions
- 146 Enfatizar que en los JP no se lleven los sombreros de agencias sino de UN
- 147
1. Assist in mobilization of resources fund JPs as well as continue JP that have started
 2. Ensure that approved resources are sent to Country Office on time
 3. Ensure Accountability and transparency to donors
 4. Maintain good Donor relations for future programs
- 148
1. Simplification and harmonization at HQ level.
 2. Improved structures of decentralized decision making in case of some specialized Agencies.
- 149 Clear guidance
- 150 Technical support to COs.
- 151
1. Initiate and conduct regular surveys on the development and management of Joint Programmes
 2. Share best practices from different countries on the management if Joint Programme
 3. Develop common and harmonized reporting tool for all the UN Agencies to avoid to Agencies to make different reports for one programme
- 152 Agency procedures in line with agreed UNDG guidelines
- 153
1. LET COUNTRY OFFICES GET A PORTION OF THE OVERHEADS, TO STRENGTHEN PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT!!!!!!!!!!!! (Some Agencies do, but some, regrettably, do not.)
 2. Develop interagency MoUs and workplans at global / regional level, such as the excellent one between UNFPA and ILO in the Arab States that can really be used as basis for in-country joint initiatives.
 3. Since most JPs are developed in conjunction with resource mobilisation, improve knowledge about joint programme modalities in HQ RM branches and do joint RM at HQ level.
- 154 Effort to harmonize operations procedures and reporting requirements
- 155 Technical review of what is contained in joint Programme in terms of substance and impact.
- 156 Clear guidelines
- 157 Strongly driven operational harmonization across agencies at HQ level, in addition to the pass-through mechanism.
- 158 Encourage and promote joint coordination at the country-level among their agencies' staff.
- 159 Access to donors
- 160 Stronger monitoring mechanism to deliver as one in a friendly manner.
- 161 Some flexibility in the fund utilization depending on the priority of the government.
- 162 Support in the development of proposals
- 163 Favorecer el intercambio de buenas practicas; definir lineamientos homologados, tanto programaticos como administrativos, entre agencias para la conducción de programas conjuntos. Diseños de modelos de evaluación y de administración con base en resultados aplicables a los JP

- 164 Simple encouragement, support and sufficient flexibility would do wonders, with sufficient attention to the facilitating role of the programme managers, and respect to all participating UN agencies, which implies rather acting as a 'host' than well as a 'lead' agency. .
- 165 Perhaps an impartial coordinator to help in the initial stages
- 166 Administrative and technical.
- 167 Encourage the field offices to work closely with other UN agencies. Provide existing LOU/MOU between a given agency and others sometime better known at HQs level and not at the field level!!
- 168 Primero una clara linea de organización y coordinación local, UN as team!!! y no otras instrucciones de gestión y posicionamiento paralelo. Es importante guías claras de gestión y resulta muy importante empoderar al RC y a su oficina para apoyar estratégicamente la programación conjunta.
- 169 Political pressure on Agency country offices
- 170 Possibility of direct coordination between HQ Focal Point and JPM
- 171 Relationships from HQ to HQ to solve issues
- 172 Consolidate & simplify admin requirements
- 173 Usual support as for other projects.
- 174 Improve information sharing between agency HQ and country office. It happens that agency HQ share information with MPTF office without country office knowing or verifying the information.
- 175 Must fund a coordinator
- 176 Technical and resource mobilisation
- 177 Les outils actuels du secretariat pour le suivi-evaluation sont bons
- 178 Internal agency systems and incentives still privilege individually driven resource mobilisation and programme management. RC has responsibility but not matching authority to hold Heads of Agencies responsible to deliver as one.
- 179 International coordination staff in RC office
- 180 Encourage more 'joint programming' than 'joint programme' and educate donors on the benefit of joint programming and costs of JPs.
- 181 Streamlining of reporting (narrative and financial). A thorough manual and guidelines for operations from the start of the program.
- 182 Help mobilize resources
- 183 They should buy in to the concept
- 184 Administration procedures should be harmonized among the agencies.
- 185 Pienso que antes de que las sedes de las Agencias brinden soporte, deberían estar convencidas de que la Programación Conjunta tiene muchas ventajas que pueden propiciar mayor eficacia y eficiencia en la cooperación del SNU. Una vez que hayan políticas claras y un posicionamiento sólido con respecto a la Programación Conjunta por cada una de las Agencias, sus equipos nacionales sentirán que es una metodología de trabajo que deben seguir.
- 186 Political support to promote the formulation and execution of JP in common working areas at country level
- 187 More support from the highest level is needed, Resident coordinator to lobby with ministers, when it comes down to sustainability stage of implemented activities.
- 188 Technical assistance and M&E support
- 189 More guidelines on managing JPs especially for specialized agencies
- 190 To make one pool for the money to be managed by the JPM.
- 191 Clear guidelines are need with clear SSA and MOU forms for UN agencies developing JPs
- 192 Facilitate common and harmonized set of rules and regulations. In their absence, accept the standards developed in the country as valid in lieu of their own.
- 193 Stronger political back-up in developing JPs, especially with regard to determining roles & responsibilities (based on mandates, competency, nationally present capacity) and inter-agency / financial arrangements.
- 194 To tell their country offices to take it easy, and put content over process.

