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Preface

The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) engages in a broad range of partnerships and collaborative relationships. This study specifically focuses on UNICEF engagement with global programme partnerships (GPPs), an increasingly popular development cooperation modality for addressing pressing global issues and internationally agreed development goals.

The study aimed to assess the magnitude, modalities and evaluability of UNICEF engagement in GPPs, and to draw lessons to enhance the relevance and effectiveness of future UNICEF participation in these important collaborative mechanisms. The study was commissioned by Programme Division and coordinated and implemented by the Evaluation Office and the Programme Partnerships Unit. An interdivisional steering committee oversaw the conduct of the study and endorsed the final report. Preliminary results of the study informed the formulation of the UNICEF Strategic Framework for Partnerships and Collaborative Relationships.

The study was conducted under the leaderships of Simon Lawry-White and Lucien Back, Senior Evaluation Specialists in the UNICEF Evaluation Office, and Pascal Villeneuve, Associate Director, Programme Division, with the support of external consultants Shyama Kuruvilla and Rema Balasundaram and intern Katarina Davis. The report was edited by Margo Alderton. We would like to take this opportunity to thank the study team and the editor for conducting this challenging task with methodological rigour and in a very professional manner.
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It is hoped that the study will further boost UNICEF’s capacity to engage strategically in GPPs and to work effectively with others to achieve greater results for children. We also hope that this study will contribute to global thinking on the value of GPPs as partnership instruments to address global public good issues and internationally agreed development goals.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) engages in a broad range of partnerships and collaborative relationships. This study specifically focuses on UNICEF engagement with global programme partnerships (GPPs), an increasingly popular development cooperation modality for addressing pressing global issues and concerns.

Despite the fact that UNICEF has been engaged in GPPs for decades, GPP mention as a distinct partnership category was introduced for the first time in the midterm review of the medium-term strategic plan (MTSP) for the period 2006 to 2009 and in the new Strategic Framework on Partnerships and Collaborative Relationships (SFP CR), recently approved by the UNICEF Executive Board. Engagement in a growing number of GPPs warrants that UNICEF better understand not only the opportunities offered by these instruments to advance children’s rights, but also the engagement challenges resulting from their numbers and diversity.

The lack of baseline information and the difficulty in evaluating the effect of UNICEF engagement in the absence of pre-existing policies and strategies led to the decision to modify the focus of the study and to place greater emphasis on assessing the evaluability of UNICEF engagement in GPPs. An evaluability assessment is a review of a given programme or intervention, at the early stages of or preceding an evaluation, to determine, among other things, whether the programme’s objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable. The study included several components: assessing information requirements and available knowledge in relation to a number of pre-identified evaluation questions; compiling and synthesizing baseline information to facilitate the planning of subsequent process and impact evaluations; developing a conceptual approach to guide and analyse UNICEF engagement; and appraising readiness for evaluation by assessing current engagement practices and procedures using the proposed conceptual model as an analytical template.

Findings and recommendations

- Finding 1: GPPs are expanding the current system of international cooperation from being primarily inter-governmental to being tripartite (state, business and civil society).

GPPs have long been part of the development architecture. Their recent multiplication, however, has been a remarkable phenomenon. This report estimates their current number at 168, compared to 10 in 1989. Driving the promotion of these partnership instruments is the awareness that extraordinary efforts are required and will continue to be required from the international community if the world is to meet such objectives as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) or avert the risk of global warming. Another major factor is the decline in the cost of information and communications, linking the global and local forces of economic integration, public participation, and organizational decentralization in ways unimaginable just a few years ago.

GPPs are expanding the current system of international cooperation from being primarily intergovernmental to being tripartite, drawing in all actor groups—state, business and civil society. They have gradually become a key institutional instrument to deliver global public goods and to help developing countries achieve Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs), including the MDGs. They have been conceived as a focused response to a global challenge requiring collective action to achieve results in various sectors such as: health; food security and nutrition; HIV/AIDS; water; sanitation and hygiene; environment; trade; finance; security; gender equality; and social protection. Much of the evidence points to an enduring role for GPPs, though recent trends indicate a slowing down of their annual incidence.

While the contribution of GPPs to development is acknowledged, they are encouraged to more systematically support country ownership, to align and harmonize their assistance proactively, and to make good use of mutual accountability frameworks, while continuing their emphasis on achieving results. The development community is also encouraged to first use and, if necessary strengthen, existing channels for aid delivery before creating separate new GPPs.
GPPs have sprung up primarily in an ad hoc way in the absence of an internationally agreed policy framework regulating their role in the international cooperation landscape. Several attempts have been made by different institutions, including UNICEF, and several authors to propose specific terminologies, defining features and typologies. While the definitions proposed share many similar features, they now need to be reconciled and their terminologies harmonized. There is also a need for greater international consensus on typologies and on the pros and cons of different organizational models to inform decisions on the high-level purposes, supporting strategies, degree of partnership integration, governance structures and funding models of existing and future GPPs. These efforts can build on the emerging evidence base derived from the growing number of independent reviews and evaluations conducted using internationally agreed norms and standards.

**Recommendation**

1.1 UNICEF should advocate externally for the need to further refine and harmonize definitions, terminologies, typologies and desirability criteria associated with GPPs. These collaborative efforts will eventually lead to international consensus on the total number of GPPs and their individual characteristics, on the pros and cons of different organizational models, and on criteria to be used by decision makers when considering creating new GPPs. All these elements could then form the basic constituents of an international policy framework on GPPs.

**Finding 2: GPPs have the potential to advance children’s rights.**

On the one hand, illustrative evidence collected during the course of this study tends to confirm that a large number of GPPs have the potential to advance children’s rights significantly. This is not surprising given that the main raison d’être of these partnerships is to deal with developmental issues—a majority of which are also immediate, underlying or structural determinants of children’s rights.

On the other hand, GPPs have a targeted, often narrow focus on specific development gaps. This may affect their capacity to embrace a more holistic approach to programming in line with the human rights principles of universalism, interdependence and indivisibility, and to promote a multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral perspective when consideration is given to policies, programmes or actions in favour of children.

Leveraging the child-specific impact potential of GPPs through a human rights lens is what UNICEF should aim to achieve through its engagement. Given the mission of UNICEF to advocate for the protection of children’s rights and a cross-sectoral approach, partners increasingly look to UNICEF to ensure a whole child perspective within, and across, GPPs.

Assessing the child-specific impact potential of GPPs, however, requires a better understanding of the value chain that links partners’ inputs to expected partnership results, and how this value chain reflects results-based management (RBM) and principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Developing, testing and applying such metrics for engagement planning and evaluative purposes are urgently needed.

**Recommendations**

2.1 UNICEF should develop, test and promote analytical methods and metrics for assessing the extent to which RBM and principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child are correctly reflected in the value chain that links partners’ inputs to expected partnership results.

2.2 Because of its involvement in a large number of GPPs, UNICEF can help build bridges across GPPs with the view to promote a whole-child approach through enhanced complementarities and attention to human rights principles.

2.3 When the World Bank/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs (World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook) is revised, UNICEF could lend its support to strengthen the gender equality and human rights components.
Finding 3: UNICEF engagement in GPPs is significant, but its evaluability is constrained by limited availability of historical data and by the lack of a conceptual framework.

In order to answer the evaluation questions initially prioritized by the steering committee, the evaluation would have needed data not currently supported by UNICEF internal information systems. Several factors contributed to this situation, including the lack of an institutionalized vetting process, the absence of a central database and filing system, and the lack of more explicit reporting requirements. Information from country office annual reports, while helpful to illustrate the fact that UNICEF engagement at the country level is significant and diverse, is not always sufficiently specific to support trend analysis and to identify good practices.

Analysis of the information available nevertheless confirms that UNICEF engagement in GPPs is significant, multifaceted and varies from one partnership to another and from one level of engagement to another (global, regional and local).

UNICEF currently engages in 77 out of 168 GPPs. UNICEF is a formal member in 62 GPPs and plays a governance role in 42 of them. In five of these cases, UNICEF either hosts the partnership secretariat or provides secretariat and coordination services. The vast majority (96 per cent) of the GPPs in which UNICEF participates are relevant to the medium-term strategic priorities of UNICEF, with more than 50 per cent of them related to the child survival and development agenda of UNICEF. More than 60 per cent of all the GPPs in which UNICEF participates are less than 10 years old, with a good number among them still in their maturing phase.

In 75 per cent of the GPPs in which UNICEF participates, public and non-public actors compose the membership base and populate governance structures. In 16 per cent of cases, participation in governance structures is limited to public actors, even though the membership base includes public as well as non-public actors. In only a very small number of partnerships with mixed or non-public membership is the participation in governance structures limited to non-public partners.

The vast majority (86 per cent) of GPPs in which UNICEF participates do not have a separate juridical personality. The secretariats of these partnerships are usually hosted by one of the partners at the request of the partnership board or equivalent governance structure (e.g., steering committee). Only 14 per cent of the partnerships in which UNICEF participates carry a separate juridical personality. They are registered either as private not-for-profit foundations (e.g., Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition [GAIN], Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation [GAVI], and Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria [GFATM]), limited companies (e.g., Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers [CSUCS]), associations (e.g., Gender Water Alliance); or 501(c)3 companies in the case of organizations based in the United States (e.g., Malaria No More).

Engagement roles may evolve over time depending on the level of maturity of the partnerships and the changing nature of partners’ engagement. Roles inventoried fall under three categories: governance-related, managerial and programmatic. Overall, the combination of a global mandate and an extensive country presence gives UNICEF a powerful voice in the GPPs that it decides to co-create or engage in. As such, UNICEF has a responsibility to work with its global partners to raise the standards of priority setting, coordination, governance, management and evaluation in these partnerships. Because of its simultaneous presence at global, regional and country levels, UNICEF can play a valued overall role by enhancing synergies between globally driven concerns and national development priorities.

The evaluability of UNICEF engagement is also constrained by the lack of an agreed definition on what is meant by ‘effective engagement’ in the case of GPPs. The new SFPCR defines the objective of engagement as “fostering a child-focused development agenda and building the capacity of partners and societies to execute effective and efficient social policies for children.” Effective engagement is therefore the extent to which the above objective has been attained—or is expected to be attained—efficiently, in a sustainable fashion, and with a positive institutional development impact.

Assessing the plausibility that this high-level objective may be achieved in the case of GPPs poses the challenge of clarifying what conceptual approach underpins UNICEF engagement in this type of partnership. The report proposes a conceptual model informed by the literature on global partnerships and partnership engagement, and developed with UNICEF staff and external respondents with conceptual knowledge.
and practical experience of these issues. The model includes an engagement cycle made up of three phases (assess and define, manage and broker, and review and realize) interacting with a partnership life cycle that provides the broader context within which the engagement cycle is defined and operates.

**Recommendations**

3.1 UNICEF needs to develop, test and implement a conceptual framework to guide its engagement in GPPs in a manner consistent with the high-level objectives stated in the new SFPCR. A definition of ‘effective engagement’ and a conceptual framework are proposed in this report.

3.2 To strengthen the evaluability of its engagement, UNICEF needs to establish a central database serving as a repository of critical information on UNICEF engagement in GPPs. The structure of the database should be consistent with the structure of the conceptual framework eventually adopted by UNICEF and should identify indicators, data sources, data management processes, information products, dissemination and use. The design requirements of the realization phase of the new UNICEF Virtual Integrated System of Information (“Vision”) Project on Global Public Policy Networks should take into account the specific data needs of this central database. The guidelines on annual reports should be updated to include information on UNICEF engagement in GPPs at country, regional and global levels.

---

**Finding 4: Improving the evaluability of ‘relevance’ as an evaluation criteria requires that engagement decisions be carefully weighed against selectivity criteria, subjected to a vetting process and communicated internally and externally.**

Based on the information available, useful inferences can be made on the thematic relevance of GPPs in which UNICEF participates vis-a-vis its medium-term strategic priorities. Evaluating the relevance of UNICEF engagement, however, must go beyond thematic relevance to include other parameters, such as assessing the pros and cons of investing UNICEF reputation and resources in GPPs compared to other programming alternatives, or ensuring that UNICEF roles in various GPPs are roles for which UNICEF holds strong comparative advantages.

Assessing these different dimensions of relevance requires multi-year trend analysis for which detailed historical information is currently not available, with the exception of a very small number of GPPs such as REACH. This situation largely reflects the absence of selectivity criteria and internal processes to assess, define, decide, document and communicate engagement decisions.

The lack of selectivity criteria and lack of a proper vetting and authorizing environment led to fragmented decisions, exposing UNICEF to several types of risks caused by insufficient quality control, underestimation of political and legal dimensions, insufficient backing from senior management, and potential conflicts of interest. Making strategic choices in favour of GPPs requires a good understanding of the pros and cons and acceptable trade-offs associated with their high-level purposes, and supporting strategies and related management and governance structures that range from loose coordination networks to legally constituted partnerships. Assessing and comparing expected engagement benefits and transaction costs requires methods and tools not currently available. Defining engagement modalities requires a nuanced approach on a case-by-case basis. Often, UNICEF can fulfill an appropriate role through only limited involvement. In other cases, however, there is a strong argument for full engagement—taking a leadership role and devoting considerable resources over a long period of time. From interviews conducted with UNICEF staff members, it appears that more specific guidance on how to approach these complex issues is urgently needed.

This report suggests a number of characteristics associated with successful GPPs. These characteristics can serve as a basis for the development of decision trees adapted to the five strategic decisions that UNICEF will typically need to consider: co-create, join, modify, disengage or dissolve.

---

1 REACH stands for “Ending Child Hunger and Undernutrition”. REACH is a country-led approach to scale up proven and effective interventions addressing child undernutrition through the partnership and coordinated action of UN agencies, civil society, donors, and the private sector, under the leadership of national governments.
For most of the GPPs in which UNICEF participates, it was not possible to ascertain if engagement decisions are systematically communicated to and acknowledged by the partnerships, either in the form of an exchange of letters or a more formal memorandum of understanding. The process of communicating and acknowledging UNICEF engagement decisions is important not only from a partnership accountability point of view, but also because it allows UNICEF to express the motives and the objectives it will pursue through its engagement, the roles it will be playing, and its expectations regarding the defining features of the partnership. Engagement decisions made at the global level are rarely communicated to other levels of the organization.

### Recommendations

4.1 While the idea to engage in a GPP may be promoted within UNICEF by anyone, the ultimate decision to commit the organization should be made by UNICEF senior management and be informed by the result of a standardized appraisal process involving relevant in-house expertise. Being clear about what constitutes the authorizing environment is an important condition to ensure unity of purpose across management levels.

4.2 Establishment of a vetting and authorizing environment should be linked to the formulation of criteria and standards for the identification, appraisal and funding of UNICEF engagement in GPPs. To the extent possible, internal guidelines should be harmonized with those of other organizations with similar GPP portfolios.

4.3 UNICEF does not have the methods and tools to support trade-off analysis of engagement benefits versus transaction costs. Given the complexity involved in developing such methods, this may best be achieved through collaborative efforts with organizations also involved in GPPs and equally concerned by these issues.

4.4 Engagement decisions should be properly documented and recorded, and should be communicated to external partners and internal stakeholders.

#### Finding 5: Improving the evaluability of ‘effectiveness’ as an evaluation criteria will require managerial as well as behavioural changes.

Readiness for evaluation requires ensuring that key management structures are in place to support engagement in a meaningful way. Parameters to be verified include: the existence and plausibility of engagement targets and approaches; the adequacy of GPP-related functions and supporting structures; and the clarity of accountability lines, conducive policies, procedures, rules and regulations. In addition, it is necessary to assess the extent to which staff entering into and managing a partnership engagement have received adequate support to enable them to do so effectively, and whether adequate resources have been devoted to support these functions.

Although engagement in GPPs is mentioned as a crosscutting strategy in the midterm review of the current MTSP, there are no specific and quantifiable targets relating to this aspect in the results frameworks of the revised focus areas and in the integrated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework. Several GPPs are listed in the ‘key partnerships’ and in the ‘areas of cooperation’ sections of focus areas, but no engagement targets and related indicators are mentioned.

An examination of the annual work plans of the organizational units managing UNICEF engagement in various GPPs shows tremendous variations of treatment both within and across units. For a minority of partnerships in which UNICEF participates, engagement activities and corresponding budget lines are clearly shown. However in a majority of cases, it is difficult to ascertain whether any activities had been planned to support UNICEF engagement.

In setting engagement targets and indicators, consideration will need to be given to the types of results that UNICEF would consider as reflective of an effective engagement. At least three approaches may be considered:

- **Holistic and integrated approach**: Results for children that are achieved by the partnership as a whole without specific reference to the contributions of individual organizations *in casu* UNICEF
Assessing individual contributions to partnership results: Results that are achieved by UNICEF and other partners in contributing to the agendas, approaches and implementation capacity of the partnership

Value-added or ‘counterfactual’ of the partnership, and UNICEF engagement compared with alternative programming. Results that are achieved with respect to the value-added or counterfactual of the partnership and individual partners, that is, what results the partnership might have achieved if UNICEF had not been engaged and what results UNICEF might have achieved had it opted for an alternative programming approach or partnership

Engagement objectives and corresponding budgets are derived from higher authority. It is necessary to juxtapose the expectations of senior management with the expectations of line managers and alert senior managers to discrepancies in perceptions. Significant disagreements on engagement objectives, if not reconciled, can adversely affect the acceptability of future evaluations.

