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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
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### 3. Persons Interviewed in Three Case Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)</td>
<td>Maria Morazo</td>
<td>Responsible for Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Jorge Samaniego</td>
<td>Programme Officer UNREDD); ex-national director (Yasuni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Coordination Unit, Water and Sanitation Governance</td>
<td>Jordi Sanchez</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (MIDUVI – Water)</td>
<td>Edgar Rodriguez</td>
<td>Technical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment (UNREDD)</td>
<td>Carola Borja</td>
<td>Subsecretary of Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment (UNREDD)</td>
<td>Patricia Velasco</td>
<td>National Director of Climate Change Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Coordination Unit, Yasuni</td>
<td>Zornitza Aguilar</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment (Yasuni)</td>
<td>Tania Villegas Segovia</td>
<td>Subsecretary of Natural Patrimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)</td>
<td>Jose Giraldo</td>
<td>Advisor to the Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)</td>
<td>Yadira Carpio</td>
<td>Director of Culture of Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaria Nacional de Agua (Water)</td>
<td>German Rodriguez</td>
<td>Director of Social Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaria Tecnica de Cooperacion Internacional (SETECI)</td>
<td>Silvia Albuja</td>
<td>Technical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator Office</td>
<td>Diego Zorrilla</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator Office</td>
<td>Patricio Jarrin</td>
<td>Coordination Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator Office</td>
<td>Pablo Galarza</td>
<td>MDG-F M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Fernando Pachano</td>
<td>Programme Specialist (Governance and Poverty Reduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Gabriel Jaramillo</td>
<td>Programme Specialist (Environment and Risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Consultant</td>
<td>Miguel Angel Lombardo</td>
<td>Country Evaluation (MDG-F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Mandip Rai</td>
<td>REACH focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction</td>
<td>Naresh Chapagain</td>
<td>Under Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development</td>
<td>Bodh Raj Niroula</td>
<td>National Programme Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development</td>
<td>Dinesh Koirala</td>
<td>LGCDP District Facilitator, Kavre District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development</td>
<td>Ganga Datta Awasthi</td>
<td>Consultant, former Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development</td>
<td>Gobinda Bahadur Karkee</td>
<td>Local Development Officer, Kavre District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development</td>
<td>Gopi Khanal</td>
<td>National Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare: Dept of Women and Children</td>
<td>Mamta Bista</td>
<td>Women Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Embassy</td>
<td>Bibek Chapagain</td>
<td>Energy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Embassy</td>
<td>Camilla Rosaak</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC/HC Office</td>
<td>Caroline Vandenabeele</td>
<td>Head of RC/HC Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC/HC Office</td>
<td>Robert Piper</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator / Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK DFID</td>
<td>Simon Lucas</td>
<td>Climate Change and Inclusive Growth Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Peace Fund - Nepal</td>
<td>Hemlata Rai</td>
<td>Programme Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Peace Fund - Nepal</td>
<td>Lach Fergusson</td>
<td>Peace Building Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Purna Shrestha</td>
<td>EVAW focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>Rojee Joshi</td>
<td>LGCDP focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
<td>Head, PeaceBuilding and Recovery Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Pragyan Joshi</td>
<td>LGCDP focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Rafeeqe Siddiqui</td>
<td>LGCDP Focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Shantam Khadka</td>
<td>UNIRP focal Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Aruna Pant</td>
<td>UNIRP Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Balkrishna Sharma</td>
<td>National Gender Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Bijay Thapa</td>
<td>LGCDP focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Sudha Pant</td>
<td>EVAW focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Beth Verhey</td>
<td>LGCDP Chair /Chief Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Parbati Shrestha</td>
<td>UNIRP Education Case Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Patrizia Benvenuti</td>
<td>EVAW - Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Pratisha Dewan</td>
<td>EVAW focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Saba Mebrahtu</td>
<td>REACH focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>Christian Simmelkiaer</td>
<td>LGCDP focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Jhabindra Bhandari</td>
<td>REACH National Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Ashok Bhurtyal</td>
<td>REACH focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Dr. Manav Bhattarai</td>
<td>REACH Health Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Persons Interviewed: Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Agnes Ndamata</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Irene Among</td>
