



UNDG meeting

19 September 2012, 9:00 AM - 11:00 AM (EST)

DC1 – 21st Floor, Hank Shannon Conference Room

Final Report

Item 1 – Introduction by the UNDG Chair

1. The UNDG Chair, Helen Clark, opened the second UNDG meeting of 2012 by sharing her reflections on key developments of the past few months and the critical tasks ahead, including the follow-up to Rio +20, the post-2015 agenda, and the QCPR.

2. With regard to Rio+20, she provided an overall positive assessment of the outcome, highlighting that the UNDG had a key role to play in supporting countries in its implementation. Prior to the summit, it had seemed a concrete possibility that there would be no agreement on an outcome at all, which would have been disastrous given the enormous challenges across all pillars of sustainable development. A key success of Rio+20 was the mobilization of non-state actors on a very large scale, including in cyber space where the Rio Dialogues organized by the United Nations attracted much interest. The UNDG Chair emphasized that the experiences of Rio+20 would have important implications for the future of UN summitry, which would need to be guided by the objective to ensure inclusive, bottom-up stakeholder consultations and the mobilization of the world's peoples behind decisions with global impact.

3. With regard to the post-2015 development agenda, the UNDG Chair pointed to the complexity of several parallel consultation processes. In addition to the Secretary-General's High Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, Member States launched a separate process for establishing sustainable development goals at Rio+20, which will be guided by an open working group of the General Assembly whose schedule is not aligned with the MDG Review Summit in 2013. UNDP and UNDESA, as co-chairs of the Secretary-General's in-house post-2015 Task Team, have prepared a first report on behalf of the UN development system, including the IFIs, and the OECD titled "Realizing the Future we Want", which has been made available by the Secretary General. In order to create an effective link between the different processes, the Secretary-General has accepted the UNDG Chair's proposal to establish a Post-2015 Secretariat, which will be supported by staff secondments from Member States and UN system entities.

4. The UNDG Chair emphasized that in order to build on the success of the MDGs, the post-2015 development agenda would need to be focused, time-bound, measurable, and easy to communicate. It should set goals and targets across the three pillars of sustainable development, and prioritize the unfinished business of the MDGs. The UNDG Chair highlighted that the UNDG would have a critical role to play in bringing the collective depth and breadth of its expertise to bear in support of this process. In this context, she highlighted the joint support provided by the UNDG to facilitate inclusive consultations on the post-2015 development agenda in more than fifty countries, as well as nine thematic consultations on issues ranging from governance to food security, led by UN system entities.

5. The undg Chair noted that the follow-up to Rio+20 and the deliberations on the post-2015 development agenda will have an important bearing on the QCPR, which will outline how the UN development system will be expected to drive these important processes. She highlighted that it would be of particular importance that the QCPR be informed by the experiences and lessons learned of Delivering as One. In this context, she thanked the undg High Level Group and its Chair Anne-Birgitte Albrectsen for having initiated work on developing Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One as called for in the Outcome Document of the Tirana Conference and noted that it would be ideal if these were ready in time to inform the QCPR. With regard to funding, the undg Chair underlined the importance and urgency of addressing the issue of shrinking levels of core funding in support of the work of the undg.

6. With regard to results, the undg Chair pointed to two recent processes, which are of particular relevance for determining how the undg could better achieve and report on results at the country level: The positive experiences with the MDG Acceleration Framework and UNICEF's Monitoring Results for Equity System - MoRES. She noted that these experiences offered significant potential for improving the joint work of UN Country Teams around thematic clusters and more effective results reporting by Resident Coordinators. UNDP and UNICEF have started deliberations on how best to take this forward within the undg.

7. Looking ahead, the undg Chair tasked the ASG Advisory Group with starting timely preparations for the next set of undg strategic priorities, noting that these would need to be fully aligned with the QCPR and that for the next two years MDG acceleration would need to continue to be on top of the agenda.

8. In response to the Chair's introductory remarks, UNICEF positively acknowledged that collaboration around substantive issues had markedly improved within the undg and the ASG Advisory Group. As a result, the work of the undg had become significantly more strategic and the collective impact of the undg had been enhanced.