Within UNICEF, the Division of Programmes is responsible for: acquiring GPP-related knowledge, developing relevant policy guidance, coordinating UNICEF engagement through the complementary efforts of its technical sections and the newly established GPP unit in Geneva, and corporate reporting on GPP engagement. In discharging these responsibilities, the Division of Programmes collaborates with the legal office and with other divisions such as the Division of Communication, the Division of Policy and Practice, the Public Alliances and Resource Mobilization Office, the Private Fundraising and Partnership Division, and the Supply Division.

Both the SFPCR and the Biennial Support Budget for 2010–2011 call for a process of alignment between the urgent need to sharpen the strategic focus of UNICEF engagement within GPPs and organizational capacities, internal structures and business processes. This process of alignment should be undertaken as rapidly as possibly, and its outcome should be communicated to internal stakeholders and external partners.

Information on organizational expectations for managing risks within the risk categories commonly identified within UNICEF (financial, hazard, strategic and operational) is contained in the UNICEF Risk Reference Guide issued in 2008, notably in relation to partner relations and management of third parties. The guide, however, lacks specificity with regards to the management of risks associated with UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

Effective engagement requires competencies and skills that will need strengthening across the organization. An initial list of characteristics of effective engagement leaders is proposed. During the course of this study, there were several examples of individual UNICEF staff who had strategically and successfully positioned UNICEF to leverage partnership resources and achieve results. These individuals can play a helpful role in supporting the development of appropriate skill-building and other training materials.

Effective monitoring of UNICEF engagement at the individual partnership level and across all the GPPs in which UNICEF participates will require a more dynamic portfolio management process. This process should favour proactivity over reactivity and assess the performance of the UNICEF portfolio, either at the aggregate level or at sub-category (sector or outcome) level. It will require developing a more comprehensive portfolio and more robust review procedures involving relevant internal stakeholders.

Recommendations

5.1 Once engagement decisions have been made by UNICEF senior management, appropriate action should be taken and documented to translate institutional commitments into multi-year engagement strategies and a results framework spanning the MTSP time-frame. These should be appropriately reflected in annual work plans and budgets. When deciding on engagement targets, consideration should be given to the types of results that UNICEF would consider as reflective of an effective engagement.

5.2 UNICEF should undertake a process of alignment between the urgent need to sharpen the strategic focus of UNICEF engagement within GPPs and organizational capacities, internal structures and business processes. This process of alignment should be undertaken as rapidly as possibly, and its outcome should be communicated to internal stakeholders and external partners.

5.3 UNICEF should review the process of appointment of UNICEF representatives serving on the boards and steering committees of GPPs. UNICEF representatives should have terms of reference
and should declare potential or real conflicts of interest. They should be correctly briefed and identify follow-up actions.

5.4 UNICEF needs to produce specific guidance on engagement in GPPs. Relevant manuals, most importantly the Programme and Policy Manual, should be updated and complemented with issue-specific guidance notes. These guidelines should be developed with the participation of internal stakeholders and harmonized with the guidelines, when they exist, of partner organizations. A conflict of interest policy addressing UNICEF engagement in GPPs should also be developed.

5.5 The UNICEF Risk Reference Guide should be updated to include the management of risks associated with UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

5.6 Portfolio review procedures should be developed and implemented. They should favour proactivity over reactivity and allow assessments of performance at the individual partnership level and the aggregate level.

Finding 6: Evaluating institutional engagement in GPPs is constrained by the lack of internationally agreed criteria and methods.

Evaluating institutional engagement in GPPs is still uncharted territory for many organizations, including UNICEF. Addressing the lack of internationally accepted criteria and methods to evaluate institutional engagement in GPPs requires urgent attention by the development community and would constitute a very helpful complement to the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook. It would allow future evaluations of GPPs to include a stronger assessment of the roles played by institutional partners in contributing to partnership goals and objectives. The likely benefits would include greater institutional accountability and clearer division of labour based on partners’ comparative advantages, as well as greater comparability of institutional engagements within and across partnerships.

From the evidence collected, it does not seem that UNICEF systematically reviews the evaluation results of the GPPs in which it participates with the view to make potential engagement adjustments. If these internal reviews do take place, they are not documented.

Recommendations

6.1 UNICEF should consider collaborating with other interested organizations, including the World Bank and OECD-DAC, on the development of a standard methodology for evaluating institutional engagement in GPPs. This could be carried out as part of the revision of the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook or as a separate but harmonized product.

6.2 When designing evaluations of the GPPs in which it participates, UNICEF should continue to promote the use of the indicative principles and standards contained in the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook and ensure that the evaluation design includes an assessment of the performance of institutional partners.

6.3 UNICEF should review more systematically the evaluation results of the GPPs in which it participates, with the view to adjusting its own engagement strategies accordingly. Any decision to modify the nature of its engagement as a result of such internal reviews should be communicated to the partners and to the chair of the board or steering committee (in the case of formal partnerships). These internal reviews should be documented and records should be kept in a central file.

Finding 7: Strengthening the evidence base on GPPs and institutional engagement will require a collaborative effort.

The number of independent reviews and evaluations of GPPs is growing rapidly and is generating a substantial body of knowledge and evidence. A cross comparison of individual evaluations would allow gauging
common trends and good practices, and would permit a better overall assessment of the pros and cons of GPPs as a new form of international cooperation.

**Recommendation**

7.1 In order to further strengthen the evidence base on GPPs as an instrument of international cooperation, and take advantage of the growing number of independent reviews and evaluations conducted using internationally agreed norms and standards, UNICEF should consider commissioning a meta-analysis of published evaluations. This could be best done through a collaborative effort involving organizations sharing similar portfolios.
RESUMEN EJECUTIVO

Introduction

UNICEF participa en una amplia gama de asociaciones y relaciones de colaboración. Este estudio se centra específicamente en la participación de UNICEF en los programas mundiales de colaboración (GPP, según sus siglas en inglés), una modalidad de cooperación para el desarrollo cada vez más popular para hacer frente a diversos problemas y preocupaciones mundiales.

A pesar de que UNICEF ha participado en GPP durante décadas, la mención de los GPP como una categoría distinta de asociación se introdujo por primera vez en el examen intermedio del Plan estratégico de mediano plazo para el período 2006 a 2009 y en el nuevo Marco estratégico sobre asociaciones y relaciones de colaboración (SFPCR, según sus siglas en inglés), recientemente aprobado por la Junta Ejecutiva de UNICEF. La participación en un creciente número de GPP indica que UNICEF no sólo comprende mejor las oportunidades que ofrecen estos instrumentos para promover los derechos de los niños, sino también los retos que presenta esta participación debido a su número y diversidad.

La falta de información de referencia y la dificultad de evaluar el efecto de la participación de UNICEF debida a la ausencia de políticas y estrategias previas condujo a la decisión de modificar el enfoque del estudio para hacer un mayor hincapié en la evaluación de la evaluabilidad de la participación de UNICEF en los GPP. Una evaluación de la evaluabilidad es una revisión de un programa o intervención, en las fases iniciales o que preceden a una evaluación, para determinar, entre otras cosas, si los objetivos del programa están adecuadamente definidos y sus resultados son verificables. El estudio incluyó varios componentes: la evaluación de los requisitos de información y los conocimientos disponibles en relación con una serie de preguntas de evaluación predeterminadas; la recopilación y y síntesis de información de referencia para facilitar la planificación del proceso posterior y el impacto de las evaluaciones; el desarrollo de un enfoque conceptual para orientar y analizar la participación de UNICEF; y la valoración de la disposición para la evaluación mediante el examen de las prácticas y procedimientos actuales de participación utilizando el modelo conceptual propuesto como un patrón analítico.

Conclusiones y recomendaciones

- Conclusión 1: Los GPP están ampliando el sistema actual de cooperación internacional que ha dejado de ser fundamentalmente intergubernamental para ser ahora tripartito (Estado, empresas y sociedad civil).

Los GPP han formado parte desde hace tiempo de la arquitectura del desarrollo. Su multiplicación reciente, sin embargo, ha sido un fenómeno notable. Este informe estima que su número actual es de 168, en comparación con 10 en 1989. Un factor que impulsa la promoción de estos instrumentos de asociación es la conciencia de que se necesitan, y se seguirán necesitando, esfuerzos extraordinarios de la comunidad internacional para que el mundo cumpla con objetivos tales como los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio (ODM), o evitar el riesgo del calentamiento global. Otro factor importante es la disminución en el costo de la información y las comunicaciones, que vincula las fuerzas mundiales y locales relacionadas con la integración económica, la participación pública y la descentralización de organizaciones de una manera que hace apenas algunos años era inimaginable.

Los GPP están ampliando el sistema actual de cooperación internacional, que ha dejado de ser fundamentalmente intergubernamental para ser tripartito, atrayendo a todos los grupos de actores: el estado, las empresas y la sociedad civil. Se han convertido gradualmente en un instrumento institucional clave para distribuir bienes públicos mundiales y para ayudar a los países en desarrollo a lograr los objetivos de desarrollo convenidos internacionalmente, incluidos los ODM. Han sido concebidos como una respuesta selectiva a un desafío mundial que requiere una acción colectiva para obtener resultados en diferentes sectores tales como la salud, la seguridad alimentaria y la nutrición, el VIH/SIDA; el agua, el saneamiento y la higiene; el medio ambiente; el comercio; las finanzas; la seguridad; la igualdad entre los géneros; y la protección social. Gran parte de las pruebas empíricas indican que los GPP pueden tener una función duradera, aunque las tendencias recientes indican una desaceleración de su incidencia anual.

Si bien se reconoce la contribución de los GPP al desarrollo, se les alienta a que apoyen de manera más sistemática la apropiación por parte del país, a que adapten y armonicen su asistencia de manera proactiva,
y a hacer un buen uso de los marcos de responsabilidad mutua, mientras continúan sus objetivos hacia el logro de resultados. También se alienta a la comunidad dedicada al desarrollo al que utilice primero y, si es necesario, fortalezca los canales existentes para la prestación de la ayuda en lugar de crear por separado nuevos GPP.

Los GPP han surgido principalmente de manera ad hoc, en ausencia de un marco de políticas convenidas internacionalmente que regulen su función en el panorama de la cooperación internacional. Diferentes instituciones, entre ellas UNICEF, y varios autores han realizado diversos intentos para proponer una terminología específica, que defina las características y las tipologías. Aunque las definiciones propuestas comparten muchas características similares, ahora es necesario conciliarlas y armonizar sus terminologías. También hay una necesidad de un mayor consenso internacional sobre las tipologías y sobre los pros y los contras de los diferentes modelos organizativos para fundamentar las decisiones sobre los objetivos de alto nivel, el apoyo a las estrategias, el grado de integración de la asociación, las estructuras de gestión y los modelos de financiación de los GPP actuales y futuros. Estos esfuerzos pueden basarse en nuevas pruebas derivadas del creciente número de estudios independientes y de evaluaciones que se han realizado utilizando reglas y normas acordadas internacionalmente.

**Recomendación**

1.1 UNICEF debe promover a nivel externo la necesidad de perfeccionar y armonizar las definiciones, la terminología, las tipologías y los criterios de oportunidad asociados con los GPP. Estos esfuerzos de colaboración conducirán finalmente a un consenso internacional sobre el número total de los GPP y sus características individuales, sobre los pros y los contras de los diferentes modelos de organización, y sobre los criterios que deben utilizar los encargados de adoptar decisiones cuando consideran la creación de nuevos GPP. Todos estos elementos podrían formar los componentes básicos de un marco internacional de políticas sobre los GPP.

- **Conclusión 2: Los GPP tienen el potencial de promover los derechos de los niños.**

Por un lado, los datos ilustrativos recopilados en el curso de este estudio tienden a confirmar que un gran número de GPP tienen el potencial de promover los derechos de los niños de manera significativa. Esto no es sorprendente dado que la principal razón de ser de estas asociaciones es tratar con los problemas del desarrollo, la mayoría de los cuales también son elementos inmediatos, subyacentes o estructurales que determinan los derechos de los niños.

Por otra parte, los GPP tienen un enfoque selectivo y a veces estrecho sobre determinadas deficiencias especificas en materia de derechos. Esto puede afectar su capacidad de adoptar un enfoque más holístico a la programación, en línea con los principios de derechos humanos de universalidad, interdependencia e indivisibilidad, y fomentar una perspectiva multisectorial y multidisciplinaria cuando se tomen en consideración las políticas, programas o acciones en favor de los niños.

Lo que UNICEF debería tratar de lograr a través de su participación es aprovechar el impacto específico potencial de los GPP con respecto a la infancia a través de un prisma basado en los derechos humanos. Teniendo en cuenta la misión de UNICEF de promocionar la protección de los derechos de la infancia y un enfoque intersectorial, los asociados cuentan cada vez más con UNICEF para garantizar una perspectiva integral del niño en el marco de los GPP, tanto a nivel individual como general.

Evaluar el impacto específico potencial de los GPP con respecto a la infancia requiere sin embargo una mejor comprensión de la cadena de valor que vincula los aportes de los asociados con los resultados previstos de la asociación, y cómo esta cadena de valor refleja la gestión basada en resultados y los principios que sustentan la Convención sobre los Derechos del Niño. Se necesita urgentemente desarrollar, poner a prueba y aplicar estos indicadores para la planificación de la participación y las necesidades de la evaluación.
Recomendaciones

2.1 UNICEF debería desarrollar, poner a prueba y promover métodos de análisis y mediciones para evaluar el grado en que la gestión basada en los resultados y los principios que sustentan la Convención sobre los Derechos del Niño se reflejan correctamente en la cadena de valor que vincula los aportes de los asociados con los resultados previstos de la asociación.

2.2 Debido a su participación en un gran número de GPP, UNICEF puede ayudar a establecer puentes entre los GPP con el fin de promover un enfoque integral del niño mediante una mejor complementariedad y una mayor atención a los principios de derechos humanos.

2.3 Cuando se actualice el Assistance Committee Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs (World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook) del Banco Mundial y la Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económicos, UNICEF podría prestar su apoyo para fortalecer los componentes de igualdad de género y de derechos humanos.

- Conclusión 3: La participación de UNICEF en los GPP es significativa, pero la limitada disponibilidad de datos históricos y la falta de un marco conceptual dificulta su evaluabilidad.

Con el fin de responder a las preguntas de evaluación a las que inicialmente el Comité directivo dio un carácter prioritario, la evaluación habría necesitado disponer de datos que los sistemas de información interna de UNICEF no apoyan actualmente. A esta situación contribuyeron varios factores, incluida la falta de un proceso de investigación institucional, la ausencia de una base de datos y un sistema de archivo centrales, y la falta de requisitos más explícitos sobre la presentación de informes. La información de los informes anuales de las oficinas de país, aunque es útil para ilustrar el hecho de que la participación de UNICEF en el plano nacional es importante y diversa, no siempre es suficientemente específica como para apoyar el análisis de tendencias y determinar buenas prácticas.

No obstante, el análisis de la información disponible confirma que la participación de UNICEF en los GPP es significativa, multifacética y varía de una asociación a otra y de un nivel de compromiso a otro (mundial, regional y local).

Actualmente, UNICEF participa en 77 de 168 GPP. UNICEF es miembro oficial en 62 GPP y desempeña un papel directivo en 42 de ellos. En cinco de estos casos, UNICEF es o bien la sede de la secretaría de la asociación o proporciona servicios de secretaría y coordinación. La gran mayoría (96%) de los GPP en que UNICEF participa guardan relación con las prioridades estratégicas de mediano plazo de UNICEF, ya que más del 50% están relacionados con la supervivencia infantil y el programa de desarrollo de UNICEF. Más del 60% de todos los GPP en los que UNICEF participa tienen menos de 10 años, y un buen número de ellos todavía está en su fase de maduración.

En el 75% de los GPP en los que participa UNICEF, actores públicos y no públicos componen su base de miembros y sus estructuras de gobierno. En el 16% de los casos, la participación en las estructuras de gobierno se limita a los actores públicos a pesar de que la base de miembros incluye también a actores no públicos. En sólo un número muy limitado de asociaciones con una participación combinada o no pública, la participación en las estructuras de gobierno se limita a los asociados no públicos.

La gran mayoría (86%) de los GPP en los que participa UNICEF no tienen una personalidad jurídica independiente. Las secretarías de estas asociaciones suelen estar organizadas por uno de los asociados, a petición de la junta de la asociación o la estructura de gobierno equivalente (por ejemplo, el comité directivo). Sólo el 14% de las asociaciones en las que participa UNICEF tienen una personalidad jurídica independiente. Están registradas como fundaciones privadas sin fines de lucro (por ejemplo, la Alianza Mundial para una Nutrición Mejorada [GAIN], la Alianza Global para Vacunas e Inmunización [GAVI], y el Fondo Mundial de Lucha contra el SIDA, la Tuberculosis y el Paludismo [GFATM]), sociedades de responsabilidad limitada (por ejemplo, la Coalición para Detener el Uso de Niños Soldados [CSUCS]), asociaciones (por ejemplo, Gender Water Alliance), o empresas 501(c)3 en el caso de las organizaciones con sede en los Estados Unidos (por ejemplo, Malaria No More).
Las funciones de la participación pueden evolucionar con el tiempo, dependiendo del nivel de madurez de las asociaciones y la naturaleza cambiante de la participación de los asociados. Las funciones inventariadas se dividen en tres categorías: relacionadas con el gobierno, gestión y programática. En general, la combinación de un mandato mundial y una amplia presencia en el país posibilita que UNICEF tenga una presencia firme en los GPP que decide establecer conjuntamente o en los que decide participar. Como tal, UNICEF tiene la responsabilidad de trabajar con sus asociados mundiales para elevar los niveles en el establecimiento de prioridades, la coordinación, la gestión, la administración y la evaluación de estas asociaciones. Debido a su presencia simultánea en los planos mundial, regional y nacional, UNICEF puede desempeñar una valiosa función general al reforzar las sinergias entre las preocupaciones impulsadas a nivel mundial y las prioridades de desarrollo nacional.