- 195 Clear guidelines on essential nature of JPs. Joint programming not JPs should be the norm as part of DaO reform.
- 196 In budget re-allocation; flexibility in adding new activities that are relevant for the context; processing the payments; in concluding contracts " waiver is a tool"
- 197 HQ should primarily say whether it is desirable for [agency] to participate in joint programming or not, and give the country offices some guidelines in how to work with other agencies on this
- 198 Money and select RCs up to the task
- 199 Corporate financial planning and reporting
- 200 Training in establishment of JP mechanisms
Training and need-based support to establish M&E systems for joint programmes
Financial reporting from participating agencies to the lead agency/AA/MA
Clearer responsibility of AA/MA in narrative reporting for joint programmes
- 201 Fund-raising
- 202 Direction to country offices to participate and the resources to make it happen
- 203 Greater delegation of authority to country level - for prioritization and reporting
- 204 Share best practices.
- 205 Quality control of the strength of the business case. Different agencies usually come with their own visions (often for very good reasons), which often than not dilutes the business case for a programme.

11. Obstacles to JP Success, identified by Survey Respondents

What are the main obstacles to develop and manage a Joint Programme?

- 1 Diminishing agency and government interest as JPs are increasingly viewed as process heavy, non value adding and unable to resource the One Fund
- 2 Les principales difficultés rencontrées concernent parfois le manque de synergie entre les Agences et également le manque de visibilité du Programme auprès des parties prenantes nationales
- 3 Different expectations, systems and procedures of UN Agencies.
- 4 Still no particular measures have been identified to overcome the constraints regarding access and management of funds by two of the implementing agencies which are not resident in the country. Currently the joint programme is not benefiting from synergies that could come from real joint implementation since partners are mostly implementing their components and then exchanging information and updates during the programme management committee meetings
- 5 Commitment of all the partners, including the UN agencies to the concept and practice of joint programming.
- 6 Coordination among UN agencies. Not harmonized administrative procedures among all the participating UN agencies. Different institutional capacities in implementing activities among the participating UN agencies.
- 7
 - 1- overdesigning of the JP at the beginning with non-realistic expectations
 - 2- heavy bureaucratic procedures for some JP that require too much time spent on paper work and reporting, using complicated reporting templates
 - 3- complicated management mechanisms such as JP National Steering Committees with no evidence of added benefits
- 8 Time and country level expertise
Knowledge on substantive issues but limited knowledge on coordination and M&E or the same people do not have the combination of expertise etc. Difficulties for a small agency under transition dealing with cross-cutting issues to be active at all levels and in all sectors with quality and timely input
Managing a JP or a One Plan is time consuming as Agency still requiring reporting and planning as per Agency allocations and targets and different fiscal year as well....
- 9 Agencies are committed to two masters - their line agencies and the Joint/DaO.
- 10 Staff time
- 11 Two the main ones are:
PUNO's agreement including sometimes, seeking clearance from HQ
Decision on MA and pool funds; this becomes political sometimes
- 12 Need to ensure there is at least one large donor and that the UN has expertise in that area of work. For example, in our country UNDP has initiated a number of JPs with no primary donor in mind and no in-country expertise in the subject matter.
- 13 Inadequate national ownership, too many UN agencies and stakeholders, small fund
- 14 Agencies' willingness.
- 15 Falta de experiencia tanto del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas como de las Agencias, Fondos y Programas en la utilización del instrumento Programa Conjunto. No existe aún un corpus de experiencia de una duración suficiente para generar un conocimiento y reflexión acerca de la gestión y funcionamiento genérico del instrumento Programa Conjunto