Item 2 – undg review of RC system funding modalities

9. The undg Chair introduced the agenda item by reminding the undg that ECOSOC had invited the undg in 2011 to conduct a review of existing funding modalities in support of the RC system, including appropriate burden-sharing arrangements among relevant UN organizations. The undg had been requested to make recommendations to improve the provision of resources and support to the RC system at the country level, to be reported by the Secretary-General to ECOSOC. The undg Chair emphasized that development partner countries expected the UN development system to fully cost-share co-ordination by 2014, which is why the importance and urgency of the successful conclusion of the undg review of RC system funding modalities before the end of 2012 could not be overestimated. The undg Chair noted that she would like to be able to take some options to her meeting with the Advisory Group Principals on the margins of the CEB fall session on 2-3 November.

10. The undg Vice-Chair, Hans d'Orville briefed the undg on the key findings, recommendations and critical issues identified by the study prepared by the firm Management Systems International and the proposal of the ASG Advisory Group with regard to the way forward. He acknowledged the rich and constructive feedback that had been received from 11 agencies, funds and programmes, the UN Secretariat, 5 Regional undg Teams and a focus group of 11 UNCTs on the first draft report. He noted that the overall reception of the study had been positive and that there was a lot of convergence in the comments. In particular, colleagues appreciated the solid analysis

and inclusive consultations - the findings of the study are based on a country survey, to which 70 RCs and 540 UNCT members responded as well as interviews conducted with 50 inter-agency focal points and budget specialists at headquarters, and 20 representatives of the Regional UNDG Teams.

11. With regard to the key concerns raised in the feedback, the UNDG Vice-Chair noted that these related in particular to: Recommended levels of additional capacity and cost increase of the RC system; further refinement of coordination needs according to country typologies; presentation of alternative coordination and funding scenarios; adequate consideration of UN system in-kind contributions; consideration of innovative sources of financing and efficiencies gained; nuanced approaches for humanitarian agencies and UN Secretariat entities; and presentation of a realistic transition plan and timeline, which takes into account agencies' bi-annual budget cycles. In response to this feedback, Management Systems International had prepared two shorter documents, which the ASG Advisory Group had recommended to serve as basis for the discussion of the UNDG: RC Funding Modalities Abstract and Scenarios for Funding the RC System.

12. With regard to the findings of the study, the UNDG Vice-Chair highlighted that it provided the UNDG for the first time with a transparent overview of the current functions, capacities and funding modalities of the RC system. A first important achievement of the study was the "unpacking" of development coordination into 10 distinct functions, which needed to be performed in all countries, albeit with varying intensity. He noted that it was important that this value proposition was properly understood and validated. A second important achievement was the most accurate estimate to date of the costs of coordination, which amounted to some \$130 million annually - \$90 million "backbone" funded by UNDP plus some \$40 million, much of which was raised by DOCO from development partners. This was equivalent to about 1.6 per cent of country programmable resources. The third key finding of the study was the need to prioritize and strengthen coordination functions in four key areas: (1) strategic analysis and planning; (2) knowledge management and coordination; (3) communication and advocacy; and (4) monitoring and evaluation. The UNDG Vice-Chair noted that the study also found significant gaps in capacities at the regional and HQ levels. A central recommendation was therefore to fully implement the outcomes of the functional review of DOCO and the capacity assessment of the Regional UNDG Teams, which the UNDG agreed on in 2010 but which had yet to be fully funded. If all demands for strengthened capacity at the global, regional and country level were to be met, the study estimated that the total system costs would need to increase from \$130 million to some \$156 million in 2013 and up to \$170 million by 2015. These estimates included capacity requirements needed to meet the likely demand for implementation of the second generation of Delivering as One in an increasing number of countries - if all new UNDAF roll-out countries were to adopt Delivering as One as called for in the Outcome Document of the Tirana Conference, the number could increase from 32 to 96 in 2015.

13. With regard to the proposed principles for cost-sharing, the UNDG Vice-Chair informed the UNDG that as the funder and manager of the RC system, UNDP had already indicated that it would continue to fund the 'backbone' of the RC system. With regard to the remaining funding gap, the study recommended that this was to be based on four overall principles: (1) funding of the RC system should be managed centrally; (2) all UNDG member entities should share in some way in the funding of the RC system as a reflection that all stakeholders benefit by participation within the system; (3) cost-sharing should be based on a combination of cash and in-kind contributions; and (4) a financial management system for transparent measurement of expenditures and return on investment needs to be put in place. The proposed cost-sharing model for the primary UNDG programming entities - the agencies, funds, and programmes - was, in turn, recommended to be determined by three principles: (1) membership fee, recognizing that all entities place a minimum load on the system, irrespective of their scale and size; (2) ability to pay, using agency headcount and agency expenditures; and (3) system load, recognizing that different entities place a different load on the system and gain different magnitudes. In addition, the report also

recommended participation of the UN Secretariat and the World Bank in the cost-sharing arrangement based on a combined flat fee for all Secretariat entities and the mere membership fee in case of the World Bank.