La evaluabilidad de la participación de UNICEF también está limitada por la falta de una definición sobre lo que se entiende por “participación efectiva” en el caso de los GPP. El nuevo SFPCR define que el objetivo de la participación es “promover un programa del desarrollo centrado en el niño y fortalecer la capacidad de los asociados y las sociedades para ejecutar políticas sociales eficaces y eficientes para los niños”. Una participación eficaz es por tanto el alcance en que el citado objetivo se ha logrado —o se espera lograr— de manera eficiente y sostenible y con un impacto positivo en el desarrollo institucional.

Evaluar la posibilidad de que este objetivo de alto nivel se pueda lograr en el caso de los GPP plantea el desafío de aclarar cuál es el enfoque conceptual que sustenta la participación de UNICEF en este tipo de asociación. El informe propone un modelo conceptual basado en la bibliografía sobre las alianzas mundiales y el compromiso de asociación, y desarrollado con personal de UNICEF y con personas encuestadas del exterior que tengan un conocimiento conceptual y una experiencia práctica de estas cuestiones. El modelo incluye un ciclo de participación compuesto de tres fases (evaluar y definir, gestionar y mediar, y examinar y realizar), que interactúa con un ciclo de vida de la asociación que sirve de contexto más amplio dentro del cual se define y opera el ciclo de la participación.

Recomendaciones

3.1 UNICEF tiene que desarrollar, poner a prueba y ejecutar un marco conceptual para orientar su participación en los GPP de una manera coherente, con los objetivos de alto nivel indicados en el nuevo SFPCR. En este informe se propone una definición de “participación eficaz” y un marco conceptual.

3.2 Para fortalecer la evaluabilidad de la participación, UNICEF debe establecer una base de datos central que sirva como un repositorio de información decisiva sobre la participación de UNICEF en los GPP. La estructura de la base de datos debe ser coherente con la estructura del marco conceptual adoptado finalmente por UNICEF, y debe identificar los indicadores, fuentes de datos, procesos de gestión, productos de información, difusión y utilización. Los requerimientos de diseño de la fase de realización del nuevo Sistema Integrado Virtual de Información (“Visión”) de UNICEF y el Vision Project on Global Public Policy Networks de las Naciones Unidas (ONU) deben tener en cuenta las necesidades específicas de datos en esta base central. Las directrices sobre los informes anuales deben actualizarse para que incluyan información sobre la participación de UNICEF en los GPP a nivel nacional, regional y mundial.

Conclusión 4: Mejorar la evaluabilidad de la “pertinencia” como criterio de evaluación requiere que las decisiones sobre la participación se sopesen cuidadosamente con respecto a los criterios de selectividad, se sometan a un proceso de selección y se comuniquen interna y externamente.

Sobre la base de la información disponible, es posible hacer deducciones sobre la pertinencia temática de los GPP en los que UNICEF participa en relación a las prioridades estratégicas a medio plazo. Evaluar la pertinencia de la participación de UNICEF, sin embargo, debe ir más allá de la pertinencia temática para incluir otros parámetros, tales como la evaluación de los pros y los contras de invertir la reputación y los recursos de UNICEF en los GPP en comparación con otras alternativas de programación, o garantizar que las funciones de UNICEF en los diversos GPP serán funciones para las cuales UNICEF tiene firmes ventajas comparativas.
La evaluación de estas dimensiones diferentes de la pertinencia requiere un análisis de tendencia plurianual para los que no hay disponible información histórica detallada, con la excepción de un número muy pequeño de GPP como REACH. Esta situación refleja en gran medida la ausencia de criterios de selectividad y procesos internos para evaluar, definir, decidir, documentar y comunicar las decisiones sobre la participación.

La falta de criterios de selectividad y la falta de un entorno adecuado de investigación de antecedentes y de autorización condujo a decisiones fragmentadas, exponiendo a UNICEF a varios tipos de riesgos causados por un insuficiente control de calidad, la subestimación de las dimensiones política y jurídica, el apoyo insuficiente de la dirección superior, y posibles conflictos de interés. Tomar decisiones estratégicas en favor de los GPP requiere una buena comprensión de los pros y los contras y las compensaciones aceptables relacionadas con sus objetivos de alto nivel, y las estrategias de apoyo y las estructuras relacionadas de gestión y de gobierno que van desde redes de coordinación muy flexibles a asociaciones jurídicamente constituidas. Evaluar y comparar los beneficios previstos y los costos de transacción requiere métodos y herramientas que no están disponibles en la actualidad. La definición de las modalidades de la participación requiere un enfoque matizado caso por caso. A menudo, UNICEF puede cumplir un papel adecuado sólo por medio de una participación limitada. En otros casos, sin embargo, existe un argumento favorable a la plena participación, adoptando una función de liderazgo y dedicando recursos considerables durante un largo período de tiempo. De las entrevistas realizadas con funcionarios de UNICEF, parece que se necesita urgentemente una orientación más específica sobre cómo abordar estas complejas cuestiones.

Este informe propone una serie de características asociadas con los GPP que han dado buenos resultados. Estas características pueden servir de base para el desarrollo de árboles de decisión adaptados a las cinco decisiones estratégicas que UNICEF tendrá que considerar en general: co-crear, unir, modificar, separarse o disolver.

En el caso de la mayoría de los GPP en los que participa UNICEF, no fue posible determinar si los asociados comunicaaron y reconocieron de forma sistemática las decisiones sobre la participación, ya sea en forma de un intercambio de cartas o un memorando de entendimiento de carácter más oficial. El proceso de comunicar y reconocer las decisiones sobre la participación de UNICEF es importante no sólo desde el punto de la rendición de cuentas de la asociación, sino también porque permite que UNICEF exprese los motivos y los objetivos que trata de alcanzar mediante su participación, las funciones que desempeñará, y sus expectativas con respecto a las características que definan la asociación. Las decisiones sobre la participación realizadas a nivel internacional rara vez se comunican a los otros niveles de la organización.

**Recomendaciones**

4.1 Si bien cualquier persona dentro de UNICEF puede promover la idea de participar en un GPP, la decisión final sobre si se debe comprometer a la organización deben tomarla los directivos superiores de UNICEF sobre la base del resultado de un proceso estandarizado de evaluación en el que se incluyan conocimientos técnicos pertinentes de la organización. La claridad sobre lo que constituye el entorno en que se realiza la autorización es una condición importante para garantizar la unidad de objetivos entre los distintos niveles de gestión.

4.2 La creación de un entorno para realizar la investigación y la autorización debe estar vinculada a la formulación de criterios y normas para la identificación, evaluación y financiación de la participación de UNICEF en los GPP. En la medida de lo posible, es preciso normalizar las directrices internas con las de otras organizaciones con similares carteras de GPP.

4.3 UNICEF no dispone de métodos ni herramientas para apoyar el análisis comparativo de los beneficios de la participación frente a los costos de transacción. Dada la complejidad que implica el desarrollo de tales métodos, tal vez se lograría mejor por medio de esfuerzos de colaboración con las organizaciones que también participan en los GPP y también están preocupadas por estas cuestiones.

4.4 Las decisiones sobre la participación deben estar debidamente documentadas y registradas, y es preciso comunicarlas a los asociados externos y a las partes interesadas internas.

---

2 Reach es una iniciativa del Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD) que intenta abordar los problemas que presenta el VIH/SIDA para el desarrollo de los países en Asia meridional y nororiental.
**Conclusión 5: La mejora de la evaluabilidad de la “eficacia” como un criterio de evaluación exigirá cambios de gestión así como de comportamiento.**

La preparación para la evaluación requiere garantizar que se hayan establecido las principales estructuras de gestión para apoyar la participación de una manera significativa. Los parámetros que se deben verificar son: la existencia y verosimilitud de los objetivos y enfoques; la adecuación de las funciones relacionadas con los GPP y las estructuras de apoyo; y la claridad de las líneas de rendición de cuentas, políticas propias, procedimientos, normas y reglamentos. Además, es necesario evaluar la medida en que el personal que trabaja y gestiona un compromiso de asociación ha recibido suficiente apoyo para poder hacerlo de manera eficaz, y se han dedicado recursos adecuados para apoyar estas funciones.

Aunque la participación en los GPP se menciona como una estrategia transversal en el examen intermedio del Plan estratégico de mediano plazo actual, no hay objetivos concretos y cuantificables en relación con este aspecto en los marcos de resultados de las esferas seleccionadas revisadas ni en el marco integrado de seguimiento y evaluación. Varios GPP figuran en las secciones “asociaciones clave” y en los “ámbitos de cooperación” de las esferas seleccionadas, pero no se mencionan las metas de la participación ni los indicadores relacionados.

Un examen de los planes de trabajo anuales de las unidades institucionales que gestionan la participación de UNICEF en diversos GPP muestra grandes variaciones de tratamiento dentro de las unidades y entre ellas. En una minoría de las asociaciones en las que participa UNICEF, las actividades de participación y las líneas presupuestarias correspondientes están claramente indicadas. Sin embargo, en la mayoría de los casos, es difícil determinar si se habían previsto algunas actividades para apoyar la participación de UNICEF.

Al establecer los objetivos e indicadores de la participación, se estudiará la necesidad de tener en cuenta los tipos de resultados que UNICEF considera como reflejo de una participación eficaz. Por lo menos se pueden considerar tres enfoques:

- **Holístico e integrado**: Resultados en favor de los niños alcanzados por la asociación como un todo, sin referencia específica a las contribuciones de las distintas organizaciones, *en este caso UNICEF*

- **Evaluación de las contribuciones individuales a los resultados de la asociación**: Los resultados logrados por UNICEF y otros asociados para contribuir a los programas, los enfoques y la capacidad de ejecución de la asociación

- **Valor añadido o “hipotético” de la asociación, y la participación de UNICEF en comparación con una programación alternativa**: Los resultados obtenidos con respecto al valor añadido o hipotético de la asociación y los asociados individuales, es decir, qué resultados podría haber logrado la asociación si UNICEF no hubiera participado y qué resultados podría haber alcanzado UNICEF si hubiera optado por un enfoque o asociación de programación alternativa

Los objetivos de la participación y los presupuestos correspondientes se derivan de una autoridad superior. Es necesario yuxtaponer las expectativas de los directivos superiores con las expectativas de supervisores directos y alertar a los directivos superiores sobre las discrepancias en las percepciones. Los desacuerdos importantes sobre los objetivos de la participación, si no se reconcilian, puede afectar negativamente la aceptabilidad de las futuras evaluaciones.

En UNICEF, la División de Programas es responsable de: adquisición de conocimientos relacionados con los GPP, el desarrollo de la orientación normativa pertinente, la coordinando de la participación de UNICEF por medio de los esfuerzos complementarios de las secciones técnicas y de la unidad sobre GPP creada recientemente en Ginebra, y la presentación de informes institucionales sobre la participación en el GPP. En el desempeño de estas responsabilidades, la División de Programas colabora con la Oficina Jurídica y con otras divisiones como la División de Comunicaciones, la División de Políticas y Prácticas, la Oficina de Alianzas Públicas y Movilización de Recursos, la División de Recaudación de Fondos en el Sector Privado y Asociaciones, y la División de Suministros.

Tanto el SPFPCR como el Presupuesto de Apoyo Bienal para 2010-2011 indican la necesidad de que haya un proceso de armonización entre la urgente necesidad de centrar la orientación estratégica de la participación de UNICEF en los GPP y las capacidades de la organización, las estructuras internas y los procesos institucionales. Este proceso de armonización debe realizarse lo más rápidamente posible, y su resultado debe comunicarse a los interesados internos y los asociados externos.
La información sobre las expectativas de la organización para la gestión de riesgos dentro de las categorías de riesgo comúnmente definidas en UNICEF (financieras, peligros, estratégicas y operativas) figura en la Guía de Referencia sobre Riesgos de UNICEF publicada en 2008, especialmente en relación a las relaciones con los asociados y la gestión de terceros. La guía, sin embargo, no es específica con respecto a la gestión de los riesgos asociados con la participación de UNICEF en los GPP.

La participación efectiva requiere competencias y actitudes que es necesario fortalecer en toda la organización. Se propone una lista inicial de las características que deben tener los dirigentes para ser efectivos en la participación. Durante el curso de este estudio, hubo varios ejemplos de empleados individuales de UNICEF que habían logrado posicionar estratégicamente con éxito a UNICEF para aprovechar los recursos de la asociación y obtener resultados. Estas personas pueden desempeñar una función útil apoyando la preparación de materiales de fomento de las actitudes y otros materiales de capacitación.

Un seguimiento efectivo de la participación de UNICEF a nivel de las asociaciones individuales y en todos los GPP en los que participa UNICEF requerirá un proceso más dinámico de gestión de cartera. Este proceso debe favorecer una actitud proactiva en lugar de reactiva y evaluar el rendimiento de la cartera de UNICEF, ya sea a nivel global o a nivel de subcategoría (de sector o de resultado). Será necesario establecer una cartera más amplia y procedimientos de examen más sólidos que incluyan a las partes interesadas pertinentes en el ámbito interno.

Recomendaciones

5.1 Una vez que los directivos superiores de UNICEF hayan adoptado las decisiones sobre una participación, es preciso adoptar y documentar las medidas apropiadas para plasmar los compromisos institucionales en estrategias de participación plurianuales y en un marco de resultados que abarque el calendario del Plan estratégico de mediano plazo. Estos se deben reflejar adecuadamente en los planes de trabajo y los presupuestos anuales. Al decidir sobre las metas de la participación, es preciso considerar los tipos de resultados que UNICEF consideraría como reflejo de una participación eficaz.

5.2 UNICEF debe emprender un proceso de armonización entre la urgente necesidad de centrar la orientación estratégica de la participación de UNICEF en los GPP y las capacidades de la organización, las estructuras internas y los procesos institucionales. Este proceso de armonización debe realizarse lo más rápidamente posible, y su resultado debe comunicarse a los interesados internos y externos.

5.3 UNICEF debería revisar el proceso de nombramiento de los representantes de UNICEF que prestan servicios en las juntas y comités directivos de los GPP. Los representantes de UNICEF deben disponer de términos de referencia y declarar cualquier conflicto de interés potencial o real. Es preciso informarles correctamente y determinar las medidas de seguimiento.

5.4 UNICEF necesita producir una orientación específica sobre la participación en los GPP. Se deben actualizar los manuales pertinentes, sobre todo el Manual de Políticas y Programas, y completarlos con notas de orientación sobre cuestiones específicas. En estas directrices deben participar las partes interesadas internas y es preciso armonizarlas con las directrices de las organizaciones asociadas, cuando existan. También es preciso establecer una política sobre conflictos de intereses que aborde la participación de UNICEF en los GPP.

5.5 Es preciso actualizar la Guía de Referencia sobre el Riesgo de UNICEF para incluir la gestión de los riesgos asociados con la participación de UNICEF en los GPP.

5.6 Es preciso preparar y aplicar procedimientos para el examen de carteras. Deben favorecer una actitud proactiva en lugar de reactiva y evaluar el rendimiento de la asociación a nivel individual y a nivel global.
Conclusión 6: La evaluación de la participación institucional en los GPP está limitada por la falta de criterios y métodos acordados internacionalmente.

La evaluación de la participación institucional en los GPP es todavía un territorio desconocido para muchas organizaciones, incluido UNICEF. Abordar la falta de criterios y métodos internacionalmente aceptados para evaluar la participación institucional en los GPP requiere la atención urgente de la comunidad encargada del desarrollo y constituirá un complemento muy útil al Sourcebook del Banco Mundial y la OCDE-CAD. Esto permitiría que las futuras evaluaciones de los GPP incluyeran una valoración más sólida de las funciones desempeñadas por los asociados institucionales para contribuir a las metas y los objetivos de la asociación. Los probables beneficios incluyen una mayor rendición de cuentas institucional y una división del trabajo más clara sobre la base de las ventajas comparativas de los asociados, así como una mayor comparabilidad de los compromisos institucionales dentro y a través de las asociaciones.

A partir de las pruebas recogidas, no parece que UNICEF examine sistemáticamente los resultados de la evaluación de los GPP en los que participa con el fin de hacer ajustes potenciales a su participación. Si estos exámenes internos se llevan a cabo, no están documentados.

Recomendaciones

6.1 UNICEF debería colaborar con otras organizaciones interesadas, incluido el Banco Mundial y la OCDE-CAD, en el desarrollo de una metodología uniforme para evaluar la participación institucional en los GPP. Esto podría llevarse a cabo como parte de una revisión del Sourcebook del Banco Mundial y la OCDE-CAD o como un producto independiente pero armonizado.

6.2 En el diseño de las evaluaciones de los GPP en los que participa, UNICEF debe seguir promoviendo el uso de los principios y normas indicativos que figuran en el Sourcebook del Banco Mundial y la OCDE-CAD y asegurar que el diseño de la evaluación incluya una valoración del desempeño de los asociados institucionales.