<td>Social Development Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Ireland</td>
<td>Caroline Kego Laker</td>
<td>Social Development Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Ireland</td>
<td>Mary Oduka-Ochan</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, Social Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Norway</td>
<td>Kamilla Kohshus</td>
<td>First Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Martin Ameu</td>
<td>National Agric/HIV Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Bernadette Ssebadduka</td>
<td>Migration Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Mariela Guajardo</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPGE</td>
<td>Judy Kamanyi</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries</td>
<td>Connie Acayo</td>
<td>Principal Information Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education and Sport</td>
<td>Roland Bnyahwaho</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Technical Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>Margaret Kakande</td>
<td>Head, Budget Monitoring and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development</td>
<td>Christine Guwatudde</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary, SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development</td>
<td>Jane Ekapu</td>
<td>Principal Gender Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development</td>
<td>Juliana Namno</td>
<td>Commissioner, Culture and Family Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development</td>
<td>Mabuya Mubarak</td>
<td>Principal Gender Officer and Gender Programme Component Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Dr Ario Alex Riolexus</td>
<td>Ag Programme Manager, AIDS Control Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Dr Collins Tusingwire</td>
<td>Ag. Assistant Commissioner, Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Dr Joshua Musinguzi</td>
<td>Ag PM SID/HCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Miriam Namugeere</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Local Government</td>
<td>Assumpta Tibamwenda</td>
<td>Local Economic Development Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Authority</td>
<td>Kareem Buyana</td>
<td>Gender Planning Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Aids Commission</td>
<td>Dr David Apuuli</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
<td>Charles Zirarema</td>
<td>Ag Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
<td>Rosemary Nalwadda</td>
<td>Gender Statistics Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Registration Services Bureau</td>
<td>Charles Nsimbi</td>
<td>Manager Civil Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator Office</td>
<td>Ahunna Eziakonwa-Onochoie</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Agnes Kisembo</td>
<td>Programme Specialist JPGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Brian Mwinamura</td>
<td>Finance Associate JPGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Paulina Chiwangu</td>
<td>JPGE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Sandra Huesser</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Economic Programme Officer, JPGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Thaddeus Sserukeera</td>
<td>UNV M&amp;E for JPGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women (attached to MGLSD)</td>
<td>Adjaratou Fatou Ndiaye</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Emebet Admassu</td>
<td>Human Rights and Gender Adviser Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Dr James Guwani</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Faridah Saleh</td>
<td>JUPSA Program Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Jotham Mubangizi</td>
<td>JUPSA Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Musa Bungudu</td>
<td>Uganda Country Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Sarah Nakku</td>
<td>Gender and HIV Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Dirk Van Hove</td>
<td>Programme Analyst, UNAIDS Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>Jenifer Bukokhe</td>
<td>Senior Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Olivia Nyakarungi</td>
<td>Programme Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Betty Kyaddondo</td>
<td>JPP Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Cecile Compaore</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Florence Apuri Auma</td>
<td>SNPO / Team Leader Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Florence Tagoola</td>
<td>Team Leader P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Janet Jackson</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Jhamba Tapiwa</td>
<td>Focal Person JPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Patrick Orotin</td>
<td>JPP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Roselidah Ondeko</td>
<td>Focal Person GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Rosemary Kindyomunda</td>
<td>National program officer HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Tapiwa Jhamba</td>
<td>JPP Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Dr Kaggwa Mugagga</td>
<td>NPO- Non-communicable diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Rita Nalwada</td>
<td>National Program Officer HIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Agencies Contacted for Discussion of HQ Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Written Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG-F Secretariat</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTF Office</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-HABITAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>No input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Documents Consulted**