- 16 There isn't sufficient accountability for the overall JP Outcome mainly because of the weak involvement of the complete organizational structure of the leading government institution. Programme Coordinators instead of responding mainly to Leading UN Agencies has to respond to getting the appropriate technical assistance and accompaniment of UN expertise to institutional process. Management, in the complete sense of the concept, has to be done by one leading governmental institution independently of external capacities added.
- 17 The main obstacle is the scramble for resources under the Joint Programme. Each partner naturally wants more of the pie and that may lead to inflation roles in the Joint programme.
- 18 Lack of commitment from head quarters of participating agencies.
- 19 The UNRC's willingness to promote joint programmes and their continuation.
- 20 UN agencies' mandates and conflict of interests over funding.
- 21 Coordination with other agencies and competition for resources
- 22 Too many agencies; limited money, limited time-frame, unclear focus/strategic value to be added.
- 23 1.-La diferencia de reglas y procedimientos administrativo-financieros de las agencias: provoca dificultades para coordinadores de programas y altos costos de transacción para las contrapartes del gobierno. La modalidad de financiamiento paralelo no ayuda a la coherencia. La modalidades "pooled funds" y "en serie" (pero a nivel local) deberían promoverse
- 24 The level of integration for all the strategies been implemented for the agencies involved.
- 25 Persons.
- 26 The transactional costs often outweigh the tangible programme results.
- 27 Defining a vision and main objectives of the JP. Each agencies has its own view and priority
- 28 Often donor driven; too many divergent agency interests; weak m&e plans.
- 29 Problems with NRAs
- 30 The delay in the availability of joint program funds
- 31 Large number of partners and stakeholders, different administrative and financial procedures of the various UN agencies, short time frames, and sometimes cumbersome rules in relation to the reality on the ground
- 32 -In terms of management of JPs, one of the challenges includes the need to portray the JP as 'one UN' which sometimes may be difficult given differences that may arise among UN agencies on various issues.
-Additionally, there have been differences witnessed in administrative rules among participating UN agencies, whereby the lack of harmonization in various administrative procedures with the implementing partner has proved to be challenging.
-One other challenge is not being able to distinguish each agency's significant contribution/results to the programme when more than one agency contributes to the same output/activities of the programme.
- 33 Too much upward accountability
- 34 Lack of agency focus/capacity. Everybody wants to join in but normally overestimate their capacity to deliver
- 35 Coordination among UN Agencies as well as ownership from the Government.
- 36 l'absence d'appropriation nationale
la complexité des procédures de gestion
l'absence de clarté dans les rôles de chaque intervenant
la modification continue des procédures en cours de route
la non unification des procédures entre agences
le changement des points focaux des membres du CGP tout au long de la durée de vie du PC
- 37 Coordination among stakeholders in term of time availability and resources for planning, monitoring and review.
- 38 Additional workloads for coordination and participation
- 39 Rigid interpretation and the use of it by agencies as a modality to fundraise
- 40 Different mandate and different capacity and staffing
- 41 Coordination and getting all agencies at the same time
- 42 To get prior agreement and full understanding of all partners and stakeholders. The project should be developed based on the realities and aimed at delivering a result.

- 43 Different UN agency has different level of implementation capacity, this cause delay in reporting
- 44 Agencies' different capacity
- 45 Coordination with government.
Poor sense of ownership by government
Coordination among the Heads of UN agencies.
Joint budget for Joint activities
- 46 Lack of will at the corporate level and the agency HQ level to support and promote JPs
The management and accountability frameworks of agencies which generate additional work and foment agency specific pursuits rather than UN working jointly
Inadequacy of funds for 'M&E mechanism
Absence of agency counterpart funds and resources
- 47 It is like herding cats - very difficult if the agencies are not fully committed to the JP.
- 48 How to set up the management, reporting and admin arrangements.
- 49 Coordination
- 50 Having common understanding and agreements.
- 51 For a country that is implementing DaO, sometimes it is difficult to get staff members to think DaO rather than agency. The other obstacle is that while planning and preparations of AWP's and budgets takes place at the joint task team levels, it is not possible to implement jointly due to different ERPs, hence to some extent it is seen as creating additional burden.
- 52 Duplicate agency reporting requirements outside the annual report. Different management fees levied by the agencies for fund management. Lack of buy-in and support from the RDT.
- 53 More than doing JPs, it is more of the resistance of UN agencies to DAO
- 54 Everybody wants to be part of the decision making
- 55 Not obstacles. There is always a learning curve as agencies learn to work together, coordinate and share ideas and objective
- 56 La cultura de trabajo debe construirse en torno a ONE UN. Otorgar mayores facultades a la coordinadora residente para llevar el programa y tomar decisiones.
- 57 Difficult to align objectives.
- 58 Es importante insistir que un programa conjunto que busque resultados estratégicos no debería ser inferior a 3 años, debe ser mínimo de 4
- 59 Different procedures and regulations among UN agencies
- 60 1. Lograr un acuerdo político a nivel de Naciones Unidas para elaborar e implementar Programas Conjuntos.
2. Énfasis aun latente del trabajo Agencial en lugar del trabajo interagencial.
3. Limitado tiempo para alcanzar los resultados previstos (actualmente 3 años).
4. Dificultades iniciales para incorporar a las contrapartes nacionales y que ellas asuman el apropiamiento del PC.
5. Normas procedimientos diferentes de cada Agencia que dificultan la implementación de los PC y aumentan los costos de transacción.
- 61 Common agenda, according to mission and each agency priorities, each donor priorities and government priorities
- 62 Agreement among PUNOs. Daily coordination with multiple agencies and counterparts.
- 63 The gap between administrative procedures and financial in common with all agencies evolved.
- 64 La disposición de las Agencias a trabajar en conjunto.
- 65 Le cadre de résultats doit être simplifié ainsi que le cadre de suivi évaluation.
- 66 -Conflict of priority and mandate;
-Coordination is taking too much time, hence costly;
-Small UN agencies see JP mechanism as a way of receiving donor fund rather than thinking about results.
-RC's office sees JP or DaO as a mechanism of controlling work of other UN agencies, rather than thinking about actual results