6.3 UNICEF debería examinar más sistemáticamente los resultados de la evaluación de los GPP en los que participa, con el fin de adaptar en consecuencia sus propias estrategias de la participación. Toda decisión de modificar la naturaleza de su participación como resultado de tales revisiones internas debe comunicarse a los asociados y al presidente de la junta o comité directivo (en el caso de las asociaciones oficiales). Estos exámenes internos deben estar documentados y sus registros deben mantenerse en un archivo central.

Conclusión 7: El fortalecimiento de la base de pruebas sobre los GPP y los compromisos institucionales exigirá un esfuerzo de colaboración.

El número de exámenes y evaluaciones independientes de los GPP está aumentando rápidamente y está generando un importante conjunto de conocimientos y pruebas. La comparación cruzada de las evaluaciones individuales permitirían medir las tendencias comunes y las buenas prácticas, así como una mejor evaluación global de los pros y los contras de los GPP como una nueva forma de cooperación internacional.

Recomendación

7.1 Con el fin de fortalecer aún más la base de pruebas sobre los GPP como un instrumento de cooperación internacional, y de aprovechar el creciente número de estudios independientes y evaluaciones realizadas utilizando las normas y reglas acordadas internacionalmente, UNICEF debería considerar la posibilidad de encargar un meta-análisis de las evaluaciones publicadas. Esto podría lograrse mejor por medio de un esfuerzo de colaboración entre organizaciones que compartan carteras similares.
RÉSUMÉ

Introduction

L’UNICEF intervient dans un vaste éventail de partenariats et de relations de collaboration. La présente étude se concentre spécialement sur la participation de l’UNICEF aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux (global programme partnerships, GPP), une modalité de coopération au développement de plus en plus populaire pour faire face aux questions et aux problèmes les plus pressants à l’échelle de la planète.

En dépit du fait que l’UNICEF est engagé dans ce genre de partenariat depuis des dizaines d’années, la mention des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux comme catégorie de partenariat distincte a été introduite pour la première fois durant l’examen à mi-parcours du Plan stratégique à moyen terme (PSMT) pour la période 2006/2009 et dans le nouveau Cadre stratégique des relations de partenariat et de collaboration récemment approuvé par le Conseil d’administration de l’UNICEF. La participation à un nombre croissant de Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux exige que l’UNICEF apprécie mieux, non seulement les perspectives ouvertes par ces instruments dans le domaine de la défense des droits de l’enfant, mais aussi les défis que présente la multiplicité de ces participations à des entreprises communes multiples et diverses.

En l’absence d’orientations et de stratégies pré-existantes, le manque d’informations de référence et la difficulté d’évaluer les effets de la participation de l’UNICEF ont mené à la décision de modifier le sujet principal de l’étude et d’accorder une plus grande importance à l’évaluation de l’« évaluabilité » de cette participation. Une analyse d’évaluabilité est l’examen d’un programme ou d’une intervention donnés, effectué à une phase précoce ou avant une évaluation proprement dite, et destiné à déterminer entre autres si les objectifs du programme sont adéquatement définis et ses résultats vérifiables. L’étude est donc organisée selon plusieurs axes : estimer quels renseignements sont nécessaires et quelle information est disponible par rapport à un certain nombre de questions d’évaluation pré-identifiées, recueillir et synthétiser des informations pour obtenir une base de référence afin de faciliter la planification des processus ultérieurs et l’évaluation des effets des programmes, mettre au point une approche conceptuelle pour guider et analyser la participation de l’UNICEF, analyser le degré de préparation à une action d’évaluation en se penchant sur les pratiques et les procédures qui caractérisent actuellement notre participation en utilisant le modèle conceptuel proposé comme modèle analytique.

Conclusions et recommandations

1° conclusion: les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux élargissent le présent système de coopération international d’une structure essentiellement intergouvernementale à une structure tripartie (État, entreprises, société civile).

Les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux font depuis longtemps partie de l’architecture du développement; cependant leur multiplication récente est un phénomène remarquable, le présent rapport estime leur nombre actuel à 168, comparé à 10 en 1989. Ce qui favorise la promotion de ces instruments de partenariat est la prise de conscience que des efforts extraordinaires sont requis, et continueront d’être requis, pour que le monde atteigne des objectifs comme les Objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement (OMD) ou pour éviter le risque du réchauffement planétaire. Un autre facteur de première importance est la forte baisse des coûts des communications et de l’information qui permet de relier entre elles les forces locales et internationales favorables à l’intégration économique, la participation du public et la décentralisation à un degré inimaginable il y a seulement quelques années.

Les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux élargissent le système actuel, essentiellement intergouvernemental, en système tripartie qui rassemble tous les groupes d’acteurs – l’État, les entreprises et la société civile. Ils sont devenus progressivement un instrument institutionnel clé pour fournir les biens publics et pour aider les pays en développement à atteindre les Objectifs de développement adoptés au niveau international (IADG), dont les OMD. Ils ont été conçus comme une réponse focalisée à un défi mondial qui demande une action collective pour pouvoir obtenir des résultats dans divers secteurs : santé, sécurité alimentaire et nutrition, VIH/SIDA, eau, assainissement et hygiène, environnement, commerce international, finances, sécurité, égalité des sexes et protection sociale. De nombreux indices indiquent que les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auront un rôle durable bien que des tendances récentes signalent un ralentissement du nombre créé annuellement.
Tout en reconnaissant la contribution des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux, on les a encouragés à soutenir plus systématiquement l’appropriation nationale de leur action, à aligner et à harmoniser leur aide de manière proactive et à utiliser à bon escient les cadres de responsabilité mutuelle tout en continuant à mettre l’accent sur l’obtention effective de résultats. Les acteurs du développement sont aussi encouragés à d’abord utiliser, et ensuite si nécessaire à renforcer, les systèmes d’acheminement de l’aide existants avant de créer de nouveaux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux autonomes.

Les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux sont essentiellement apparus de manière ad hoc en l’absence de cadre international ayant fait l’objet d’un accord sur la régulation de leur rôle dans la coopération internationale. Plusieurs tentatives ont été faites dans ce sens par différentes institutions, dont l’UNICEF, et plusieurs auteurs ont proposé une terminologie spécifique pour définir leurs caractéristiques et établir une typologie. Bien que les définitions proposées aient de nombreux traits en commun, le temps est venu de les harmoniser ainsi que leur terminologie. Il faut aussi un consensus international plus clair sur leur typologie et sur les avantages et les inconvénients des différents modèles d’organisation proposés afin d’éclairer les décisions concernant les objectifs de haut niveau, les stratégies de soutien, le degré d’intégration, les structures de gouvernance et les modes de financements des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux présents et à venir. Ces efforts peuvent faire usage de la base factuelle en cours de constitution, dérivée d’un nombre croissant d’analyses et d’évaluations indépendantes effectuées selon des normes et des standards définis internationalement.

**Recommandation**

1.1 L’UNICEF devrait promouvoir à l’extérieur la nécessité de raffiner et d’harmoniser les définitions, les terminologies, les typologies et les critères qui servent à définir l’utilité des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux. Ces efforts communs aboutiront éventuellement à un consensus international sur le nombre total de ces partenariats, sur leurs caractéristiques individuelles, sur les avantages et les inconvénients de leurs différents modèles organisationnels, et sur les critères que les décideurs doivent prendre en compte quand ils envisagent d’en créer de nouveaux. Tous ces éléments de base pourraient alors contribuer à la mise sur pied d’un cadre réglementaire international sur les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux.

- 2° conclusion: les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux offrent un moyen potentiel de promouvoir les droits de l’enfant.

D’un côté, de nombreuses constatations faites dans le cours de la présente étude illustrent le fait qu’un grand nombre de Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux offrent potentiellement la perspective de contribuer de manière importante à la promotion des droits de l’enfant, ce qui n’est pas surprenant vu que la raison d’être principale de ces partenariats est d’agir sur des questions de développement – dont la majorité sont également des facteurs déterminants, de façon immédiate, sous-jacente ou structurelle, pour les droits de l’enfant.

D’un autre côté, ces Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux ont un objectif très ciblé, parfois très étroit, sur des carences de développement spécifiques. Ceci peut influencer leur capacité d’adopter une approche holistique des programmes, axée sur les droits humains et conforme à des principes d’universalité, d’interdépendance et d’indivisibilité; ainsi que leur capacité de promouvoir une perspective multidisciplinaire et intersectorielle quand ils envisagent les orientations, les programmes ou les actions à mettre en œuvre au bénéfice des enfants.

Le but que l’UNICEF fixe à sa participation doit être de mettre à profit plus spécialement les effets potentiellement bénéfiques pour les enfants des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux en les analysant du point de vue des droits humains. La mission de l’UNICEF étant de défendre, de promouvoir et d’assurer la protection des droits de l’enfant par une approche interactionnelle, ses partenaires se tournent de plus en plus vers l’organisation pour définir une perspective globale sur le bien être de l’enfant dans le cadre de ces Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux et entre ces différents partenariats.
L’évaluation des effets spécifiquement bénéfiques pour les enfants des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux exige cependant de mieux comprendre la chaîne de valorisation qui lie les contributions des partenaires aux résultats attendus du partenariat, ainsi que la manière dont cette chaîne reflète une gestion axée sur les résultats et les principes qui gouvernent la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant. Il est urgent de mettre au point, de tester et d’appliquer de tels paramètres pour planifier la participation à ces partenariats et évaluer leurs résultats.

Recommandations

2.1 L’UNICEF doit mettre au point, tester et promouvoir des méthodes et des paramètres permettant d’apprécier dans quelle mesure la gestion axée sur les résultats et les principes qui gouvernent la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant se traduisent correctement dans la chaîne de valorisation qui lie les contributions des partenaires aux résultats attendus du partenariat.

2.2 Étant donné sa participation à un nombre important de Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux, l’UNICEF peut contribuer à jeter des passerelles entre ces différents partenariats afin de promouvoir une approche globale du bien-être de l’enfant en soulignant leurs aspects complémentaires et en insistant sur la prise en compte des principes des droits humains.

2.3 Quand le guide d’évaluation des programmes de partenariat mondiaux et régionaux de la Banque mondiale et du Comité d’aide au développement de l’Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques (OCDE) sera en cours de révision, l’UNICEF pourrait y apporter sa contribution afin d’en renforcer les dispositions qui concernent l’égalité des sexes et les droits humains.

3e conclusion: la participation de l’UNICEF à divers Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux est importante mais son évaluation est limitée par l’absence de données chronologiques et de cadre conceptuel.

Afin de répondre aux questions d’évaluation définies initialement comme prioritaires par le comité directeur, l’évaluation aurait nécessité des données qui ne sont pas actuellement fournies par les systèmes d’information internes de l’UNICEF. Plusieurs facteurs contribuent à cette situation dont le manque d’un processus de validation institutionnelle, l’absence de base de données et de classement centralisé et le manque de directives explicites concernant la rédaction des rapports. Les renseignements fournis par les rapports annuels des Bureaux de pays, bien qu’utiles pour illustrer le fait que la participation de l’UNICEF est importante et diversifiée à un niveau national, ne suffit pas toujours à contribuer à l’analyse des tendances et à identifier les bonnes pratiques.

L’analyse de l’information disponible confirme néanmoins que la participation de l’UNICEF aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux est importante, revêt des aspects multiples et varie d’un partenariat à l’autre et d’un niveau de participation à l’autre (mondial, régional ou local).

L’UNICEF participe actuellement à 77 des 168 Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux existants. L’UNICEF est officiellement partenaire de 62 de ces partenariats et joue un rôle dans les instances de direction de 42 autres. Dans cinq de ces cas, l’UNICEF abrite le secrétariat du partenariat, soit fournit les services de secrétariat et de coordination du partenariat concerné. La vaste majorité (96 %) des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’UNICEF participe relèvent des priorités stratégiques à moyen terme de l’organisation, plus de 50 % d’entre eux ayant des objectifs relatifs à la survie de l’enfant et au programme de développement de l’UNICEF. Plus de 60 % des partenariats auxquels l’UNICEF participe ont moins de 10 ans et un nombre important d’entre eux en sont encore à leur phase de maturation.

Dans 75 % des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’UNICEF participe, les membres du partenariat sont des acteurs publics et non publics qui sont aussi présents dans les instances de gouvernance. Dans 16 % des cas, la participation à ces instances de gouvernance est limitée à des acteurs publics bien que l’on compte des acteurs publics et non publics parmi les membres. Seul un très petit nombre de partenariats comptant comme membres des acteurs publics ou non publics ont des instances de gouvernance dont ne font partie que des partenaires non publics.

La vaste majorité (86 %), des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’UNICEF participe n’ont pas une personnalité juridique autonome. Le secrétariat de ces partenariats est habituellement confié à un
des partenaires à la demande du conseil d'administration du partenariat ou de l'instance de direction équivalente (par ex. comité directeur). Seulement 14 % de ces partenariats ont une personnalité juridique distincte, étant déclarés soit comme fondations privées à but non lucratif (par ex. l'Alliance mondiale pour l'amélioration de la nutrition GAIN, l'Alliance mondiale pour les vaccins et la vaccination, GAVI, le Fonds mondial de lutte contre le SIDA, la tuberculose et le paludisme, GFATM, soit comme sociétés anonymes (par ex. la Coalition pour mettre fin à l'utilisation d'enfants soldats), soit encore comme associations (par ex. Gender Water Alliance), enfin aux États-Unis comme organisations charitables (501(c)3) (par ex. Malaria No More).

Le rôle joué dans la participation à un de ces partenariats peut évoluer avec le temps en fonction de son degré de maturité et de la nature de la participation des partenaires. Les rôles recensés se classent dans trois catégories : rôle lié à la gouvernance, rôle de gestion, rôle de mise au point des programmes. Globalement, la combinaison de sa mission mondiale et de sa présence dans un très grand nombre de pays donne à l'UNICEF un poids important dans les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux qu'il décide de créer ou auxquels il décide de participer. L'UNICEF a en conséquence la responsabilité de collaborer avec ses partenaires internationaux pour améliorer les normes qui régissent la définition des priorités, la coordination, la gouvernance, la gestion et l'évaluation au sein de ces partenariats. Étant donné sa présence simultanée au niveau mondial, régional et national, l'UNICEF peut jouer globalement un rôle précieux en renforçant les synergies entre les questions qui se posent au niveau mondial et les priorités de développement nationales.

L'évaluabilité de la participation de l'UNICEF est aussi gênée par le manque d'accord sur la définition de ce que signifie une « participation efficace » dans le cas des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux. Le nouveau Cadre stratégique des relations de partenariat et de collaboration définit l'objectif de la participation ainsi : « favoriser un projet de développement centré sur l'enfant et renforcer la capacité des partenaires et de la société d'appliquer des politiques sociales efficaces et efficientes en faveur des enfants. » Une participation est donc efficace dans la mesure où l'objectif ci-dessus a été atteint – ou dans la mesure où on prévoit de l'atteindre – de manière efficace et durable ayant un effet de développement institutionnel positif.

Estimer la plausibilité que cet objectif de haut niveau puisse être atteint dans le cas d’un Partenariat programmatique mondial présente un défi, celui de clarifier la nature de l’approche conceptuelle qui sous-tend la participation de l’UNICEF à ce genre de partenariat. Le présent rapport propose un modèle conceptuel éclairé par la documentation existante sur les partenariats mondiaux et la participation à des partenariats, et développé avec le personnel de l’UNICEF et avec des contributeurs extérieurs qui ont à la fois une vision conceptuelle et une expérience pratique de ces questions. Ce modèle comprend un cycle de participation composé de trois phases (évaluer et définir, gérer et négocier, réviser et réaliser), qui entre en interaction avec le cycle de vie propre au partenariat qui fournit le cadre global où s’inscrit, est défini et opère ce cycle de participation.

Recommandations

3.1 L’UNICEF doit mettre au point, tester et appliquer un cadre conceptuel conçu pour guider sa participation dans les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux d’une manière qui s’accorde avec les objectifs de haut niveau définis dans le nouveau Cadre stratégique des relations de partenariat et de collaboration. La définition d’une « participation efficace » et un cadre conceptuel sont proposés dans le présent rapport.

4° conclusion: l’amélioration de l’évaluabilité de la « pertinence » comme critère d’évaluation demande que les décisions de participation soient soigneusement pesées par rapport à des critères de sélection, qu’elles soient soumises à un processus de validation et communiquées au sein de l’organisation et à l’extérieur.

Sur la base des informations disponibles, on peut utilement déduire la pertinence thématique des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’UNICEF participe par rapport à ses priorités stratégiques à moyen terme. Évaluer la pertinence de la participation de l’UNICEF doit cependant aller au-delà de cette pertinence thématique pour inclure d’autres paramètres comme l’évaluation des avantages et des inconvénients que représente par exemple l’investissement de la réputation et des ressources de l’UNICEF dans des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux par rapport à d’autres programmes, ou encore le fait de veiller à ce que les rôles joués par l’UNICEF dans divers Partenariats de programme sont des rôles pour lesquels l’organisation possède de sérieux avantages comparatifs.

L’évaluation de ces différentes dimensions de la pertinence exige une analyse des tendances sur plusieurs années pour laquelle des données chronologiques détaillées ne sont pas actuellement disponibles, à l’exception d’un très petit nombre de Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux comme REACH. Cette situation reflète largement l’absence de critères sélectifs et de procédures internes pour l’évaluation, la définition, la prise de décision, la documentation et la communication des décisions de participation.