14. With regard to funding scenarios, the UNDG Vice-Chair highlighted that the study proposed two funding scenarios: Scenario 1 assuming that all costs would be met fully in cash by UN system entities and Scenario 2 suggesting that the costs could be met by a combination of cash contributions and in-kind contributions for specific coordination functions. With regard to Scenario 2, the study proposed that while all countries should receive funding for at least 2 staff positions for strategic planning, knowledge management and essential coordination tasks, capacity for additional functions including M&E and communications could be provided as in-kind contributions by UN system entities in line with the commitments of the Management and Accountability system. These contributions would then be credited to the releasing agency towards its global amount due.

15. With regard to the next steps and the proposed timeline for moving to a system-wide cost-sharing model, the UNDG Vice-Chair noted that this would need to take into account the time required to seek approval from agency governing bodies and the budgetary processes for the next biennium 2014-2015. The study recommended that planning and management procedures began immediately, with UN system cost-sharing beginning by mid-2014. This would imply that continued extra-budgetary support from development partner countries would be required in 2013 and partly also in 2014. The UNDG Vice-Chair suggested that the UNDG agree on the key principles of the cost sharing modality and conveyed the recommendation of the ASG Advisory Group to mandate the UNDG Vice-Chair to convene a new task team with immediate effect to refine the recommendations of the study in light of current funding realities by mid-October. The Task Team should be representative of the diverse membership of the UNDG and prepare recommendations for consideration by the UNDG Chair and UNDG Principals at their meeting on the margins of the CEB meeting on 2-3 November.

16. The UNDG Chair, Helen Clark thanked the UNDG Vice-Chair for his leadership of this important exercise and emphasized that it was critical for the UNDG to conclude the review before the end of the year. She affirmed her intention to have an informed discussion with UNDG Principals on the review in early November and welcomed the proposal that a UNDG Task Team would prepare refined recommendations and options for this purpose. She noted that it was important to determine what levels of support were realistic in the current funding environment and highlighted that the UNDG would also need to determine how to get better value from the existing \$40 million, which are provided annually in addition to the UNDP "backbone." She also expressed her hope that the development of Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One would result in a reduction of costs compared to the coordination costs in the Delivering as One pilot countries.

17. UNDG members agreed on the urgency to conclude the review by the end of the year. The following issues were highlighted for further clarification and refinement: Tailored approaches for the participation of humanitarian agencies, non-resident agencies, and UN Secretariat entities in the cost-sharing modality; review of the level and applicability of the proposed UNDG membership fee; consultations with the HLCM Finance and Budgetary Network; robust methodology for the provision and accounting of UN system in-kind contributions. UNWTO proposed that instead of introducing a UNDG membership fee, the UNDG should recommend to the CEB, through HLCP and HLCM, to consider and approve a standard, fair and equitable system of burden-sharing by UN system entities of the cost of coordination, based on pay-for-services-delivered and capacity-to-pay, taking into account the size and budget of the entities concerned.

The following UNDG members expressed an interest in joining the Task Team: UNDP, UNICEF, UNEP, UNHCR, WFP, FAO. DESA requested a member of the Budget Division of the UN Secretariat be included.

18. **Decision:** UNDG members agreed that the UNDG Vice-Chair is to convene a Task Team with immediate effect to review the findings and recommendations of the MSI draft report and to submit refined recommendations to improve the provision of resources and support to the RC system based on system-wide cost-sharing to the UNDG Chair by 15 October for consideration by UNDG Principals. The Task Team will be lean and include members of the former Task Team, representatives from development, humanitarian and non-resident agencies as well as the UN Secretariat. Task Team members will represent the views of their respective “constituents” to ensure an inclusive process.