- 67 Having well thought out goals that all participating agencies subscribe to and able to align with their corporate goals and objectives/results frameworks, clarity in intentions, the very understanding of the difference between JPs and joint programming, funding and allocation functions, coordination and levels of substantive and fiscal government participation
- 68 Completing priorities of agencies, lack of dedicated multi-year funding.
- 69 Better orientation required for partners so that they know what they are signing up for.
Detailed assessment should be carried out to have a clear idea of the value added to the JP by each partner.
- 70 Resources
- 71 Agreement between UN agencies
- 72 Complexity and long start-up time combined with too little time for implementation
- 73 Balancing needs with availability of resources
Initial transaction costs are quite high
Staff turnover means continuous training of JP expertise
Overhead costs need to be harmonised e.g. harmonisation of percentages applicable to participating UN agencies
- 74 1) Time factor especially in this large program
2) Reaching consensus
3) Complex administrative procedures
4) The process and time implication for the government to prepare and complete TPPs (ministry proposals for the JP) was highly underestimated for this large program, and it caused a 1-year set-back
- 75 The funding raising process and distribution of approved funding
- 76 The transaction cost associated with it
- 77 Continued completion between UN agencies, lack of government ownership and leadership, too many evaluations, lack of support from Secretariat HQ, limited capacity of government and sometimes lead UN agency.
- 78 Our JP was understaffed (or unstaffed) for most of the programme, there was little to no understanding of the Programme document by agency focal points, communication between the lead agency and HQ went through the RCO, which led to long delays in correspondence.
- 79 Instabilité politique
- 80 Lack of HQ pressure on working together -> accountability of agency is towards its own HQ not towards the RC. In this sense the RC has very little leverage on bringing agencies together.
- 81 Lack of real joint programming in the programme document. Lack of enough M&E mechanisms. Lack of accountability.
- 82 Nonresident UN agencies and changing partners
- 83 Lack of dedicated staff for JP in each participating UN agencies, especially for small COs.
- 84 Too complicated requirements and guidelines.
- 85 Rivalries among personalities in various agencies and turf wars plus some being rich some being poor.
- 86 Time constraints. Budget availability. Too many agencies willing to participate due lack of funding sources.
- 87 Time
Too many agencies result in challenges in management
Decisions on funding arrangements and which agency should be the AA, in case of pass through funding
Reporting delays by some agencies that require clearance from their HQ before submitting reports
Some agencies feeling that they have to be part of JP, even if there is no added value
Challenges in agreeing on how funds should be allocated to agencies, where funding has been provided by a donor jointly to a JP.
- 88 Nothing to add other than some cases of delays in transferring funds from the AA to the PUNO.
- 89 Information sharing and inter-agency coordination
- 90 Get the buy in interest from UN agencies to be part of the JP. The Ex-Com Agencies are the usual ones to initiate the JP but it NRA, smaller UN agencies and donors to become active partners.
- 91 Different rules and procedures of involved agencies;

- 92 Too many agencies, too many approaches, each agency has a different goal
- 93 Lack of agency commitment and competition for resources leading to over statement of true capacities
- 94 The main obstacle is to standardize the administrative processes, for counterparts working with different administrative processes represents a high level of difficulty
- 95 Availability of staff
- 96 Inter-agency funds transfer
- 97 Coordination between various agencies and partners with different interests.
The United Nations administrative processes have not adapted to the demands of the JPs
- 98 Competition among UN agencies
- 99 Fight for flag versus country needs
- 100 The resources required for administration and management of a JP too often fall to the agency where the Office of the RC is located, with a significant and consistent burden on programme and operations staff of that agency to manage often multiple JPs at once. Efforts by other agencies to recruit dedicated coordination staff are welcome, as this may translate to more equitable distribution of the AA/MA responsibility.
- 101 Inadequate technical and financial competence as well as different agency policies and procedures
- 102 Even though most of the time there is a strong coordination among UN agencies and government, there are cases when it takes time more than needed the coordination aspect among UN agencies involved in the JP and government for the operationalization of the project work plan.
- 103 Awareness and appropriate UN-leadership
- 104 To bring together various agency interests - at the development stage.
- 105 Extra initial work
- 106 High turnover rate of staff involved at ground level
- 107 Since JP are still new concepts, it has been difficult to make staff members engaged in such programme to internalize the concept of JP and feel a team rather than an individual agency working to achieve the programmatic objective.
- 108 Cada uno debe entender y aceptar el rol que le corresponde. En los primeros meses de ejecución y por ser la primera experiencia en este país de trabajo conjunto entre las agencias, algunas agencias no entendían las funciones de la coordinación, lo cual mejoró significativamente según avanzaba el programa.
- 109 The design and planning phase of JPs should be reasonably shorter and more time should be allocated for implementation
- 110 Difference in UN agency administrative and financial mechanism.
- 111 Lack of good planning (not enough time and resource allocated to planning)
- 112 Lack of sufficient funds
- 113 Participating agencies' understanding and commitment
- 114 There are lots of process and not enough time for implementation. All agencies are implementing in silos not as a unit of combination of UN agencies in the specific thematic area that they have interest in it.
- 115 Agreement on UN agency financing prior to soliciting funds from donors. JPs should be UN owned and not varied on basis of donor requirements