Le manque de critères de sélection et celui de procédures de validation et d’autorisation ont mené à un éclatement de la prise de décision qui expose l’UNICEF à plusieurs genres de risques comme ceux qui peuvent découler d’un contrôle de qualité insuffisant, de la sous-estimation des dimensions politiques et juridiques, d’un appui insuffisant de la direction ou de conflits d’intérêt potentiels. Les choix stratégiques en faveur des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux exigent de bien comprendre leurs avantages et leurs désavantages et les compromis associés avec leurs objectifs de haut niveau, ainsi que les stratégies d’appui et les structures de gouvernance et de gestion concernées qui vont de réseaux à peine coordonnés à l’établissement de partenariats légalement constitués. L’évaluation et la comparaison des bénéfices escomptés et des coûts de transaction d’une participation exigent de disposer de méthodes et d’outils qui ne sont pas actuellement disponibles. La définition des modalités de participation demande une approche nuancée au cas par cas. L’UNICEF a souvent la possibilité de jouer un rôle approprié ne se contentant d’une participation limitée; dans d’autres cas il y a cependant un argument de poids en faveur d’une participation sans restriction – jouer un rôle moteur et y consacrer des ressources considérables sur une longue période. Les entretiens menés avec le personnel de l’UNICEF indiquent un besoin urgent de définir des orientations plus spécifiques sur la manière d’approcher ces questions complexes.

Le présent rapport suggère qu’il y a un certain nombre de caractéristiques que l’on retrouve dans les Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux qui ont été couronnés de succès; ces caractéristiques peuvent servir de base à la mise au point d’arbres de décision adaptés aux cinq types de décision que l’UNICEF aura habituellement à prendre concernant ces partenariats : participer à leur création, s’y joindre, les modifier, s’en désengager ou les dissoudre.

Il n’a pas été possible de décider, en ce qui concerne la majorité des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’UNICEF participe, si les décisions de participation ont été systématiquement communiquées aux partenariats concernés et reconnus par ceux-ci, que ce soit par un échange de correspondance ou plus officiellement par un mémorandum d’accord. Les procédures pour communiquer les décisions de participation de l’UNICEF et pour enregistrer leur reconnaissance par les partenaires concernés ne sont pas seulement importantes du point de vue de la responsabilité par rapport au partenariat, mais aussi parce qu’elles permettent à l’UNICEF de définir ses motifs et les objectifs que l’organisation poursuivra par sa participation, le rôle qu’elle entend jouer et ce qu’elle attend en termes de caractéristiques définissant le partenariat en question. Les décisions de participation prises au niveau mondial ont été jusqu’ici rarement communiquées aux autres niveaux de l’organisation.

---

3 Reach est une initiative du Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement (PNUD) qui traite des problèmes que le VIH/SIDA pose aux pays en développement de l’Asie du Sud et du Nord-Est.
Recommandations

4.1 Bien que l'idée de participer à un Partenariat de programme mondial puisse être promue par n'importe qui au sein de l'UNICEF, la décision d'engager l'organisation doit être prise par la direction de l'organisation et repose sur les résultats d'une procédure d'évaluation normalisée menée par ses propres spécialistes de cette question. La clarté sur ce qui constitue le cadre d'autorisation est une condition importante pour assurer l'unité de but partagée entre les différents niveaux de la hiérarchie de l'UNICEF.

4.2 La mise en place de procédures de validation et d'autorisation doit être liée à la formulation de critères et de normes régissant l'identification, l'évaluation et le financement de la participation de l'UNICEF aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux. Dans toute la mesure du possible, ces directives internes doivent être harmonisées avec celles des autres organisations qui sont parties prenantes dans des partenariats similaires.

4.3 L'UNICEF ne dispose pas de méthodes et d'outils lui permettant de faire l'analyse des arbitrages à opérer entre les avantages de la participation et ses coûts de transaction. Étant donné la complexité impliquée par le développement de méthodes de ce genre, la meilleure solution est sans doute d'y procéder en collaboration avec des organisations également engagées dans des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux et également concernées par ces questions.

4.4 Les décisions de participation doivent être correctement étayées et enregistrées, et doivent être communiquées aux partenaires extérieurs et aux parties prenantes au sein de l'organisation.

5° conclusion: l’amélioration de l’évaluabilité de l’« efficacité » comme critère d’évaluation exigera des modifications des procédures de gestion aussi bien que des comportements.

Être prêt à procéder à une évaluation, cela signifie que les structures de gestion clés nécessaires pour soutenir de manière appropriée la participation sont en place. Les paramètres à vérifier sont l'existence et le caractère plausible des objectifs et des approches de la participation; l'adéquation des fonctions et des structures de soutien aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux, la clarté de la hiérarchie des responsabilités, la définition d'orientations, de procédures, de règles et de réglementations favorables à cette participation. Il est de plus nécessaire d’analyser la mesure dans laquelle le personnel qui est engagé dans cette participation et qui la gère reçoit un appui adéquat qui lui permet d’accomplir ces tâches de manière efficace et de voir si des ressources suffisantes ont été consacrées à ces fonctions.

Bien que la participation aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux soit mentionnée comme question transversale dans l'examen à mi-parcours actuel du Plan stratégique à moyen terme (PSMT), il n’existe pas de cibles spécifiques et quantifiables relatives à cet aspect dans les cadres de résultats pour les domaines d’intervention privilégiés dans la révision et dans le cadre de Suivi et évaluation intégré. Plusieurs Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux sont mentionnés dans les sections « partenariats clés » et « domaines de coopération » concernant ces axes d’intervention privilégiés, mais aucune cible n’est fixée à la participation à ces partenariats et aucun indicateur la concernant n’est mentionné.

Un examen des programmes de travail annuels des instances de l’organisation qui gèrent la participation de l’UNICEF à divers Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux révèle des différences de traitement considérables au sein de ces instances comme entre elles. Pour une minorité des partenariats auxquels l’UNICEF participe, les activités de participation et les postes budgétaires correspondants sont clairement indiqués, et dans la majorité des cas, il est difficile de déterminer si des activités quelconques avaient été organisées dans le cadre de la participation de l’UNICEF.

Au moment de définir des cibles et des indicateurs pour la participation de l’UNICEF à ces partenariats, on devra prendre en considération le genre de résultats que l’organisation considérait comme traduisant bien une participation efficace. Au moins trois approches peuvent être examinées :

- **Approche holistique globale et intégrée** : les résultats obtenus par le partenariat dans son ensemble au bénéfice des enfants sans référence spécifique aux contributions individuelles des différentes organisations, dans notre cas l'UNICEF
Évaluation des contributions individuelles aux résultats obtenus par le partenariat : les résultats obtenus par l’UNICEF et ses partenaires en termes de contribution aux programmes, aux approches utilisées et à la capacité de mise en œuvre des programmes du partenariat.

Valeur ajoutée ou comparaison théorique avec un partenariat sans l’UNICEF et participation de l’UNICEF comparée avec d’autres choix de programmes : les résultats qui sont obtenus en terme de valeur ajouté ou termes comparatifs théoriques par le partenariat et les partenaires individuels, c’est-à-dire les résultats que le partenariat aurait obtenus théoriquement sans la participation de l’UNICEF, et les résultats que l’UNICEF aurait obtenu théoriquement s’il avait fait le choix d’autres programmes ou d’autres partenariats.

Les objectifs de participation et les budgets correspondants sont fixés par les autorités supérieures ; il faut donc juxtaposer les attentes de la direction avec celles des responsables hiérarchiques et alerter les cadres supérieurs aux différences de perception. Des désaccords importants sur les objectifs de participation peuvent, s’ils ne sont pas résolus, compromettre le caractère acceptable des futures évaluations.

Au sein de l’UNICEF, c’est la Division des programmes qui est chargée de recevoir les informations sur les Participations de programmes mondiaux, de mettre au point les directives d’orientation pertinentes, de coordonner les participations de l’UNICEF grâce aux efforts complémentaires de ses sections techniques et de la cellule Participations programmatiques mondiaux nouvellement établie à Genève, ainsi qu’avec les rapports internes de l’organisation concernant ces partenariats. Pour assumer ces responsabilités, la division des Programmes collabore avec le Bureau juridique et avec d’autres services comme la Division des politiques et des pratiques, la Division de la communication, le Bureau des Alliances avec le secteur public et de la mobilisation des ressources publiques, la Division de Collecte de fonds privés et partenariats et la Division des approvisionnements.

Le Cadre stratégique des relations de partenariat et de collaboration, tout comme le Budget d’appui biennal pour l’exercice 2010-2011, demandent un alignement entre le besoin urgent de préciser l’axe privilégié à donner à la participation de l’UNICEF dans les Participations programmatiques mondiaux et les capacités organisationnelles, les structures internes et les modes de fonctionnement. Ce processus d’alignement doit être engagé aussitôt que possible et son issue devra être communiquée aux partenaires extérieurs et aux parties prenantes au sein de l’organisation.

L’information sur les prévisions que fait l’organisation pour gérer les risques dans le cadre des catégories de risques communément identifiés par l’UNICEF (risques financiers, naturels, stratégiques et opérationnels) se trouve dans le guide de référence sur les risques publié en 2008, notamment en ce qui concerne les relations avec les partenaires et la gestion des rapports avec des tierces parties. Ce guide manque cependant de références spécifiques concernant la gestion des risques associés avec la participation de l’UNICEF aux Participations programmatiques mondiaux.

Une participation efficace demande des compétences et des savoir-faire qui auront besoin d’être renforcés dans toute l’organisation. Une liste initiale des caractéristiques nécessaires chez les personnes chargées de diriger ces actions de participation est proposée. Au cours de la présente étude, nous avons rencontré plusieurs exemples de membres du personnel de l’UNICEF qui avaient réussi à positionner stratégiquement l’organisation pour lui permettre de tirer le meilleur parti possible des ressources d’un partenariat et pour obtenir des résultats effectifs. Ces personnes peuvent jouer un rôle utile en contribuant au développement des compétences nécessaires et à celui du matériel de formation.

Le suivi efficace de la participation de l’UNICEF au niveau d’un partenariat individuel, comme à celui de tous les Participations programmatiques mondiaux auxquels l’organisation participe, demandera une gestion plus dynamique de ces partenariats, une gestion qui préfère des interventions proactives plutôt que réactives tout en évaluant la performance, que ce soit au niveau global ou au niveau d’une sous-catégorie (secteur ou réalisation). Il faut donc développer un portefeuille de participations plus exhaustif et des procédures d’examen plus solides qui impliquent les parties prenantes internes à l’organisation qui sont concernées.

Recommandations

5.1 Une fois que les décisions de participation ont été prises par la direction de l’UNICEF, les mesures appropriées doivent suivre et être étayées pour traduire les engagements institutionnels en stratégies d’engagement sur plusieurs années et en cadre de résultats couvrant la période définie par le Plan stratégique à moyen terme. Ceci doit se refléter de manière appropriée dans les programmes de travail annuels et dans les budgets. Au moment de décider des cibles de participation,
on prendra en compte le genre de résultats que l’organisation considérerait comme traduisant bien une participation efficace.

5.2 L’UNICEF doit lancer le processus consistant à aligner la nécessité urgente de mieux focaliser la participation de l’UNICEF aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux avec ses capacités organisationnelles, ses structures internes et ses modes de fonctionnement. Ce processus d’alignement doit être engagé aussitôt que possible et son issue devra être communiquée aux partenaires extérieurs et aux parties prenantes au sein de l’organisation.

5.3 L’UNICEF doit revoir la procédure de nomination de ses représentants qui siègent aux conseils d’administration et aux comités directeurs des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux. Les représentants de l’UNICEF doivent disposer d’un mandat et doivent déclarer leurs conflits d’intérêts, réels ou potentiels; ils doivent recevoir des instructions claires et pouvoir identifier les suites à donner aux décisions prises.

5.4 L’UNICEF doit produire des directives spécifiques pour la participation à ces partenariats; les manuels pertinents, au premier chef le Manuel des programmes et des politiques, doivent être actualisés et complétés par des notes d’orientation spécifiques sur certaines questions. Ces directives doivent être mises au point avec la collaboration des parties prenantes internes à l’organisation et harmonisées avec les directives des organisations partenaires, quand celles-ci existent. Une politique sur les conflits d’intérêts doit aussi être définie concernant la participation de l’UNICEF aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux.

5.5 Le guide de référence sur les risques de l’UNICEF doit être mis à jour pour y inclure la gestion des risques associés à la participation aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux.

5.6 Des procédures d’examen du portefeuille de participations doivent être mises au point et mises en œuvre. Elles devront favoriser les mesures proactives par rapport aux mesures réactives et permettre l’évaluation des performances obtenues au niveau des partenariats individuels ainsi qu’à celui de leur ensemble.

6° conclusion: L’évaluation de la participation institutionnelle aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux est limitée par le manque de critères et de méthodes faisant l’objet d’un consensus international.

L’évaluation de la participation institutionnelle aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux est encore un territoire vierge pour de nombreuses organisations, y compris pour l’UNICEF. Le problème du manque de critères et de méthodes faisant l’objet d’un consensus international pour évaluer la participation institutionnelle aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux nécessite que l’ensemble des acteurs du développement s’en occupe de façon urgente, car ces critères et ces méthodes seraient un complément très utile au guide de la Banque mondiale et de l’OCDE. Ceci permettrait aux futures évaluations des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux d’inclure une estimation plus claire du rôle joué par les partenaires institutionnels dans la contribution apportée à la définition des buts et des objectifs. Les avantages en seraient probablement une responsabilisation plus grande des partenaires institutionnels et une vision plus claire de la division du travail sur la base des avantages comparatifs des participants, ainsi qu’une meilleure possibilité de comparaison interne à un partenariat comme d’un partenariat à l’autre.

Les renseignements recueillis ne semblent pas indiquer que l’UNICEF examine systématiquement les résultats des évaluations des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels il participe afin de procéder à des ajustements potentiels de sa participation; si ces examens ont bien lieu, ils ne font pas apparemment l’objet de documentation.

**Recommandations**

6.1 L’UNICEF doit envisager de collaborer avec d’autres organisations concernées, dont la Banque mondiale et le Comité d’aide au développement de l’OCDE, à la mise au point d’une méthodologie normalisée pour évaluer la participation institutionnelle aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux, Ceci pourrait prendre place dans le cadre de la révision du guide de la Banque mondiale et de l’OCDE ou prendre la forme d’un document autonome mais harmonisé.
6.2 En mettant au point les évaluations destinées aux Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels il participe, l’UNICEF doit continuer à promouvoir l’utilisation des normes et des principes indicatifs contenus dans le guide de la Banque mondiale et de l’OCDE et s’assurer que la conception de l’évaluation comprend une analyse de la performance des partenaires institutionnels.

6.3 L’UNICEF doit examiner plus systématiquement l’évaluation qui est faite des résultats des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux auxquels il participe en vue d’ajuster ses propres stratégies de participation en fonction de ces résultats. Toute décision de modifier la nature de sa participation à la suite d’un tel examen mené à l’interne devra être communiquée aux partenaires et à la présidence du conseil d’administration ou du comité directeur (dans le cas de partenariats officiels) concerné. Ces examens internes doivent faire l’objet de documentation et leurs résultats conservés dans un fichier central.

■ 7e conclusion: le renforcement de la base factuelle des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux et des participations institutionnelles exigera un effort de collaboration.

Le nombre d’examen et d’évaluations effectués de manière indépendante se multiplie rapidement et produit une quantité considérable de connaissances et de données. Un comparaison transversale de ces évaluations individuelles permettrait de jauger les tendances et les bonnes pratiques communes ainsi qu’une meilleure estimation globale des avantages et des inconvénients des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux comme nouvelle forme de coopération internationale.

Recommandation

7.1. Afin de renforcer plus encore la base factuelle des Partenariats programmatiques mondiaux comme instruments de coopération internationale, et pour profiter du nombre croissant d’examens et d’évaluations effectués de manière indépendante en utilisant les normes et les standards définis internationalement, l’UNICEF devrait envisager de commander une méta-analyse des évaluations publiées. La façon la plus facile de réaliser ce projet serait par un effort de collaboration avec d’autres organisations engagées dans le même genre de partenariat.
1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

1.1 Background

UNICEF engages in a broad range of partnerships and collaborative relationships. This study specifically focuses on UNICEF engagement with GPPs, an increasingly important modality for channeling and delivering development assistance to address pressing global issues and concerns.

Despite the fact that UNICEF has been engaged in GPPs for decades, explicit reference in UNICEF policy frameworks of these development cooperation instruments as a distinct partnership category is very recent. In January 2008, the UNICEF Programme Division issued a policy brief4 to raise internal awareness on the growing importance of these partnerships for UNICEF-supported programmes. The same year, the midterm review5 of the UNICEF MTSP for the period 2006–2009 introduced the concept of GPPs for the first time in a UNICEF strategic planning document. These partnerships are described as "greatly complementing the cooperation partnerships pursued at country level in support of national goals and priorities and many of the technical partnerships outlined in the focus areas of the MTSP." GPPs "offer the opportunity of shaping international initiatives and building coalitions of support for activities that enhance and leverage resources for key child-related results, consistent with the MDGs and the MTSP. They also offer a wide range of learning opportunities with other organizations."