- UNDP, 2012. Lessons Learned from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD), June 2012
6. Joint Programme Listings Received from Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Joint Programme Lists</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOCO-2005</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOCO-2007</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPTFO</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDG-F</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNWOMEN</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality of JP</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>183,941,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>351,710,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2,390,573,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>163,145,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,107,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>3,095,477,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNRCO</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

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

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

- 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
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.
La simplification des modalités de gestion / reporting.
- La documentation en français: les partenaires nationaux n'ont pas accès aux outils développés en anglais.

- Technical expertise in certain areas;
- With simplified guidelines and harmonizing business practices;
- Raising funds

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.

Technical support and resource mobilization.

Agency HQs should re-enforce the importance of Joint Programmes to their Country Offices

Resources mobilization and consultants

RC should be facilitating more when there are problems

Harmonisation of procedures and for Agency HQ to be aware of UNDG guidelines.

Technical assistance in programme development and monitoring and evaluation

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.

Respond to emails!

Coordination positions should ideally be appointed by HQ and report directly to them.

La tenue régulière des réunions du Comité Technique de Pilotage

Resource mobilization (initiatives such as MDG achievement funds could be enlarged).

Propose alternatives

HQ should accept joint reporting (not agency specific)

HQ should continue to have a JP Management unit to support JP implementation.

A focal point for UN agencies at HQ.

Learn from past mistakes to develop better guidelines.

Harmonization of administrative procedures among agencies. Support to mobilize funds

Simplified guidelines signed by all agency heads and sent to country level.

Support for funding for joint programmes, especially with the economic down turn.

Technical expertise, particularly if there is a need to verify the viability of the interventions.

Technical assistance in the formulation of JP, to implementation and M & E.

Clear guidelines as to the Agency’s involvement on JPs and associated costs for it

Normative guidance on procedure

Work on the simplification of processes at the level of the agencies HQ

Strong involvement of the sr management

Model contracts

It is necessary the review of financial and administrative mechanisms to improve agility and avoid delays.

RC should play a leading and facilitating role

Support international partnership process (ex IHP+ on health domain)

Financial and technical support

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.

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!

Share good practices/stories from other countries.

Technical expertise and reduce the amount of money charged to JP resources

Nothing particular, but moral blessing to DaO
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.

Algunas HQ no entienden la agilidad que se requiere para ejecutar estos programas y retienen los recursos más de lo esperado.

Technical support and cross-country learning

Clear guidelines and help desk.

Increase planning tools better user friendly. Develop staff capacity on their use and allocate enough time and resource to the JP

Flexibility in the management of the Joint Programmes

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.

Frequent and committed involvement of UN agency Headquarters and on financial and substantive reporting.

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.

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.

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.

Explain benefits and ensure that it forms part of checklist at the PAC stage

A strong message from HQ on importance of JP, particularly from specialized agencies.

Harmonized financial systems

Try to reduce differences in administrative and financial procedures between agencies. Policy support for the joint programming and executing become effective.

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.

1. TA for quality assurance
2. Share best practice
3. Conduit for channeling of funds from donor

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

Simplify procedures. Leave room for UNCTs to innovate and adapt to national context and needs.

We need to get serious about harmonizing the operational procedures of our agencies and our levels of decentralized authority!

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.

Provide direct policy and guidance to design and implement JPs

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
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.

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.

More incentives at the level of individual agencies; clearer guidelines; sharing of experiences

To facilitate and support the process to establish a UNDAF including dialogue amongst Agencies at HQ level.

A strengthened UN Resident Coordinator with a clear mandate over the JP an office and budget

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.

Empower local representatives/delegate authority to get the work done

1. Share the best practices
2. Unified the reporting format.
3. Ensure the required staffing

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

Take into consideration national/country realities and simplify their agency guidelines

A catalogue of good JP examples

Agreement should come from heads of agencies on harmonization of procedures.

HQ should have a better understanding on the reality of the project implementation.

Global lessons learned

Technical support in developing JPs.

More follow up on reporting.

Timely operational and financial closure of JPs

Additional temporary staff or facilitators for the development of the programme

Support on RBM -practical part.

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

Simplification of procurement processes within the programme. Joint rules in management of JP for all agencies.

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)

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.