- 116** The nature of the joint programme strongly encourages UNCT agencies to work closely together and become inclusive throughout the implementation stage. This however stretches the decision-making process (e.g. more meetings) and causes delay since agreements are made based on a group consensus. Despite this, there is a general appreciation for a consultative process. In addition, UNCT agencies have differing strategies for providing human resource requirements which is tied to the agency's fund transfer mode or payment modality. In other words, if an agency downloads funds or transfer funds to an implementing partner, it may not require the same amount of "human-hours" versus a direct payment fund transfer mode which requires more time and human resources to implement the programme activities. Also, some government implementing partners opt for direct payment modality instead of direct fund transfer due to organizational concerns such as procurement and auditing procedures. In addition, Although in consonance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, downloading of funds to Implementing Partners, there is also a tendency that after respective funds were transferred, implementing UNCT agencies execute parts of joint program, with limited coordination between agencies, which sometimes result in a combination of different approaches and missed opportunities to share information and lessons learned. Both among the UN agencies and among Implementing Partners, challenges within organizational coordination and rigid processes caused delays in engaging service providers/consulting firms and in fund releases. In addition, there is still a perception that the Joint Programme activities are additional work.
- 117** Challenges are the usual ones when developing joint initiatives.
- 118** The lengthy planning process
- 119** Key obstacles relate to differing approaches to programme planning, including budgeting, and programme management. Some agencies operate through defined projects approach, others operate through a programme results based approach; financial systems are not aligned. HACT is mostly not functioning, or implemented differently. Most agencies do not use government systems (including procurement systems). JPs are generally not following Government planning and budgeting calendar...etc...JP are ultimately not demonstrating alignment with aid effectiveness principles. JP create their own project management structures and units...
- 120** In developing a Joint Programme, main obstacles are the negotiation and agreement on areas of intervention. Agencies should be willing to compromise and to be committed to the common goal rather than the benefit of their agency. In managing a JP, it is important to have a strong STA to manage and be able to be on behalf of all UN participating agencies and there would be a need in a lead coordinating agency, who will back up the STA and commit to this challenging extra job.
- 121** Lack of understanding of the benefits it can bring
- 122** Lack of resources. Given current scarce resources, UN entities are often more concerned with individual survival than working together. Also there is an attitude that certain UN entities should mobilize resources for the "good of all" while other entities sit and wait to received funds.
- 123** Financial arrangements, competition for visibility and resources
- 124** The synchronization of the progress from many agencies and institutions is very challenging, considering this requires different decision making levels intervention. The decision power of the Coordinator is low.
- 125** Independent and different sets of rules and regulations by the UN agencies. Territoriality by UN agencies in a subject or with a national counterpart.
- 126** Different cooperation strategies (some agencies have project-based approaches while others are programme oriented) and operation modalities (some agencies' operations are very centralized while others have decentralized operations) among agencies
- 127**
1. Lead agency capacity
 2. Agreeing on fund allocation
 3. Overlapping agency mandates
 4. Participation requiring amount of staff time and communication

- 128 Lack of cooperative working experience between UN Agencies. Lack or insufficient Gov familiar with results-based management. Some participants may tend to micro-management
- 129 True coordination at the level of implementation, tapping into each other comparative advantages, creating joint implementation teams among participating agencies (optimizing involvement).
- 130 We need to harmonize our administrative/operational guidelines/procedures and rules!
- 131 The legally binding nature of joint programs (vs. joint programming processes), entails too much negotiation within country and also with our HQs. I believe we can often achieve the same objectives through joint programming.
- 132 Active cooperation of participating UN Agencies
Low capacity in managing JPs
- 133 Coordination and bringing on board all agencies especially while meeting tight deadlines.
Resource mobilization.
- 134 Agency wide coordination and defining the lead agency
- 135 The main challenge to develop a JP is to have agencies sit around a table to devise a jpg. Unless the financial framework is significant they do not want to do that. During implementation the major challenge is to ensure that they move with the same level of responsibility and quality.
- 136 Induction on JP for new colleagues, specially heads of office with no experience or knowledge about the issue.
- 137 Reluctance from individual UN agencies, who sometimes are only interested in joint programmes if they provide additional resources.
- 138 Time delays due to a lot of discussion on the process
- 139 Staff deficiency; relevant mechanism for accountability of each participating agencies; different procedures in each respective UN Agency
- 140 Having multiple UN Agencies with non-unified rules and regulations and reporting system both financially and technically makes coordination sometimes very difficult. There is no incentive for the Agencies to work together under a joint programme except if there is a fund which requires that as the MDGF.
- 141 UN Agencies will to collaborate further from mobilize resources
Lack of harmonized UN procedures
Lack of clarity in the roles and responsibility of the partners
- 142 Having enough funds to cover coordination costs and getting the same or enough dedication from all parties involved. Feedback from participating Un agencies is that annual reporting is cumbersome and should be simplified plus reporting on certain aspects of One Country Funds requested by donors implies high transaction costs for small amounts of funds that some countries receive.
- 143 Confusing the goals -- a JP is a modality to get a job done, not an end in itself nor primarily a resource-mobilisation tool.
- 144 Transaction costs within UN.
- 145
1. Coordination and harmonization is a difficult process. Participating agencies try to have a sense of entitlement” instead of having a careful consideration to put themselves in the best place to respond to national priorities.
 2. Weak national capacity on having ownership and leadership on JP implementation
 3. Lack of long term financial support from government and donors
- 146 Involvement of the agencies
- 147 - The funding mechanism (pooled or parallel)
- The reporting mechanism
- 148 Time, competence and personal relations
- 149 Frequent reporting
different procedures and business practices
- 150 UN culture is not conducive for working together. There is a systemic reluctance to sharing information. Also, the transaction costs are often underestimated.