In June 2009, the UNICEF Executive Board approved a strategic framework, the SFPCR.6 The SFPCR focuses on the engagement of UNICEF in GPPs and with civil society organizations, the corporate sector, and other entities, such as the media and knowledge institutions. The document outlines the future approach of UNICEF in a consistent and strategic way with the view to ensuring that partnerships and collaborative relationships contribute to the best results for children and promote their rights.

1.2 Rationale

So far, UNICEF has not carried out an evaluation of its engagement in GPPs. As noted in the midterm review of the MTSP (#190), "UNICEF’s engagement in an increasing number of GPPs with diverse objectives, stakeholders and governance mechanisms warrants that UNICEF better understand the opportunities offered by these instruments to advance child rights, but also the engagement challenges resulting from their numbers and diversity." In order to take stock of the performance of UNICEF engagement in GPPs and to derive lessons and recommendations to guide future involvement, the Division of Programmes and the Evaluation Office agreed to collaborate on an evaluation, which started in August 2008.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the degree to which UNICEF engagement with GPPs is enhancing the realization of children’s rights and generating sustained investments and results in children’s survival, development and protection. The results of this evaluation were to translate into strategic, programmatic and managerial recommendations for use in the formulation of the Board strategy on partnerships and collaborative relationships, and were to inform implementation of the second phase of the MTSP.

The lack of baseline information and the difficulty in evaluating the effect of UNICEF engagement in the absence of pre-existing policies and strategies initially led the evaluation team to place the emphasis on the formative dimension of the evaluation and limit its summative dimension.

Upon receipt of the inception report in September 2008, the steering committee adopted a list of prioritized evaluation questions (Annex 2). In January 2009, a high-level advisory panel met in New York to discuss emerging findings. In April and May, comments on the first draft of the evaluation report were received from several panel members as well as from members of the steering committee. These comments pointed out that, despite data and information-gathering efforts, there was not sufficient evidence to provide reliable and credible answers to the evaluation questions. They also noted that most of the basic strategic, programmatic and management parameters were not in place in order to be evaluated. Furthermore, while a growing number of GPPs have been evaluated, institutional engagement and strategies to engage with these part-

---

nships have not followed the same trend. Evaluating institutional engagement in GPPs is still uncharted territory for many organizations, including UNICEF, and suffers from the lack of internationally accepted criteria and methods.

Evaluations are resource intensive and should usefully document the organization’s progress towards meeting its strategic objectives. To ensure this is the case, evaluability assessments are normally conducted before undertaking an intensive evaluation. As a result, the Evaluation Office proposed modifying the focus of the study and placing emphasis on assessing the evaluability of UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

An evaluability assessment is an "assessment of information requirements and available knowledge in order to determine whether reliable and credible answers can be given to the questions asked." A slightly more operational definition is provided in the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook: “An evaluability assessment is a review of a given programme, at the early stages of or preceding an evaluation, to determine, among other things, whether the programme’s objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable.” An evaluability assessment is thus indicated as a prerequisite to an evaluation when the objectives of the programme are unclear, when an M&E framework is lacking, or when needed data are absent or of questionable quality. In this context, an evaluability assessment is a technical tool to assess the basic parameters that will make it possible to evaluate fully at a later stage both the results of the development intervention (in this case UNICEF engagement in GPPs) and the processes that led to these results. An evaluability assessment is also a useful tool to help clarify the strategic goals and objectives; develop the management theory (conceptual or logic models and measures); and build stakeholder awareness, understanding and buy-in to the strategy and measures.

The objectives of this study were therefore to:

- Assess whether reliable and credible answers can be given to the initially prioritized evaluation questions, based on an assessment of information requirements and available knowledge
- Compile and synthesize information that will facilitate the planning of subsequent process and impact evaluations
- Propose a conceptual approach to guide UNICEF engagement in GPPs
- Appraise the evaluability of UNICEF engagement based on the conceptual framework

1.3 Methods

This study comprised a range of methods: baseline definitions and portfolio development; interviews with UNICEF staff and external informants; GPP case and country sampling and selection; GPP cases selected for in-depth analysis; country visits to UNICEF regional and country offices; review of country programming documents, annual reports and GPP-related literature; guidance from a UNICEF steering committee; feedback from a high-level advisory panel; and development of a conceptual model to guide UNICEF engagement in GPPs highlighting the management changes required for effective engagement.

A detailed description of methods and advisory mechanisms can be found in Annex 1.

---

2. PRIORITIZED EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This section assesses information requirements and available knowledge in relation to the evaluation questions initially endorsed by the steering committee.

The evaluation questions were categorized according to the seven following categories:

- Relevance and alignment
- Coherence and integration
- Efficiency and effectiveness
- Nature of UNICEF engagement and roles
- Communication and dissemination
- Management, oversight and monitoring
- Sustainability, risks and exit strategies

The following is a summary of findings for each category. More details are provided in Annex 2.

2.1 Relevance and alignment

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: the role of GPPs as international cooperation instruments to advance the MDGs; the alignment of UNICEF engagement in GPPs with UNICEF medium-term strategic priorities; and the possibility that activities supported by GPPs are competing with, or substituting for, activities that UNICEF would otherwise implement through its standard programming approach.

There is a growing body of literature on GPPs. Based on available evidence, various attempts have been made to systematize the characteristics of GPPs and to assess their features and impact on the international development architecture. A growing number of independent reviews and evaluations on the performance of GPPs have been conducted, thus contributing to strengthening the evidence base on GPPs.

The midterm review of the MTSP and the SFPCR both mention engagement in GPPs as a crosscutting strategy. The revised annexes to the MTSP mention a number of GPPs in the results frameworks of focus areas. However, not all GPPs in which UNICEF participates are indicated. Furthermore, historical data and information on past engagement decisions are very limited and, when available, do not always refer to relevant MTSP focus areas. Information on engagement strategies and results frameworks is limited to a small number of GPPs in which UNICEF participates.

Existing UNICEF programming guidelines do not include criteria and methods for the counterfactual assessment of UNICEF engagement in GPPs. When available, historical information on engagement decisions rarely includes an analysis of alternative options.

2.2 Coherence and integration

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: whether UNICEF engagement strategies are harmonized with those of other UN organizations; whether global-level engagement decisions affect regional and country-level UNICEF programming practices; and whether engagement in GPPs is harmonized with other partnering and collaborative roles played by UNICEF.

Efforts to harmonize UNICEF engagement with other UN organizations are documented for several GPPs (e.g., GAVI, GFATM and Fast Track Initiative [FTI]). Harmonization efforts relate to partnership development, preparation of board meetings, strategic and evaluation planning, and resource mobilization. Information exists on nascent efforts to harmonize engagement policies with the World Bank and the World Health Organization (WHO).

Generic field guidance on how to manage engagement with GPPs is not available. Information on GPP-specific guidance, when available, is limited to specific roles (e.g., principle recipient role in the case of GFATM, or monitoring communication and social mobilization efforts in the case of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative [GPEI]).
Information on efforts to harmonize engagement in GPPs with engagement in other types of partnerships is not available. Nascent efforts exist to strengthen communication between partnership functions as part of the implementation of the new SFPCR.

2.3 Efficiency and effectiveness

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: the existence of an agreed-upon definition of ‘effective engagement’; the extent to which GPPs have produced results that support UNICEF medium-term strategic priorities; the extent to which GPPs have contributed resources to UNICEF country programmes; and whether UNICEF programming practices in selected countries have influenced the alignment with national frameworks of selected GPP operations.

Information on an agreed definition of ‘effective engagement’ is not available. A definition is proposed in this report.

Information on the extent to which GPPs have produced results that support UNICEF corporate priorities is very limited. Despite the fact that the performances of a significant number of GPPs have been evaluated, these evaluations generally provide scarce information on the relationship between partnership results and the impact of these results on the priorities of participating institutions. This situation reflects evaluation designs that give marginal emphasis to ‘partner-centric’ benefits. Producing this type of information is not currently a major priority of the UNICEF integrated M&E framework—with the exception of the planned United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) evaluation.

Information on financial resources contributed by specific GPPs to support UNICEF country programmes is available through the UNICEF contribution management system.

Information on the influence of UNICEF programming practices on the alignment of the operations of selected GPPs with national frameworks exists in a limited number of cases (e.g., RBM, Health Metrics Network and FTI). Providing information on this issue in the country office annual reports is not currently a standard requirement.

2.4 Nature of UNICEF engagement and roles

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: the roles played by UNICEF through its engagement in GPPs; UNICEF comparative advantages; and whether the organization is perceived to be a good partner as assessed against Paris Declaration and UNICEF partnership principles.

Useful baseline information on roles played by UNICEF in its engagement in GPPs is contained in the policy brief 11 issued by the Programme Division and in the UNICEF Executive Board document ‘Mapping of UNICEF Partnerships and Collaborative Relationships’. 12

Information on engagement decisions, when available, provides limited information on the roles that UNICEF endeavours to fulfil as part of its membership. Useful but limited information can be found in the evaluation reports of various GPPs. Providing feedback information on roles played by UNICEF is not currently a standard requirement of country office annual reports.

Information on partners’ perceptions of the performance of UNICEF in its engagement in GPPs is limited to the feedback obtained from the interviews conducted during this exercise.

2.5 Communication and dissemination

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on efforts by UNICEF to communicate the benefits and results of its engagement both internally and externally. The information available is limited. Corporate reporting on engagement results is often limited to a small number of cases for which there are either global evidence of impact (e.g., Measles Initiative) or evidence of results that can be attributed to a

specific UNICEF intervention (e.g., improved success rate of malaria proposals in the context of the GFATM Round 8).

2.6 Management, oversight and monitoring

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: documentation of past engagement decisions; consistency with the initial inventory of GPPs in which UNICEF participates; UNICEF influence on the formation of new GPPs; whether or not existing UNICEF business processes and guidelines provide adequate criteria and guidance to inform engagement and disengagement decisions; whether or not the UNICEF management structure is suited and able to support effective engagement; and the most important organizational changes required to make UNICEF engagement more effective.

As noted previously, availability of historical information on past engagement decisions is very limited. This situation may be due to the current lack of an institutionalized vetting process and due to the absence of a central filing system. This situation also affects the availability of historical information on the influence of UNICEF in the creation of new GPPs. This gap is partially filled by the evaluation reports of several GPPs that contain information on the role of UNICEF as co-founder.

Information on the availability of business processes and guidelines to inform engagement and disengagement decisions is available and points to the need to improve internal guidance and processes as noted in the SFPCR.

Information on UNICEF approaches to managing its engagement in GPPs has improved significantly since 2007. There was no information relevant to UNICEF engagement in GPPs in biennial budget documents established for the current biennium budget. The description of the biennial support budget for 2010–2011 now contains information on the strategic intents and organizational changes that will be pursued by UNICEF during the 2010–2011 biennium in its engagement in GPPs.

This report contains a portfolio analysis that can be compared to the initial inventory conducted by the Division of Programmes.

2.7 Sustainability, risks and exit strategies

Information requirements were determined in relation to questions on: transaction costs, sustainability and management of risks associated with UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

Information available points to the absence of methods to measure costs of engagement and engagement sustainability. Information on organizational expectations for managing risks within the risk categories commonly identified within UNICEF (financial, hazard, strategic and operational) is contained in the UNICEF Risk Reference Guide issued in 2008, notably in relation to partner relations and management of third parties. However, this information lacks specificity with regards to managing risks associated with UNICEF engagement in GPPs. Information on risk assessment relating to UNICEF engagement in GPPs is available on a case-by-case basis, often triggered by specific events.

---


3. DEFINING FEATURES OF GPPs

3.1 Defining partnerships

The 2005 World Summit Outcome Resolution reaffirmed the commitment to the global partnership for development set out in the Millennium Declaration, the Monterrey Consensus and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation to achieve the IADGs, including the MDGs.15

“A successful partnership is one where partners check their brands at the door and together achieve results that are greater than the sum of the individual parts.” (Source: external partner)

In the 2005 World Summit Outcome, world leaders resolved, inter alia, to “enhance the contribution of non-governmental organizations, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders in national development efforts, as well as in the promotion of the global partnership for development” (OP 22 e).

While welcoming recent efforts to enhance the quality of aid and increase its impact, including the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (OP 23 c), world leaders also recognized the value of developing innovative sources of financing, including sources with participation from the private sector (OP 23 d and e). They resolved to address the development needs of low-income and middle-income countries by working in competent multilateral and international forums to help them meet, inter alia, their financial, technical and technological requirements (OP 23 f and g).

The 2005 World Summit Outcome also welcomed the positive contributions of the private sector and civil society, including non-governmental organizations, in promoting human-rights and other dimensions of national and global development, notably in the following areas: the generation of new investments and employment, financing for development, health, agriculture, conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and environmental management, energy, forestry and the impact of climate change.

A 2008 resolution of the UN General Assembly, ‘Towards Global Partnerships’, defines partnerships as voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both public and non-public, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake specific tasks and, as mutually agreed, to share risks, responsibilities, resources and benefits.16

The resolution also stresses the contribution of voluntary partnerships to achieving IADGs, including the MDGs, while reiterating that they serve as a complement to, but are not intended to substitute for, the commitments made by governments with a view to achieving these goals (OP 3).

Given the fact that the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council exercise oversight and policy-setting over the Executive Board of UNICEF, this resolution must be considered mandatory for UNICEF. This situation prevails for UNICEF, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), but not for the specialized agencies (e.g., WHO) or for international financial institutions (e.g., members of the World Bank Group).

Given the authoritative nature of the definition of partnerships contained in the recent resolution on partnerships of the General Assembly, the distinction made in the Executive Board Framework Paper between ‘collaborative relationships’ and ‘partnerships’ seems tautological. The General Assembly definition of partnerships covers both formal and informal relationships.

3.2 Defining GPPs—An evolving process

The recent multiplication of global partnerships with a programmatic intent involving multiple public and non-public stakeholders has led to several attempts by different authors and institutional actors to propose specific terminologies and definitions along with their defining features (Annex 3). These terminologies are of

---

potential interest to UNICEF to the extent that they remain compatible with the definition of the General Assembly and that they help to inform UNICEF engagement in these types of partnerships.

The World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook\textsuperscript{17} proposes the following definition:

Global and Regional Partnership Programs (GRPPs) are programmatic partnerships in which:

- The partners contribute and pool resources (financial, technical, staff and reputational) toward achieving agreed-upon objectives over time.
- The activities of the programme are global, regional or multi-country (not single-country) in scope.
- The partners establish a new organization with a governance structure and a management unit to deliver these activities.

This definition is important to the extent that it is part of an international effort to respond to the growing need to develop consensus principles and standards for the evaluation of GRPPs. Several elements included in the UN General Assembly definition, however, are not explicitly featured in the Sourcebook definition, such as references to the voluntary and collaborative nature of partnerships, the public and non-public mix of stakeholders, and the agreement to share risks and responsibilities in addition to resources and benefits.

Other definitions featured in Annex 3 complement the Sourcebook definition by emphasizing the voluntary nature of participation, the involvement of multiple public and non-public actors, and the sharing of risks and benefits.\textsuperscript{18,19,20} Two definitions make explicit reference to the objective of furthering progress towards global development goals.\textsuperscript{21,22}

In its new SFPCR\textsuperscript{23}, UNICEF proposes a definition of GPPs that builds on the Sourcebook definition but attempts to complement it by emphasizing several of the missing features mentioned above while remaining coherent with the UN General Assembly definition. UNICEF also decided to add a feature that is not mentioned in any of the definitions listed in Annex 3; namely, a reference to the promotion and protection of children’s rights.

The UNICEF Board-approved definition of GPPs is the following:

*Global programme partnerships are defined as voluntary and collaborative relationships that:

- Reach an explicit agreement at the global level on programmatic objectives that are relevant to the promotion and protection of children’s rights and to the achievement of internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals.
- Have a programmatic focus that extends across more than one region of the world.
- Involve multiple public and non-public stakeholders, who are actively engaged in the partnerships and programmatic decision making at the global level.
- Establish formal or informal modalities of cooperation to meet these objectives in a medium- or long-term framework."\textsuperscript{24}

Annex 3 provides further explanatory notes on the UNICEF definition. While understandable from a UNICEF standpoint, the reference to the promotion and protection of children’s rights makes the UNICEF definition more aspirational than a true reflection of the historical features of GPPs. The strength of this definition is that it can contribute to incentivizing these partnerships to more strongly adhere to the principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and, for UNICEF, to develop tools and methods to screen the child-friendliness of potential partnerships, either at the request of partners or on its own initiative.


\textsuperscript{20} United Nations Foundation, ‘Understanding Public-Private Partnerships’.


\textsuperscript{22} The World Bank, ‘Global Programme Funds at Country Level: What have we learned?’. The Global Programmes and Partnership Group, Concessional Finance and Global Partnerships Vice Presidency, 2008.


\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
For an inventory of active GPPs, this study used all the elements of the UNICEF definition as screening criteria, with the exception of the reference to children’s rights for the reason mentioned in the previous paragraph.

3.3 Trends and relevance of GPPs to advance children’s rights

3.3.1 The rise of GPPs in the development landscape

The rapidly changing development landscape presents opportunities and challenges for UNICEF engagement with a wide range of actors and issues that must be managed at the global, regional and country levels. This study sought to ascertain from UNICEF staff and external partners their perceptions about the main trends related to the development landscape and, more specifically, their opinions about the growing importance of GPPs as a development cooperation instrument.