Better coordinated and more effective resource mobilisation strategy at the interagency level, as well as ensuring more robust communications on the processes.

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

Guidance and funding
More oversight visits; not warm and fuzzy "support mission with "advice"
Simplified rules and guidelines.
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.
Implementation of a communication plan in the very beginning of the programme.
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
Planning and M&E tools to increase linkages with the UNDAF
Technical support, donor requirements.
More reporting, procurement and auditing flexibility
Unify administrative procedures
Empowering the Coordinator on the Focal Points of the agencies
HQs should provide more practical support and should revise their personnel evaluations to reflect contributions to JPs.
Resource mobilization at a global level and in policy decisions
Enfatizar que en los JP no se lleven los sombreros de agencias sino de UN
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
1. Simplification and harmonization at HQ level.
2. Improved structures of decentralized decision making in case of some specialized Agencies.
Clear guidance
Technical support to COs.
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
Agency procedures in line with agreed UNDG guidelines
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.
Effort to harmonize operations procedures and reporting requirements
Technical review of what is contained in joint Programme in terms of substance and impact.
Clear guidelines
Strongly driven operational harmonization across agencies at HQ level, in addition to the pass-through mechanism.
Encourage and promote joint coordination at the country-level among their agencies' staff.
Access to donors
Stronger monitoring mechanism to deliver as one in a friendly manner.
Some flexibility in the fund utilization depending on the priority of the government.
Support in the development of proposals
Favorecer el intercambio de buenas practicas; definir lineamientos homologados, tanto programaticos como administrativos, entre agencias para la conduccion de programas conjuntos. Diseños de modelos de evaluación y de administración con base en resultados aplicables a los JP
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.

Perhaps an impartial coordinator to help in the initial stages

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!!

Primero una clara línea 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.

Political pressure on Agency country offices

Possibility of direct coordination between HQ Focal Point and JPM

Relationships from HQ to HQ to solve issues

Consolidate & simplify admin requirements

Usual support as for other projects.

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.

Must fund a coordinator

Technical and resource mobilisation

Les outils actuels du secretariat pour le suivi-evaluation sont bons

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.

International coordination staff in RC office

Encourage more 'joint programming' than 'joint programme' and educate donors on the benefit of joint programming and costs of JPs.

Streamlining of reporting (narrative and financial). A thorough manual and guidelines for operations from the start of the program.

Help mobilize resources

They should buy in to the concept

Administration procedures should be harmonized among the agencies.

Piensan 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.

Political support to promote the formulation and execution of JP in common working areas at country level

More support from the highest level is needed, Resident coordinator to lobby with ministers, when it comes down to sustainability stage of implemented activities.

Technical assistance and M&E support

More guidelines on managing JPs especially for specialized agencies

To make one pool for the money to be managed by the JPM.

Clear guidelines are need with clear SSA and MOU forms for UN agencies developing JPs

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.

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.

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?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obstacle Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diminishing agency and government interest as JPs are increasingly viewed as process heavy, non-value adding and unable to ressource the One Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Different expectations, systems and procedures of UN Agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commitment of all the partners, including the UN agencies to the concept and practice of joint programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 |
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.

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.

Lack of commitment from head quarters of participating agencies.

UN agencies’ mandates and conflict of interests over funding.

Coordination with other agencies and competition for resources

Too many agencies; limited money, limited time-frame, unclear focus/strategic value to be added.

The level of integration for all the strategies been implemented for the agencies involved.

Persons.

The transactional costs often outweigh the tangible programme results.

Defining a vision and main objectives of the JP. Each agencies has its own view and priority

Often donor driven; too many divergent agency interests; weak m&e plans.

Problems with NRAs

The delay in the availability of joint program funds

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

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.

Too much upward accountability

Lack of agency focus/capacity. Everybody wants to join in but normally overestimate their capacity to deliver

Coordination among UN Agencies as well as ownership from the Government.

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

Coordination among stakeholders in term of time availability and resources for planning, monitoring and review.