- 151 The main obstacle that we have faced was the lack of political stability, which resulted in delays in the implementation process, bidding, supplies, evaluations, expenses etc...
- 152 Lack of continuity after proposed project period
- 153 Coordination between agencies, joint reporting.
- 154 Time of agencies' staff members
- 155 Agreeing on developing a JP.
- 156 Joint meeting at all levels
- 157 Risk of losing visibility
Risk of losing time when working with other
misunderstanding of JP justification: Some agency thing JP are only or those who need money, as they have enough funds they did not see the need to involve themselves in a JP
- 158 Each participating agency wants to be a leading agency, sometime it may lead to termination of JP or reducing of funds
- 159 1. Personalities
2. Dissonant individual agency guidelines
3. Limited donor investment presently
- 160 Los aspectos administrativos, complejos y divergentes entre agencias.
Las coordinaciones entre agencias
El rol de la coordinación debe ser mas claro en cuanto a valorar los resultados de cada agencia.
- 161 Relying on partners to fulfill obligations, who often overstate their capacity and expertise. Also an agency's SOPs for programme design/implementation do not enable it to effectively utilise joint funding. Also project prioritisation should be transparent and based on previous project implementation and evaluation of performance, as well as objective criteria for engaging in a project. There is also no harmonised approach to M&E, and often an agency will exaggerate the outcomes in order to gain more funding.
- 162 Coordination (time consuming process, especially for smaller agencies)
- 163 Time/Staffing
- 164 Too many UN agencies and weak staff capacity outside of narrow technical knowledge; scarce resources being competed for; some agency staff who openly say they will do what they please for the good of themselves, their agency
- 165 UN does not have one/same corporate rules, hence each participating UN agencies guided by their rules and procedures, hence, it does time put in a conflicting situation and leads to an extremely difficult working situation
- 166 Changing priorities within the agencies. Transition of senior staff presents a challenge. Understanding the nature of collaboration.
- 167 Communication with the agencies in a wider aspect. Communication strategies should be a part of preliminary implementation.
- 168 Too many meetings as RC is involved but does not have much of the accountability of RC, agencies have its own procedures and the authority as some agency can bring on the table much faster than others as a result JP mainly fails due to " speed " problem
- 169 Donor priorities and requirements that do not always take into account joint programming tools available (CCA and UNDAF). Coordination of agendas and perspectives require dedicated time for planning which is seldom available.
- 170 "Divergence of minds" amongst agencies. Donor preference. lack of leadership (technical, programme an management)
- 171 True added value
- 172 Availability of the RC and lack of equal response from the implementing UN agencies.
- 173 Different administrative procedures in the agencies
- 174 Coordinate with the Focal Points of the Agencies. A Coordinator does not rule on the Officers, Focal Points of the Agencies, and the Focal Points gives priority to the work of their agencies.