Key concerns expressed by respondents in relation to the overall development landscape were the need for: better coordination of development assistance (official and non-official), establishment of sound development principles and best practices, agreement on ethical and regulatory frameworks, and establishment of transparent assessment and reporting systems to ensure mutual accountability.

GPPs have long been part of the development architecture. For example, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research was established as far back as 1971. An attempt was made in this study to inventory existing GPPs using the UNICEF definition—but without including the criteria of programmatic relevance to the promotion and protection of children’s rights—for the reasons mentioned in the previous section.

Figure 1 illustrates the remarkable growth of GPPs in recent years. These partnerships have gradually become a key institutional instrument to deliver global public goods and to help developing countries achieve IADGs, including the MDGs. They have been conceived as a focused response to a global challenge requiring collective action to achieve results in various sectors such as health, food security and nutrition; HIV/AIDS; water, sanitation and hygiene; environment; trade; finance; security; gender equality; and social protection.

---

26 Defined as “commodities, resources, services—and also systems of rules or policy regimes with substantial cross-border externalities that are important for development and poverty reduction, and that can be produced in sufficient supply only through cooperation and collective action by developed and developing countries.”
Most respondents agreed with the analysis that “a combination of factors has pushed GPPs to the forefront of the development landscape.” These include threats to global development, many of which directly affect the realization of children’s rights, including food insecurity, resource degradation (reflected in loss of biodiversity, water scarcity and climate change), the spread of communicable diseases, rising disparities in the redistribution of global wealth, and international insecurity. The global nature of these threats and the complexity in dealing with them effectively has underscored the realizations that no single institution can effectively address these issues alone and that collective action is urgently needed. Driving the promotion of these partnerships is the awareness of the daunting magnitude of the challenges facing the international community in the years ahead. If the world is to meet objectives such as the MDGs, avert the risk of global warming, and reduce dependence on fossil fuels, extraordinary effort and innovation will be required for many years to come.26

Additional factors include the perceived failure of traditional international organizations in addressing development and humanitarian challenges effectively, the growing importance of private philanthropy, the necessity of mobilizing additional resources, the need for better harmonization of aid among donors and international organizations, and the call for the adoption of a global partnership for development in the context of the MDGs and the Monterrey Agreement. Another factor is the decline in the cost of information and communications linking the global and local forces of economic integration, public participation, and organizational decentralization in ways unimaginable just a few years ago.27

However, there are indications that the pace is slowing down. This may be due to several factors including the overcrowding of sectors such as health and the growing realization among donor countries and developing countries that the time may have come to move from experimentation to consolidation. The question therefore arises whether GPPs are just a development fad or whether they will become a permanent and significant component of the world’s development architecture.

26 Kaul and Conceição, op. cit.
The Accra Agenda for Action\textsuperscript{28} acknowledges the important contribution of GPPs to development, but encourages them to more systematically: support country ownership, align and harmonize their assistance proactively, and make good use of mutual accountability frameworks, while continuing their emphasis on achieving results. The Accra Agenda for Action encourages donors first to use and strengthen existing channels for aid delivery before creating separate new channels that “risk further fragmentation and complicate co-ordination at country level.”

Some argue that global public-private partnerships seem to be here to stay.\textsuperscript{29} They occupy an increasingly open middle ground between markets and states, permitting more nuanced and potentially more effective policy-making. They demonstrate that when markets fail, the policy response does not have to be government intervention alone; it can also be partnering. They also demonstrate that when governments fail, the response does not have to be to turn to the market; it could also be public-private partnering. Figure 2 illustrates how GPPs have increasingly filled the policy space between public and private sectors.

Figure 2. GPPs as a link between public and non-public development actors\textsuperscript{30}

Global programme funds (GPFs) are also growing.\textsuperscript{31} Although contributions to GPFs currently represent approximately 3 per cent of total Official Development Assistance (ODA) flows and 5 per cent of country programmable aid, these shares are expected to rise as new funds come on-stream to address key issues such as climate change, trade and other emerging global issues. To the extent that GPFs mobilize development finance from non-traditional sources, such as philanthropic institutions, the private sector and civil society, there is a strong argument that they are a source of additional aid. What is less clear, however, is whether donors of ODA are actually providing additional resources to meet the specific goals of GPFs. In many cases, they are likely substituting highly targeted funding in place of general multilateral and bilateral assistance.\textsuperscript{32} The current financial crisis may prove to be a test case for checking donors’ long-term interest to use GPFs as important channels to deliver for children in hard times.


\textsuperscript{29} Kaul and Conceição, op. cit.


\textsuperscript{31} See definition in Annex 1.

\textsuperscript{32} World Bank, ‘Global Programme Funds at Country Level: What have we learned?’, The Global Programmes and Partnerships Group, Concessional Finance and Global Partnerships Vice Presidency, 2008.
The success of a number of GPPs derives from their ability to address specific issues and to channel resources to countries to achieve rapid results. Quick wins, however, do not equate to sustainable development. A potential consequence of the proliferation of these partnerships is that the development debate could rapidly move to an issue debate.

3.3.2 Number and types of GPPs

This study attempted to inventory existing GPPs using the restricted UNICEF definition. Annex 5 provides a list of 168 GPPs that appear to meet these definitional criteria.

It was beyond the scope of this study to conduct an in-depth typology analysis. GPPs differ greatly in terms of age and maturity, public versus non-public membership mix, type of governance, legal status, the nature and intensity of partners’ engagement, high-level goals and outcomes, and supporting strategies and activities. Moreover, over time, these partnerships tend to gain new characteristics or to modify the relative importance of their attributes as they mature.34 Different authors have proposed different, yet complementary, typologies, which are summarized in Annex 6.

A useful summary of the main categories is provided by the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook34:

- Some, generally small, programmes are primarily policy or knowledge networks that facilitate communication, advocate policy change, and generate and disseminate knowledge and good practices in their sector (e.g., Countdown to 2015, Cluster Munitions Coalition, and Gender and Water Alliance).
- Other, somewhat larger, programmes also provide country- or local-level technical assistance to support national policy and institutional reforms and capacity strengthening, and to catalyze public or private investment in the sector (e.g., Health Metrics Network, UNGEI and Micronutrient Initiative).
- The largest programmes also provide investment resources to support the provision of global, regional or national public goods (e.g., GFATM; Education for All (EFA)/FTI; GAVI; UNITAID, an international facility for the purchase of drugs against HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis; and the Global Environmental Facility [GEF]).

---

"Global programme partnerships are mainly analysed with a development economics lens. All around us there is evidence of the problems of economic approaches. UNICEF has to help the world see what these global partnerships look like through a human rights lens, and through the eyes of the children of the world." (Source: external partner)

UNICEF engagement in GPPs must be guided by a sound understanding of the different types of GPPs and the pros and cons associated with their purpose to support strategies and related management and governance structures. For this reason, UNICEF should attempt to develop a typology of GPPs based on published evidence. It should also strive to harmonize this typology with those used by other international organizations with similar portfolios, such as the World Bank, UNDP and WHO.

3.3.3 Relevance of GPPs to advancing children’s rights

It was beyond the scope of this study to assess the impact of past and active GPPs on children’s wellbeing and on the realization of their rights. Illustrative evidence collected during the course of the study tends to confirm that a large number of the GPPs listed in Annex 5 have the potential to address many of the immediate underlying and structural causes impeding the realization of children’s rights. This is not surprising given that the main raison d’être of these partnerships is to deal with developmental issues, a majority of which are also underlying and basic causes of children’s unmet rights. Figure 3 shows the UNICEF Concep-

---

33 UNAIDS is a particular case in point of a global initiative initially limited to UN organizations (the co-sponsors). However the membership of the Programme Coordinating Board evolved over time and now includes both UN and non-UN actors, including governments and non-governmental organizations. IASC is a borderline case. Full membership is limited to UN organizations only and large international non-governmental organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross have standing invitee status only. However in practice, no distinction is made between members and standing invitees and the number of participating agencies has expanded since inception of the IASC in 1992.
tual Framework for Situation Assessment and Analysis of the Rights of Children and Women\textsuperscript{35} with illustrative examples of GPPs that address determinants of rights at different levels.

Figure 3. Examples of GPPs that address underlying and structural determinants of children’s rights

UNICEF should aim to leverage the child-specific impact potential of GPPs through its engagement in these programmes. GPPs have a targeted, often quite narrow, focus on specific gaps in the development landscape. Partners increasingly look to UNICEF to ensure a whole child perspective within and across GPPs. This holistic perspective needs to extend across the multiple determinants of child survival, development, protection and participation.\textsuperscript{36}

“UNICEF is the organization that is best placed to mitigate the fragmenting effects of vertical GPPs on children. UNICEF has to take a holistic overview of GPPs to ensure that there is continuity of care across the developmental stages of a child from birth to adolescence and across the social determinants that influence these stages (family, community, and environment).”

“UNICEF has one of the broadest cross-sectoral mandates. Based on this UNICEF can help to build bridges across vertical GPP silos so that children do not fall through the gaps. Right now UNICEF does not live up to this responsibility, and if UNICEF cannot do this, no other organization can.” (Source: external partners)


\textsuperscript{36} The holistic approach of the Convention on the Rights of the Child emphasizes the importance of promoting a multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral perspective when consideration is given to policies, programmes or actions in favour of children. The aim is to focus on the whole child and to promote the effective realization of all of his or her rights. Therefore it is essential to foster an increasing synergy amongst the various sectors which are relevant to the child’s life, and prevent fragmented interventions. See: Pais, M. S., ‘A Human Rights Conceptual Framework for UNICEF’, UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Florence, 1999.
Assessing the child-specific impact potential of these partnerships, however, requires better understandings of the value chain that links partners’ inputs to expected partnership results and how this value chain reflects RBM and principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child. A blueprint approach to analysing the child impact dimension of partnership value chains should be avoided given the diverse nature of these partnerships, but it would be extremely helpful if UNICEF could develop and test such an analytical method in collaboration with interested parties including academia and research institutions. This effort by UNICEF would also fit well with the increasing realization that, although the development of tools to measure the performance of global health partnerships (a major subset of GPPs) is still in its infancy, a useful tool would need to use indicators that are systematic, consistent and broadly applicable across the various categories of global health partnerships.  

This effort could build on current efforts deployed by UNICEF to leverage the child focus of major global funds, such as GFATM. GFATM has developed a metric to measure its operational and grant performances as well as system effect and impact. Collaboration is underway between UNICEF and the GFATM to assess whether this metric is able to allow accurate reporting on child-related GFATM investments and results.

As more GPPs undergo process and impact evaluations, applying this metric to evaluation design could ensure that these evaluations generate critical information and child-focused recommendations and would help UNICEF better assess the child-specific impact potential of GPPs. This information could also be used by UNICEF to make appropriate engagement decisions depending on the child focus of GPPs.

---

4. MODES OF ENGAGEMENT: MAIN FEATURES OF THE UNICEF PORTFOLIO AND ROLES

4.1 Defining engagement

For the purpose of this study, engagement is defined as UNICEF involvement in GPPs through the commitment of organizational resources, including technical, financial, human resources, reputational, programming, procurement, and social and political capital resources.

4.2 GPPs in which UNICEF is engaged: A baseline portfolio

4.2.1 Variables

The following portfolio analysis is limited to variables for which reasonably accurate data were available. These variables include:

- **Modes of institutional engagement**
- **Alignment with UNICEF strategic priorities**: The extent to which the programmatic themes and objectives of GPPs are congruent with UNICEF priority areas as defined in the UNICEF MTSP
- **Partnership maturity**: age of GPPs in which UNICEF participates
- **Public and non-public participation**: The degree of participation of public and non-public stakeholders; participation is assessed in relation to formal membership and involvement in governance structures
- **Legal status**: Whether or not the partnership carries a separate juridical personality

The analysis also includes a description of the roles that most often characterize UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

Answering the initial evaluation questions in a reliable and credible manner would have required a more detailed portfolio analysis, which in turn, would have required data not currently supported by UNICEF internal information systems. In order to improve the evaluability of UNICEF engagement, a portfolio analysis template will need to be developed. This template should identify indicators, data sources, data management processes, information products, dissemination and use. The conceptual framework presented in the following chapter can inform the development of this template.

4.2.2 Modes of institutional engagement

UNICEF engagement follows different modalities. The first step in defining UNICEF engagement is to determine whether UNICEF is a formal member of the partnership or is just a collaborative partner. Being a formal member implies an institutional endorsement of the mandate, goals and strategies of the partnership and a commitment to “work together with other partners to achieve a common purpose or undertake specific tasks and, as mutually agreed, to share risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits.” Being a collaborative partner does not imply the same level of institutional commitment and occurs when UNICEF decides to engage in collaborative activities with GPPs on a case-by-case basis and for specific activities.

Such collaborations may be contractual (e.g., being a recipient of grants to implement specific projects or provide procurement services, such as UNITAID and GFATM) or informal (e.g., providing technical support to CSUCS).

When UNICEF is a formal member of a GPP, it may or may not play a role in the governance of the partnership. For example, UNICEF participates in the governance of GPPs such as GAVI, EFA/FTI, GAIN and the Child Rights Information Network. Conversely, UNICEF is a formal member but is not directly involved in the governance of partnerships such as the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action, the Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, and the Global Water Challenge.

38Public and non-public categories apply to state and non-state actors upon which the portfolio data have been based.
When UNICEF is involved in the governance of GPPs, it may play a partnership management role or not. Partnership management roles occur when UNICEF is asked and agrees to host the partnership and its secretariat, or provide secretariat services for the partnership or manage multi-donor trust funds on behalf of the partnership.

Annex 10 lists all GPPs in which UNICEF participates. For each of them, the mode of engagement is indicated using the typology described above. Figure 4 summarizes the relative importance of each mode of engagement. UNICEF participates in 77 (46 per cent) of the 168 partnerships inventoried. UNICEF is a formal member in 62 cases and plays a governance role in 42 of these partnerships. In five cases, UNICEF either hosts the partnership secretariat or provides secretariat or coordination services.\(^{40}\)

**Figure 4. Importance of UNICEF participation and engagement modalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global programme partnerships</th>
<th>168</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative partner</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal member</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No governance role</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management role</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management role</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2.3 Alignment with UNICEF strategic priorities**

Figure 5\(^{41}\) shows how the GPPs in which UNICEF participates are categorized based on their thematic relationship with the focus areas of the UNICEF MTSP. A majority (55 per cent) of the 77 GPPs in which UNICEF participates are relevant to Focus Area 1 (child survival and development), reflecting the global predominance of these partnerships in the health sector, and to a lesser extent in the nutrition and water, sanitation and hygiene sectors. Only 3 of the 77 partnerships in which UNICEF participates were found to be marginally relevant to MTSP focus areas.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{40}\) UNICEF hosts the secretariats of the Better Care Network, the Donors Working Group on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting, and UNGEI. UNICEF provides a coordination platform to the Global Public/Private Partnership for Handwashing with Soap and the Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative.

\(^{41}\) The total number of GPPs in which UNICEF participates is slightly higher in Figure 5 than in Figure 4. This indicates that a small number of GPPs are equally relevant to several focus areas.

\(^{42}\) Global Alliance to Eliminate Leproxy, Global Collaboration for Blood Safety, and Stop Tuberculosis Partnership.
4.2.4 Partnership maturity

Figure 6 shows the age distribution of GPPs. The length of UNICEF affiliation may differ from the age of the partnership, depending on when UNICEF decided to join the partnership. The information is usually available for partnerships that UNICEF co-founded but is difficult to find in other cases. This information is important given that the dynamic of engagement can vary depending on the maturity of partnerships. For future evaluability purposes, it would be helpful if UNICEF could include this variable in its portfolio analysis template.
4.2.5 Public and non-public participation at membership and governance levels

Table 1 shows the degree of participation of public and non-public stakeholders in the GPPs in which UNICEF participates. Participation is assessed in relation to formal membership and involvement in governance structures. The analysis confirms that in a majority of cases (75 per cent) the membership of the partnerships and their governance structures include a mix of stakeholders from public and non-public sectors. In 16 per cent of cases, while the membership composition is mixed, participation in the partnership governance is limited to public partners. This is the case, for example, of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases.

The case of the United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) is also worth mentioning in this context. Established in 1994 by a resolution of the UN Economic and Social Council and launched in January 1996, the governance of UNAIDS was initially limited to public stakeholders—essentially the UN co-sponsors. The composition of the Programme Coordinating Board of UNAIDS, however, now includes representatives of non-governmental organizations and of people living with HIV/AIDS. However, these particular stakeholders do not have voting rights. The UNAIDS case is indicative of a number of public partnerships that, over time, have opened up their governance to non-public stakeholders. In only a very small number of partnerships with mixed or non-public membership is the participation in governance structures limited to non-public partners.\(^\text{43,44}\) These partnerships are clear borderline cases as, in some cases, it is unclear whether the principle of collective decision making that characterizes GPPs is effective or whether these partnerships are managed by a single entity that enters into collaborative arrangements with different parties to carry out specific work.

\(^{43}\) Mixed membership: Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, Global Road Safety Forum, and PMTCT Donation Programme.