19. UNDG members also agreed that cost-sharing would be based on the following principles: (1) Funding of the RC system should be managed centrally; (2) all UNDG member entities should share in some way in the funding of the RC system as a reflection that all stakeholders benefit by participation within the system; (3) cost-sharing should be based on a combination of cash and in-kind contributions; (4) a financial management system for transparent measurement of expenditures and return on investment needs to be put in place. UNDG members also re-affirmed the principles established by the UNDG ASG Advisory Group on 23 February 2012¹, highlighting that coordination should not be funded by reductions nor transfers from programme budgets, that cost-sharing should follow differentiated approaches, and that innovative approaches to funding should be explored.

Item 3 – Update on the development of standard operating procedures for Delivering as One

20. The UNDG Vice-Chair, Hans d’Orville introduced the item, noting that at the Fifth Intergovernmental Conference on Delivering as One in Tirana, Delivering as One countries confirmed the findings of the Independent Evaluation and agreed that the approach had delivered at the country level but that further efforts were required to overcome systemic challenges at headquarters. He informed the UNDG that the Secretary-General had mandated the UNDG Chair to initiate and lead the formulation of “Standard Operating Procedures” (SOPs) for UN Country Teams in countries wishing to adopt the DaO approach as called for in the Outcome Document of the Tirana Conference. The UNDG was expected to present a first report before the end of the year, preferably in time to inform the QCPR negotiations. He thanked Anne-Birgitte Albrechtsen for her leadership of the UNDG High Level Group (HLG), which is overseeing this work in full collaboration with the UNDG mechanisms, HLCM Networks, Regional UNDG Teams, and country colleagues.

21. On behalf of the HLG, Udo Janz provided an update on the status of the preparations of the SOPs. He informed the UNDG that the HLG is in the process of developing minimum Standard Operating Procedures on programming, business practices, leadership, and One Voice arrangements. He thanked UNDG members for supporting the work of the HLG on One Voice with the expertise of several communications experts. The SOPs would be simplified and harmonized to the extent possible, reducing transaction costs at the country level. He noted that zero draft versions of the SOPs would be considered by the 11 members of the HLG at a retreat on 27 September, which would be followed by another retreat at the end of October. In addition, a Validation Group would be formed, composed of representatives from the Regional UNDG Teams, Resident Coordinators, UN

¹ (1) Coordination should meet cost/benefit tests, with costs and mechanisms kept as lean as possible to deliver agreed and necessary coordination services; (2) coordination should not be funded by reductions nor transfers from programme budgets; (3) there should be full transparency and accountability in coordination cost categories and amounts, and sources of funding and amounts; (4) UN agencies, governments and donors should bear coordination costs if they receive benefits (e.g. all those who participate in a UNCT should contribute); (5) changes to the current system and practices may affect the amount of burden-sharing that is already taking place.

Country Teams, Heads of RC Offices, NRA representatives as well as OMT Chairs. OHCHR invited the HLG to also draw on the expertise of the undg Human Rights Mechanism with regard to One Voice, One Leader, and One Programme. The HLG will report back to the undg on the outcome of the retreat on 27 September.

Item 4 – Draft management response to the Independent Evaluation of Delivering as One

22. Debbie Landey, Director of DOCO introduced item by recalling that the Secretary-General had been asked by the Chair of the Evaluation Management Group of the Independent Evaluation to provide a management response to the recommendations contained in the report. Since the undg co-ordinated activities related to Delivering as One, the Secretary-General had requested the undg Chair to take the lead in preparing the management response and to ensure that the views of the High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) and the High-Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) were sought and included in the response. DOCO had since prepared an initial draft based on the relevant statements and recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's most recent report on the QCPR.

23. With regard to the feedback received from the undg, Ms Landey acknowledged the very constructive comments and suggestions, which had been received from eight undg members: ILO, WFP, WHO, UNHCR, UNFPA, UNIDO, UNDP and UNICEF. She noted that the draft had overall been welcomed as being comprehensive as well as strategic.

24. With regard to the format of the management response, Ms Landey indicated that DOCO would be happy to follow the suggestion made by several undg members to re-draft the report according to UNEG evaluation response methodology, clearly indicating whether or not the Secretary-General agreed with the recommendations and what actions the UN system would take.

25. With regard to the substance, Ms Landey indicated that there was broad consensus on some of the key messages and the thrust of the recommendations put forward in the Secretary-General's report. There seemed to be overall agreement on the need to implement all of the recommendations of the Independent Evaluation with the exception of Recommendation 8, which suggested that all United Nations entities, notably funds and programmes, might wish to increasingly make contributions to the One Fund from their existing core and non-core contributions. Ms Landey noted that this recommendation might be perceived by some as a significant divergence from the original purpose of the One Funds – which had been intended as complementary financing mechanisms to mobilize resources in addition to organization-specific core and non-core resources – thereby risking adding rather than reducing transaction costs. She suggested that greater clarity in this regard could be expected from the proposed review of One UN Funds called for in the Secretary-General's report.