Additional workloads for coordination and participation

Rigid interpretation and the use of it by agencies as a modality to fundraise

Different mandate and different capacity and staffing

Coordination and getting all agencies at the same time

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.
Different UN agency has different level of implementation capacity, this cause delay in reporting

Agencies' different capacity

Coordination with government.
Poor sense of ownership by government
Coordination among the Heads of UN agencies.
Joint budget for Joint activities

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

It is like herding cats - very difficult if the agencies are not fully committed to the JP.

How to set up the management, reporting and admin arrangements.

Coordination

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 AWPs 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.

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.

More than doing JPs, it is more of the resistance of UN agencies to DAO

Everybody wants to be part of the decision making

Not obstacles. There is always a learning curve as agencies learn to work together, coordinate and share ideas and objective

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.

Difficult to align objectives.

Es importante insistir que un programa conjunto que busque resultados estratégicos no debería ser inferior a 3 años, debe ser mínimo de 4

Different procedures and regulations among UN agencies

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.

Common agenda, according to mission and each agency priorities, each donor priorities and government priorities

Agreement among PUNOs. Daily coordination with multiple agencies and counterparts.

The gap between administrative procedures and financial in common with all agencies evolved.

La disposición de las Agencias a trabajar en conjunto.

Le cadre de résultat doit être simplifié ainsi que le cadre de suivi évaluation.

-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
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.

Completing priorities of agencies, lack of dedicated multi-year funding. 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.

Resources

Agreement between UN agencies

Complexity and long start-up time combined with too little time for implementation

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

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

The funding raising process and distribution of approved funding

The transaction cost associated with it

Continued completion between UN agencies, lack of government of ownership and leadership, too many evaluations, lack of support from Secretariat HQ, limited capacity of government and sometimes lead UN agency.

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.

Instabilité politique

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.

Lack of real joint programming in the programme document. Lack of enough M&E mechanisms. Lack of accountability.

Nonresident UN agencies and changing partners

Lack of dedicated staff for JP in each participating UN agencies, especially for small COs.

Too complicated requirements and guidelines.

Rivalries among personalities in various agencies and turf wars plus some being rich some being poor.

Time constraints. Budget availability. Too many agencies willing to participate due lack of funding sources.

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.

Nothing to add other than some cases of delays in transferring funds from the AA to the PUNO.

Information sharing and inter-agency coordination

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.

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.
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
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.

Challenges are the usual ones when developing joint initiatives.

The lengthy planning process

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...

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.

Lack of understanding of the benefits it can bring

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.

Financial arrangements, competition for visibility and resources

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.

Independent and different sets of rules and regulations by the UN agencies. Territoriality by UN agencies in a subject or with a national counterpart.

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

1. Lead agency capacity
2. Agreeing on fund allocation
3. Overlapping agency mandates
4. Participation requiring amount of staff time and communication
Lack of cooperative working experience between UN Agencies. Lack or insufficient Gov familiar with results-based management. Some participants may tend to micro-management.

True coordination at the level of implementation, tapping into each other comparative advantages, creating joint implementation teams among participating agencies (optimizing involvement).

We need to harmonize our administrative/operational guidelines/procedures and rules!

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.

Active cooperation of participating UN Agencies

Low capacity in managing JPs

Coordination and bringing on board all agencies especially while meeting tight deadlines.

Resource mobilization.

Agency wide coordination and defining the lead agency

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.

Induction on JP for new colleagues, specially heads of office with no experience or knowledge about the issue.

Reluctance from individual UN agencies, who sometimes are only interested in joint programmes if they provide additional resources.

Time delays due to a lot of discussion on the process

Staff deficiency; relevant mechanism for accountability of each participating agencies; different procedures in each respective UN Agency

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.

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

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.

Confusing the goals -- a JP is a modality to get a job done, not an end in itself nor primarily a resource-mobilisation tool.

Transaction costs within UN.

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

Involvement of the agencies

- The funding mechanism (pooled or parallel)
- The reporting mechanism

Time, competence and personal relations

Frequent reporting

different procedures and business practices

UN culture is not conducive for working together. There is a systemic reluctance to sharing information. Also, the transaction costs are often underestimated.
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...