- 175 The agencies and their staff are overstretched in their input to several JPs limiting the level of commitment in follow-up.
- 176 The high number of participating agencies is a concrete obstacle, generating serious problems with govt. partners: too many different admin. policies and implementation delays, making very difficult a real coordination and synergy in the impact
- 177 The achievement of a common understanding of the situation and the adoption of a common approach; the acceptance of "co" responsibilities and accountability
- 178 La definición de actividades y presupuesto
- 179 1. Lack of Government Commitment and ownership
2. Disagreements on who should become the AA
- 180 1. JP coordinators with desired coordination and consensus building competencies, in addition to management and technical competencies.
2. Further need to advance on collaborative engagement among UN Agencies.
3. Lack of sufficient harmonization and simplification within UN at HQ level.
- 181 UN Agencies and funding, it's difficult to manage the individual needs of the agencies and requirements from the national institutions
- 182 Competing for resources and it is time consuming. Continued feeling to defend individual agency identities.
- 183 The unpredictability of One UN funds
- 184 - long lead time
- agreeing on common problem analysis
- participating agencies with no funding
- 185 1. Agency competition for funds and for visibility.
2. Coordination costs time and money.
3. Efforts in this regard are not appreciated enough by our HQ and our performance assessment supervisors.
- 186 Lack of UN agencies' operations procedures harmonization
- 187 Getting commitment to deliver on results in a timely manner by all partners. Reports are often delayed and the lead agency has to go an extra mile to have them done
- 188 Agreement on the modality
- 189 Lack of shared goal and implementation strategy; coordination requirements; initial investment to formulate the JP outcome/outputs.
Pass-through mechanism is heavy and expensive for smaller programmes.
- 190 Still insufficient understanding of the benefits of joint programming approach and narrow agencies' mandate focus.
- 191 Coordination of activities among UN agencies
- 192 The resource mobilisation and delivering as one.
- 193 Coordination among UN agencies as well as with the implementing partners was the biggest challenge and timely reporting of the progress report was another challenge that we faced.
- 194 Competition among agencies
- 195 Overlaps among UN agencies mandates. Time consuming.
- 196 1. Las diferencias en la forma de ver los problemas, sus causas y soluciones entre agencias y con socios.
2. La dificultad de conciliar los enfoques de intervención 3. La conciliación entre las prioridades institucionales y las prioridades del programa. 4. Los ritmos de trabajo y la prioridad asignada de cada agencia e institución 5. Una definición poco clara de la participación en la toma de decisiones de las agencias y de la unidad de coordinación. 6. La dificultad para visibilizar y reconocer el trabajo de las agencias como parte del programa conjunto.
- 197 The technical staff that can't but think within their own professional silo.
- 198 Time it takes to come to an agreement
- 199 Creating synergy amongst enrolled institutions.

- 200 Agencies laying down their mandates/mission to stick to country development planning or UNDAF results matrix!! How to get agencies progress at the same pace in informing/training their staff in the UN Reform process. Some really ignore what it is while others want to implement it in the field and this creates problems for those who want the change to One UN!!
- 201 El mayor obstáculo es el interés de posicionar individualmente a cada agencia, un reto importante de la experiencia con el MDGF fue la comunicación coordinada entre agencias y socios pero esto fue muy difícil, todavía queda mucho camino especialmente en contexto de recursos escasos y mucha competencia por recursos de donantes.
- 202 Agency mandate and capacity for resource mobilization
- 203 JPs can sometimes be very costly so the proper ratio between HR costs and activities related costs have to be introduced;
In the JP implemented until now the role of the JP Manager/Coordinator was not very precise and strong (emphasis on coordination vs. management, no insight and control over individual agencies' budget.
- 204 Long-serving staff too set in their agency's mode of work :-). More awareness needed on the benefits which JP can bring to the UN system
- 205 UN individualities; intra UN competition
- 206 Effective/efficient coordination; at times lack of clear guidelines/procedures on distribution of funds among participating agencies.
- 207 Initial set up & running
- 208 Coordination
- 209 When any of the participating UN agencies has problems with their capacity to fulfill a role that was agreed on. This impacts on other participating UN agencies and government.
- 210 Turf ownership
lack of funding for a coordination person
- 211 Low operational capacity of some UN agencies
Weak leadership given by RCO to lead agencies
- 212
1. The commitment and availability of technical staff from agencies. Often times task left to one agency deemed to have expertise in the area. Other agencies never contribute technical or financial input but want to be on the JP and no one can throw them out even if their value added is zero.
 2. Financial resources. agencies tend to have a wait and see attitude on JPs therefore devoting the least amount to them especially if they are not in the lead
 3. JPs take long to take off because the decision making is not clear
 4. RC and Heads of agencies also slow down implementation and often do not know the content of JPs enough to give advice
- 213 Les lourdeurs administrative
- 214 Resistance to joint accountability
Time consuming process for joint decision making which might frustrate participating agencies
JP coordinators have no supervisory authority and yet responsible for JP management.
Parallel fund is decreasing JP coordinator capacity to monitor and well manage the programme. Should be common basket with the team at the RCO office: JP coordinator plus admin assistant.
Lack of M&E and communication specialists for the JP
- 215 Too many agencies competing for same limited resources and inclusive and consensus building nature of UN processes that cannot filter out weaker agencies and dilutes the quality of the JP. The formulation also becomes lengthy and inefficient due to the consensus building processes. No clear and decisive team leader due to inter-agency dynamics that enforces quality and coherency control. The need to manage internal UN dynamics takes away the time and focus from letting the government take the lead and meaningfully engaging with other national stakeholders.
- 216 Small amounts of money for a lot of extra work, RC office does not have the capacity and needs strengthening.