26. Ms Landey noted that the undg feedback also suggested sharpening the management response in selective areas by specifying concrete actions to be taken by the undg, for instance with regard to indicating (1) how system-wide ownership of the RC system can be enhanced; (2) what actions will be taken to address key challenges to implementing the M&A system; (3) if and how the recommended consolidation of functions under the undg at headquarters level should be addressed; (4) how system-wide evaluations can complement agency-specific ones; and (5) how the undg intends to accelerate progress on rationalization and harmonization of business practices. Ms Landey further indicated that DOCO would be happy to follow the suggestion to include references to the undg's ongoing work on Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One countries, which

had been omitted from the initial draft since the undg had yet to receive an official mandate from Member States for working on such an integrated support package for Delivering as One.

27. With regard to the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report, Ms Landey noted that several agencies had expressed concerns with regard to specific elements, relating, in particular, to the feasibility of implementing some of the recommendations in the area of business practice reform, especially within the proposed timeframes. Recalling that the management response was ultimately to be issued by the Secretary-General – and not by the undg – Ms Landey assured the undg that every effort would be made to find the right balance in addressing the concerns of undg members while ensuring the consistency and integrity of the Secretary-General's reporting to the General Assembly. In line with the suggestions from several undg members, Ms Landey further suggested that the management response be limited to addressing the 12 recommendations of the Independent Evaluation – not the lessons learned – as requested by the Chair of the Evaluation Management Response, together with a brief cover note, which had also been shared for comments.

28. In terms of next steps, Ms Landey informed the undg that the draft management response would also be discussed at the forthcoming 24th Session of HLCM (24-25 September) and HLCP (3-5 October). The undg Chair had therefore agreed to extend the deadline for all written comments until 8 October. The undg Chair would subsequently share a final draft with the undg for approval on a no-objection basis. The Secretary-General would then bring the final version to the attention of Member States during the QCPR deliberations.

Item 5 – Update on QCPR preparations

29. Marie Oveissi, Head, Capacity Development Office, DESA briefed the undg on the status of the QCPR preparations. She thanked the undg for the support and inputs provided in preparation of the Secretary-General's second report on the QCPR, which had been very well received. She assured the undg that all comments had been carefully considered and reflected in the final report to the greatest extent possible. She further informed the undg that DESA would prepare a summary note on the key recommendations and timelines outlined in the Secretary-General's report, which would be shared with Member States and the undg once it becomes available. The draft resolution on the QCPR was expected to be introduced during the week of 15 October and that negotiations were scheduled to be concluded by 30 November, although delays would need to be expected.

30. In response to the presentation, the Chair of the ASG Advisory Group, John Hendra informed the undg that the ASG Advisory Group would hold a retreat to discuss common messaging once the draft resolution was available and that the summary report prepared by DESA would be a useful input. In order to ensure that the UN development system is being seen as speaking with one voice on the QCPR, it was suggested that DESA could consider inviting a small delegation of the ASG Advisory Group to any events that might be organized for Member States on the QCPR. OHCHR welcomed the inclusion of a human rights dimension in the final version of the Secretary-General's report, reflecting the contribution of the undg Human Rights Mainstreaming mechanism and also increasing level of interest and support among Member States including programme countries. FAO thanked DESA for the preparation of a solid report while also noting concerns that the RC system was portrayed as the only coordination mechanism while work around thematic clusters was not sufficiently recognized; that specialized agencies should also be included in the debate on critical mass; that there should be due consideration to review and evaluate the existing 2010 UNDAF guidelines before deciding whether to develop new guidelines; that agency-specific programming frameworks should be recognised as complementary to the UNDAF process, as it

had been in an earlier version of the report; and that appropriate reference should be given to the role of the RC in terms of coordination functions since RCs had primarily a coordination role for the planning and coordination of programmes, not 'authority' in this regard. DESA acknowledged the comments but confirmed that the report had by now been finalized and issued by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

Item 6 – Request to establish a UNDG Task Team on Culture and Development

31. Hans d'Orville introduced the proposal on behalf of UNESCO, highlighting that the nexus between culture and development had been explicitly recognized by the 2010 High-Level Meeting of the General Assembly on the MDGs and that harnessing the potential of culture for sustainable development was a matter for all UN organizations engaged in development activities. Progress was particularly required through the operational activities of the UN system at regional and at country levels. He noted that in follow-up to a letter by Ms Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO, to the UNDG Chair in July 2012, UNESCO would like to propose the establishment of a dedicated UNDG Task Team on Culture and Development.