Lack of continuity after proposed project period

Coordination between agencies, joint reporting.

Time of agencies' staff members

Agreeing on developing a JP.

Joint meeting at all levels

Risk of losing visibility
Risk of losing time when working with other agencies.

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

Each participating agency wants to be a leading agency, sometime it may lead to termination of JP or reducing of funds

1. Personalities
2. Dissonant individual agency guidelines
3. Limited donor investment presently

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.

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.

Coordination (time consuming process, especially for smaller agencies)

Time/Staffing

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

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

Changing priorities within the agencies. Transition of senior staff presents a challenge. Understanding the nature of collaboration.

Communication with the agencies in a wider aspect. Communication strategies should be a part of preliminary implementation.

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

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.

"Divergence of minds" amongst agencies. Donor preference. lack of leadership (technical, programme and management)

True added value

Availability of the RC and lack of equal response from the implementing UN agencies.

Different administrative procedures in the agencies

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.
The agencies and their staff are overstretched in their input to several JPs limiting the level of commitment in follow-up.

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.

The achievement of a common understanding of the situation and the adoption of a common approach; the acceptance of "co" responsibilities and accountability.

La definición de actividades y presupuesto

1. Lack of Government Commitment and ownership
2. Disagreements on who should become the AA

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.

UN Agencies and funding, it's difficult to manage the individual needs of the agencies and requirements from the national institutions

Competing for resources and it is time consuming. Continued feeling to defend individual agency identities.

The unpredictability of One UN funds

- long lead time
- agreeing on common problem analysis
- participating agencies with no funding

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.

Lack of UN agencies’ operations procedures harmonization

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

Agreement on the modality

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.

Still insufficient understanding of the benefits of joint programming approach and narrow agencies’ mandate focus.

Coordination of activities among UN agencies

The resource mobilisation and delivering as one.

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.

Competition among agencies

Overlaps among UN agencies mandates. Time consuming.

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.

The technical staff that can't but think within their own professional silo.

Time it takes to come to an agreement

Creating synergy amongst enrolled institutions.
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!!

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.

Agency mandate and capacity for resource mobilization

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.

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

UN individualities; intra UN competition

Effective/efficient coordination; at times lack of clear guidelines/procedures on distribution of funds among participating agencies.

Initial set up & running

Coordination

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.

Turf ownership
lack of funding for a coordination person

Low operational capacity of some UN agencies
Weak leadership given by RCO to lead agencies

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

Les lourdeurs administrative

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

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.

Small amounts of money for a lot of extra work, RC office does not have the capacity and needs strengthening.
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.

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 two (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.

Good design, common commitment to shared goals

The number of participating agencies and national institutions. Consensus requires consultation and it is time consuming.

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.

Conflict of interests of RC and UNDP.

Insufficient financial resources deals for JP donors, agencies unwillingness to have resources to JP, unwillingness of some agencies to promote joint implementation mechanism

Resistance and change management within participating UN agencies.

Staff not getting enough time from their respective agencies to engage

Timeframe and NRA participation

The different rules and procedures in each Agency

UN coordination at HQ level. No clear guidelines related to management modalities. Last revision is from 2003.

Independent and different sets of rules and regulations by the UN agencies. Territoriality by UN agencies in a subject or with a national counterpart.

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.

Current guidelines (and practices, e.g. MDG-F) require too much bureaucracy. Too much process, too little content.

Independence of RC and issues of UNDP firewall; limited M&E capacity in some agencies; NRA and decision making

Funding.

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

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].

Lack of will to do so on the part of UN agency heads and poor leadership skills of RC

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;
Corporate financial planning and reporting
Donor preference for clear lines of accountability and reporting
Mutual accountability for results
Competition for money among agencies
Getting buy-in from the UN partners
Parallel systems to agency own resulting in reduced agency buy-in and increased staff burden,
Agreement to joint intervention between agencies versus budget distribution
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.
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
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.