- 217 Political will at the senior leaders of all organizations involved. Different ERP, administrative and financial rules and procedures of participating organizations. colleagues who are not used or have not learned to work with other agencies
- 218 Certain general obstacles observed include: insufficient consideration of startup time for complex joint programs; difficulties caused by misunderstanding of the different roles and responsibilities of the actors and potential confusion regarding "who" the program belongs to (for example: MDG Fund programs promote national empowerment and ownership but the budgets lie fully within the UN agencies in the case of Panama); need to include local actors and beneficiaries at all stages of the process.
- 219 Good design, common commitment to shared goals
- 220 The time dedicated to change the mind frame of agencies in order for them to see the added value of JP
- 221 The number of participating agencies and national institutions. Consensus requires consultation and it is time consuming.
- 222 La débil coordinación al interior del SNU.
Persiste la lógica de trabajo individual de las Agencias.
Los Estados se han acostumbrado a trabajar de forma directa con las diferentes agencias del SNU y resulta más fácil la ejecución de planes de trabajo anuales.
Se opta por esta opción solamente cuando el donante o el Estado lo exigen.
- 223 Conflict of interests of RC and UNDP.
- 224 Insufficient financial resources deals for JP donors, agencies unwillingness to have resources to JP, unwillingness of some agencies to promote joint implementation mechanism
- 225 Resistance and change management within participating UN agencies.
- 226 Staff not getting enough time from their respective agencies to engage
- 227 Timeframe and NRA participation
- 228 The different rules and procedures in each Agency
- 229 UN coordination at HQ level. No clear guidelines related to management modalities. Last revision is from 2003.
- 230 Independent and different sets of rules and regulations by the UN agencies.
Territoriality by UN agencies in a subject or with a national counterpart.
- 231 Inter-agency coordination (the politics of cooperation vs. competition - over funds especially).
Speaking as one voice to donors & government partners; avoiding that certain agency "circumvent" the JP Manager / JP communication channels.
JP Manager is a "tooth-less tiger", i.e. no reporting lines (= accountability) exist of agencies towards the JPM, which gives him/her (and the respective AA) no leverage to sufficiently influence implementation & quality assurance.
- 232 Current guidelines (and practices, e.g. MDG-F) require too much bureaucracy. Too much process, too little content.
- 233 Independence of RC and issues of UNDP firewall; limited M&E capacity in some agencies; NRA and decision making
- 234 Funding.
- 235 The different execution modalities per UN agency
Team building among the participating implementers
Agree on common outcomes and outputs
Getting the needed information on time
- 236 1. [Humanitarian agency] budgeting framework and fund raising policy.
2. The so-called ExCom agencies are too dominant in the process, and the framework and the guidelines reflect their way of working, which do not fit for [humanitarian agency].
- 237 Lack of will to do so on the part of UN agency heads and poor leadership skills of RC
- 238 Lack of Government ownership; lack of clarity on the issue; lack of clear analysis of comparative advantages/strengths of participating agencies; limited capacity of UN to be able to prioritise and make tough decision; limited focus of some UN agencies on results; too much focus by some UN agencies on processes;

- 239** Corporate financial planning and reporting
- 240** Donor preference for clear lines of accountability and reporting
Mutual accountability for results
- 241** Competition for money among agencies
- 242** Getting buy-in from the UN partners
- 243** Parallel systems to agency own resulting in reduced agency buy-in and increased staff burden,
- 244** Agreement to joint intervention between agencies versus budget distribution
- 245** UN Agencies tend to consider the JP as a source of funding, rather than an instrument for development. It is easier to cooperate with the UN Agencies within the UNDAF, but not through a JP.
- 246** To my mind the main obstacles are the lack of incentives (except donor pressures) and accountability framework. specifically, the following obstacles have to be addressed:
a) in times where the strength of a business case is the decisive fund raising reason, there should be an arbiter to "reject" agency claims to participate on the basis of substance
b) there needs to be a solution on the fight for the cost-recovery portions. donors have to accept that multi-agency participation often needs higher transaction costs that should be reimbursed
c) empower the RC/office to be the arbiter of last resort
d) the JP programme definition should also comprise the inclusion of esp. technical agencies through letters of agreements and other sub-contracting arrangements
e) acknowledge that managerial capacity is as (or more) important for comparative advantage as/than mandate
- 247** Differing mandates and ways of working

12. Specific JP Mechanism Improvements, Identified by Survey Respondents

- Develop joint workplan at the outcome or output level, with agency responsibilities at that level.
- Delink further funding of each agency from delivery of all agencies.
- Ensure one uniform set of Guidelines used for all JPs.
- Simplify reporting – one set of templates for JP (no separate reporting to donors or HQ).
- Clarify inter-agency MOU terms and conditions to apply when UNDP is not the AA or MA
- Further develop local coordination and management arrangements for parallel funding arrangement.
- Make reports more relevant and more substantive – templates should be user and reader friendly.
- Financial reporting: administration costs should be included
- AWP is in Word, should also be in excel
- Financial tools should have calculation functions installed
- Several questions in reporting templates are inappropriate or largely duplicates
- Simplify templates for budgeting, monitoring and financial issues
- JP tools are good, but not necessarily match agency own data formats
- Harmonize reporting periods of HQ and country
- Get donors to buy-in to the reporting tools, not require their own separate reports.
- Workplans and templates should be aligned with those for DaO.