32. The overall goal of the Task Team would be to enhance the role of culture in the UN common country programming process and development programmes pursued by the entities of the United Nations system within their respective mandates. It could also accompany the preparation of the next Creative Economy Report, which has been launched by UNDP and UNESCO and is scheduled to be issued by the end of 2013.

33. With regard to the working arrangements, Mr. d'Orville confirmed that UNESCO would be ready to chair the Task Team, which would be time-bound until the end of 2013, task-specific, and self-serviced in line with the UNDG working arrangements.

34. In response to the proposal, OHCHR suggested that the terms of reference of the Task Team should foresee close collaboration with the UNDG Human Rights Mechanism and the UNDAF Programming Network.

35. **Decision:** UNDG members agreed to establish a time-bound UNDG Task Team on Culture and Development until the end of 2013. The Task Team will be chaired by UNESCO and fully self-serviced with concrete terms of reference. UNESCO will report on the status of the Task team at the next UNDG meeting.

Item 7 – AOB

Update on the implementation of the Management and Accountability System

36. The Co-Convener of the UNDG Working Group on RC System Issues (WG-RCSI), George Assaf provided a brief update on the status of implementation of the Management and Accountability System (M&A System) and on improving the RC/HC/DO performance appraisal system.

37. With regard to the M&A System, he recalled that the UNDG had made it a key priority for this year to ensure the full implementation of the M&A System and that UNDG members had committed to undertake four critical changes to strengthen the mutual accountability for results between RCs and UN Country Teams: (1)

revision of the job descriptions of their representatives in the field to explicitly recognize the role of the Resident Coordinator in strategically positioning the UN in each country; (2) ensuring that the results of UN country teams are included in agency performance appraisal systems; (3) ensuring full compliance of reporting obligations to the Resident Coordinator on resource mobilization and programme implementation performance of UNDAF/One Programme elements led by a UN agency; and (4) empowering Resident Coordinators to provide an assessment of performance as a formal input into agency performance appraisal processes.

38. With regard to the status of implementation, Mr. Assaf noted that to date, only seven organizations had confirmed full implementation of all four of these agreements: UNAIDS, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNIDO, WHO, and UN-Women, 12 agencies had reported partial implementation of one or more actions, and one agency had reported no implementation. Mr Assaf noted that at the current rate of progress, the undg was unlikely to be able to report full implementation of the M&A System by the end of the year.

39. With regard to addressing the obstacles impeding full implementation, Mr. Assaf emphasized the need for much stronger commitment and leadership at the level of Agency Heads. He conveyed the recommendation of the WG-RCSI that the undg Chair might wish to call upon undg Principals on the margins of the CEB to speed up implementation of the M&A agreements by the end of 2012. The WG-RCSI also urged that a letter be sent to all agencies requesting full recognition of the role of RCs and the importance of appraising and rewarding UNCT results in agency performance appraisal systems. The letter should also highlight the importance of the involvement of the Regional undg Teams in monitoring compliance with the M&A agreements. The matrix tracking the implementation of the M&A agreements would be shared with the undg Principals for information.

40. With regard to the update on improving the RC/HC/DO and UNCT performance appraisal system, Mr. Assaf noted that this was part of the actions identified in the undg management response to the M&A Review. He informed the undg that WG-RCSI had identified a set of short-and long-term recommendations to enhance the appraisal system for 2012 and beyond. In this regard, he highlighted two short-term recommendations: (1) launching the performance appraisal process earlier in the year - by October/November 2012 - to allow for the provision of timely inputs to individual undg agencies for the appraisal of their representatives taking place in the first quarter of the following year; and (2) holding Regional undg Team appraisals meetings in February/March 2013. Mr. Assaf further confirmed that in order to strengthen mutual accountability between RCs and UNCT members, the lite-One80 would be eliminated. For the 2012 appraisal cycle, clearer guidance would be produced, stressing the mandatory nature of the full-One80 tool. An analysis of the utility of the One80 would also be conducted.