\(^{44}\) Non-public membership: Children Without Worms, Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Emergency Capacity Building Project, and The Sphere Project.
Table 1. Level of public and non-public engagement in the GPPs in which UNICEF participates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance mix</th>
<th>Membership mix</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 Legal status of GPPs in which UNICEF participates

Table 2 shows that 14 per cent of GPPs in which UNICEF participates carry a separate juridical personality. They are registered either as private not-for-profit foundations (e.g., GAIN, GAVI, GFATM), limited companies (e.g., CSUCS), associations (e.g., Gender Water Alliance), or 501(c)3 companies in the case of organizations based in the United States (e.g., Malaria No More). The most formal type of relationship between UNICEF and these partnerships is when UNICEF sits on the board or equivalent governance structure. In these cases, liabilities incurred by board representatives can be significant and need to be scrutinized as explained in the following chapters. The majority (86 per cent) of GPPs in which UNICEF participates do not have a separate juridical personality. The secretariats of these partnerships are usually hosted by one of the partners at the request of the partnership board or equivalent governance structure, such as a steering committee. This is, the case for a majority of global health partnerships hosted by WHO. In more loosely organized partnerships (e.g., UNGEI, Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination, Measles Initiative, GPEI), one of the partners provides coordination services.

Initiators of GPPs are usually keen to maintain a link with the UN system, for example, by requesting UN organizations provide hosting arrangements. However, in the case of GPFs (e.g., GEF, GAVI, GFATM, GAIN), a recent trend has been towards moving out of the UN system and becoming separate independent organizations.

Table 2. GPPs with UNICEF participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership has a separate juridical personality</th>
<th>Collaborative partner</th>
<th>Formal member: No governance role</th>
<th>Formal member: Governance role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 Roles played by UNICEF

Mapping the roles of UNICEF in GPPs is challenging due to: varying modes of institutional engagement ranging from informal collaborative relationships to formal institutional arrangements, for example as host of GPPs; the multiplicity of roles assumed by UNICEF in these partnerships; and the dynamic nature of these relationships and roles. Any attempt to map UNICEF roles in a coherent and systematic manner is further complicated by the fact that partners and UNICEF may have different perceptions of these relationships and roles.

Figure 7 provides a tentative list of the different roles currently played by UNICEF. These roles were identified based on information collected from UNICEF country offices, regional and divisional annual reports, interviews, evaluation reports and partnerships’ websites. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient information for a detailed assessment of each role across the spectrum of GPPs in which UNICEF participates. Internal UNICEF reporting on engagement is more anecdotal than systematic, except in cases where the transfer of resources is involved (e.g., procurement services or grant management). This lack of comprehensiveness impacts negatively on the evaluability of UNICEF engagement in these partnerships. To improve the situation, it will be important that engagement decisions are properly documented and recorded and that they include a description of the roles to which UNICEF has committed. Potential roles should be scrutinized to

---

45 Child Rights Information Network, GAIN, GAVI, Malaria No More, and Micronutrient Initiative.
ensure correct alignment with MTSP support strategies and UNICEF comparative advantages. Roles should be agreed upon in consultation with partners, communicated externally and internally, adequately resourced and capacitated, supported by relevant systems, monitored and adjusted as needed, and periodically documented.

Figure 7. Inventory of roles played by UNICEF in GPPs

Roles performed by UNICEF vary from one partnership to another and from one level of engagement to another (e.g., global, regional and local). They may evolve over time depending on the level of maturity of the partnership and the evolving roles of partners. The assessment found that good engagement management practices at the field level were those that integrated a combination of three or more roles, generally emphasizing the importance of building social capital through partnerships.

Overall, the combination of a global mandate and an extensive country presence gives UNICEF a powerful voice in the GPPs that it decides to co-create or engage in. As such, UNICEF has a responsibility to work with its global partners to raise the standards of priority setting, coordination, governance, management and evaluation in these partnerships. Because of its simultaneous presence at the global, regional and country levels, UNICEF can play a valued overall role by enhancing synergies between globally driven concerns and national development priorities.

Based on information available, the roles most frequently played by UNICEF can be grouped into three categories: governance-related, management-related and programmatic.

**Governance-related roles**

**Partnership development**: This is the case when UNICEF, together with other partners, takes an active role in establishing a new partnership (e.g., Global Framework for Action on Sanitation and Water Supply [GF4A], GAVI, UNGEI or GAIN), or in bringing about major structural changes to existing partnerships based on evaluation results (e.g., EFA/FTI, RBM, or Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health), or in closing down or merging partnerships (e.g., Safe Motherhood Partnership). In fulfilling this role, UNICEF is
involved in defining and reviewing the value proposition of partnerships and their statutes and bylaws (in the case of formally structured partnerships). UNICEF is one of several partners currently developing a new GPP in the water, sanitation and hygiene sector (GF4A) with the purpose of assisting off-track countries in developing actionable national plans and attracting financing, and helping on-track countries sustain their progress toward achieving the MDG target on sanitation and water supply.

**Chairing:** Multilaterals are often sought to chair the boards of formal partnerships, given their global mandates and perceived neutrality. UNICEF currently chairs the board of the Micronutrient Initiative, the Iodine Network, and co-chairs the executive management team of the Flour Fortification Initiative. The function of chairing a partnership board has been maintained within the Office of the Executive Director in most cases, with delegation in a few instances. In some cases, UNICEF chairs partnership board sessions at different points in time, with the chair rotating among members.

**Strategic management:** UNICEF interacts with other partners in setting, reviewing and resetting medium-term strategic priorities for the partnership. This role gives UNICEF the possibility to influence the strategic priorities of partnerships, for example in support of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and IADGs, including the MDGs. The strategic planning process usually entails the development of a partnership work plan that lays out so-called ‘added-value’ activities, which are implemented primarily by partners (in the case of a partner-centric partnerships) or by secretariats (in the case of secretariat-centric partnerships). Defining the resource requirements of the partnership is part of the strategic planning process. In some cases, UNICEF may accept playing a more direct resource mobilization role, such as in the case of the GPEI. Finally, UNICEF will work with other partners in defining the period, terms of reference and conduct of independent evaluations.

“In my experience UNICEF has been more successful in engaging with global initiatives when there has been ongoing engagement and learning with partners. We have been less successful in global initiatives that have been event driven. For example the Global Movement for Children that developed around a specific event is not a UNICEF success story, but the decades of working and learning together with partners in developing the CRC [Convention on the Rights of the Child] is.” (Source: UNICEF staff)

**Management oversight:** This role is typical of partnerships that rely on a secretariat for various tasks delegated to them by the governing body. This role involves responsibilities such as defining the functions and structure of the secretariat, selecting senior staff, approving work plans and budgets, approving annual reports and evaluating staff performance.

“One disadvantage of collective decision making in GPPs is that UNICEF has less control over a specific global issue or programme (since decision making involves other players). On the plus side UNICEF gains by unleashing the power of multiple-stakeholder resources and synergies.” (Source: external partner)

**Cost-sharing:** A less significant form of support is sharing operational costs associated with partnership secretariats with other partners. In this case, the resources are transferred to the host institution through an inter-agency agreement.

**Management-related roles**

**Hosting GPP secretariats:** UNICEF may be asked to host partnership secretariats and provide administrative support to their operations and staff (e.g., Better Care Network and the GAVI secretariats).

**Providing secretariat services and coordination platforms:** In some cases, rather than hosting a secretariat, UNICEF provides secretariat services to the partnership (e.g., UNGEI). In the case of loosely structured partnerships, UNICEF may assume a strong—but not dominant—coordinating role (e.g., Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative).

---

46 Added-value activities are activities undertaken as a result of the existence of the partnership. They should be in addition to activities that individual partners undertake as part of their regular programmes of work.
Managing multi-donor trust funds: In a small number of cases, UNICEF has managed or is managing partnership trust funds. This was the case of GAVI until management of the GAVI trust account was transferred to the World Bank in 2006.

“Good things happen in the world when UNICEF takes on a thoughtful and catalytic leadership role … Think about the Universal Immunization Drive, Development with a Human Face, The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is the most widely ratified treaty. In all of this, UNICEF played such a strong catalytic role.”

“Governments know and trust UNICEF because of the long history of collaboration and established country-level capacities.”

“UNICEF is the partner of choice for other global actors because of UNICEF’s country connections and capacities, which are unparalleled.” (Source: external partners)

Programmatic roles

Data collection, analysis and reporting: Sound priority setting and effective M&E of partnership achievements rely on the availability of disaggregated and reliable data. Globally, UNICEF has a recognized role in monitoring MDG-related indicators and is a leader in assisting countries in collecting and analysing trend data using household surveys such as the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey. UNICEF also shares the role with other UN organizations of certifying the quality of country data (e.g., joint monitoring reports for immunization; water, environment and sanitation; nutrition; education; and child labour). UNICEF is also a member of a number of interagency monitoring groups, some of which support GPPs (e.g., REACH).

Knowledge generation: UNICEF often provides technical support and publication and dissemination assistance for reports produced by the partnerships in which it participates (e.g., the ‘Malaria & Children: Progress in Intervention Coverage, Countdown to 2015’ report) or with which it collaborates (e.g., CSUCS).

Policy advocacy: UNICEF’s strong convening power is linked to its global mandate and reach. This convening power has often been used to advocate for children at the global, regional and country level. Good data and evidence can leverage policy change and political mobilization. For example, in China, in an effort to advocate for mandatory flour fortification, the Flour Fortification Initiative leaders—including senior business executives, experts and UNICEF senior managers—met during a high-level meeting in May 2006 in Beijing. This prompted the Government of China to promote food fortification as one of the strategies for the grain and oil processing sector in its five-year food industry improvement plan.

Development of investment cases: UNICEF expertise has been used to develop investment cases, such as the measles and maternal and neonatal tetanus investment cases for GAVI. These cases were used to guide and facilitate investment decisions by the board of GAVI. UNICEF also supports the development of global, regional and national investment cases that assess financial gaps impeding progress towards the health MDGs.47

Policy advice and norm setting: As an intergovernmental organization with a global mandate for children, UNICEF has a natural role to play in providing relevant policies and norms to guide partnership operations. For example, in 2005, UNICEF and WHO released the Global Immunization Vision and Strategy 2006-201548, which serves as the overall policy framework for GAVI. Through its involvement in various partnership-related policy and technical committees and task teams, UNICEF supports the development of evidence-based policies, such as the recently adopted GAVI gender policy.49 However, a number of external partners believe UNICEF should more clearly define its role with respect to promoting and protecting children’s rights in a manner that transcends national boundaries and promotes the universality and indivisibility of children’s rights.

“Governments know and trust UNICEF because of the long history of collaboration and established country-level capacities.”

“UNICEF is the partner of choice for other global actors because of UNICEF’s country connections and capacities, which are unparalleled.”

“Good things happen in the world when UNICEF takes on a thoughtful and catalytic leadership role … Think about the Universal Immunization Drive, Development with a Human Face, The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is the most widely ratified treaty. In all of this, UNICEF played such a strong catalytic role.” (Source: external partners)

Brokering consensus and building social capital: Evidence collected during this exercise points to a general acceptance and appreciation of the UNICEF mandate as a broker for the world’s children. UNICEF is urged to take this responsibility to even higher levels to ensure that the world’s children have a voice in GPPs. As a partner, UNICEF often makes use of its convening power to facilitate policy and technical dialogue among partners. It often does so in collaboration with other UN organizations, thus augmenting the synergies derived from combined and complementary convening powers. At the country level in particular, UNICEF is usually perceived to be strong at forging alliances among government, international agencies, the private sector and civil society—including technical, educational and community-oriented and community-based organizations—and at strengthening linkages across disciplines, institutions and sectors. One challenge for UN organizations active at the country level and engaged in GPPs is to position themselves strategically as honest and neutral brokers to help developing countries reconcile externally driven programmes around global public good issues with countries’ own national priorities and programmes.

“In global public-private partnerships UNICEF is the one organization that has a clear mandate to make a difference in children’s lives.”

“Partners would be appreciative and accepting if UNICEF played a coordinating role in GPPs as a broker for children … It is up to UNICEF to seize this opportunity and responsibility.”

“It is becoming increasingly difficult to say this of any organization, but UNICEF still has a moral authority that comes from its commitment to children’s rights.” (Source: external partners)

Support to the development of national frameworks: UNICEF is increasingly involved in partnership efforts to support the development of national sector and cross-sector frameworks in line with aid effectiveness principles. Partnership examples include International Health Partnership and related initiatives, REACH, EFA/FTI and Harmonization for Health in Africa.50 One of the results of UNICEF involvement in these country-led processes is stronger programmatic and budgetary alignment with national frameworks and harmonization with other development partners, including in some cases through the participation of UNICEF in pooled funding mechanisms. In Sierra Leone, for example, UNICEF dismantled its parallel M&E system to use the national integrated health information system developed with the support of Health Metrics Network.51 Given the organizational focus on child outcomes, UNICEF often brings a strong multisectoral and multidisciplinary approach to partnership strategic planning processes, both at global and country levels. This comparative advantage is most obvious in the fields of HIV/AIDS control and child survival, which require integrated approaches based on a continuum of services and interventions.

Increasing country access to global funds: Most global funds rely on similar resource allocation procedures, whereby eligible countries submit applications to access specific investment windows. Governments often seek technical assistance to improve their ability to produce high-quality applications. One significant asset that UNICEF lends to this process is its in-country technical capacities. UNICEF country offices participate in the development of national applications to access global fund resources through relevant coordi-

50 An International Health Partnership and Related Initiatives affiliated regional mechanism through which collaborating partners (African Development Bank, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, WHO, and World Bank) provide technical support and capacity building assistance to African countries on a demand-driven basis.

nation mechanisms (Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee for Immunization for GAVI, Country Coordinating Mechanism for GFATM).

“One of the main functions of global programme partnerships is to promote global public goods such as vaccines and textbooks. UNICEF has undisputed capacities in this area.” (Source: external partners)

**Procurement services:** UNICEF procurement services and expertise in international commodity purchasing and supply are widely known and appreciated. UNICEF has a long history of supply support—both within country programmes of cooperation and, increasingly, as procurement services support to governments, development partners and GPPs. UNICEF offers these partnerships a quality-controlled and cost-effective facility, which they can use to provide essential commodities (such as vaccines and school supplies) to developing countries. For example in 2008, procurement services funded by GAVI, GFATM and UNITAID amounted to US$ 382 million, representing 57 per cent of all UNICEF procurement services throughput.

**Catalytic funding:** Provision of catalytic funding by UNICEF, though not a common practice, can have a major leveraging influence. For example, UNICEF invested US$ 550,000 of its discretionary resources to support the preparation of malaria funding proposals for GFATM Rounds 7 and 8. This was part of a partnership effort orchestrated by the RBM Harmonization Working Group to enhance the quality of country proposals. The success rate for malaria proposals rose from 23 per cent in Rounds 5 and 32 per cent in Round 6 to 75 per cent in Round 7 and 78 per cent in Round 8. Together, Rounds 7 and 8 secured approximately US$ 1.7 billion for malaria prevention and control over the five-year grant cycle. Country proposals considered absorptive capacity and included approaches to resolve system bottlenecks, for example, by strengthening community systems and behaviour change communication.

**Grant management:** As a matter of principle, UNICEF does not seek to mobilize resources for its own programmes through its engagement in these partnerships. One reason for this practice is that being dependent on GPPs for funding its own programmes can affect UNICEF independence, particularly in situations where UNICEF plays a governance role. However, in some cases where national capacities are weak and children’s needs are very significant, UNICEF is often approached to implement programmes funded by global funds, such as GFATM and GAVI. In other cases, UNICEF is either a recognized implementation partner (e.g., UNITAID and Micronutrient Initiative) or it implements specific components of partnership added-value work plans (e.g. GAVI).

**Table 3. Grants to UNICEF from selected GPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVI</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFATM</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Initiative</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>157.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication for development:** A long-time comparative advantage of UNICEF, this approach has provided UNICEF with a clear niche in several partnerships—the most emblematic being GPEI. There is, however, a perception among several partners that UNICEF expertise in this domain has eroded. The current drive to reinvigorate the communication for development function within UNICEF is trying to address this.

**Humanitarian coordination:** UNICEF is a core member of the IASC and leads or co-leads several IASC clusters (nutrition; education; and water, sanitation and hygiene). Recent IASC evaluations show that

---

52 UNICEF provides procurement services to UNITAID.
UNICEF leadership in the water, sanitation and hygiene cluster and the nutrition cluster has been effective, contributing to the humanitarian reform process.\textsuperscript{54}

5. A CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO GUIDE UNICEF ENGAGEMENT IN GPPs

5.1 Concept

One objective of this study was to verify the existence of a conceptual approach to guide UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

The recently adopted UNICEF strategic framework, SFPCR, has set objectives, guiding principles and approaches that apply to UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

As stated in the SFPCR, the objective of engaging in partnerships and collaborative relationships is to “foster a child-focused development agenda and to build the capacity of partners and societies to execute effective and efficient social policies for children.” Effective engagement is therefore the extent to which this objective has been attained—or is expected to be attained—efficiently, in a sustainable fashion, and with a positive institutional development impact.

Assessing the plausibility that this high-level objective may be achieved in the case of GPPs poses the challenge of clarifying what conceptual approach underpins UNICEF engagement in these partnerships.

The guiding principles and the ‘Way Forward’ approaches contained in the SFPCR provide important conceptual building blocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Guiding principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on delivering results for children and promoting child rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner selection criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment and ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


In addition to these guiding principles, the ‘Way Forward’ section of the SFPCR describes three approaches that UNICEF will use to maximize its engagement in GPPs:

- UNICEF will need to strengthen its ability to leverage a global aid architecture that has two main pillars of approach: one based on a country focus and the other driven by global issues. In order to play such a role, UNICEF will need to manage its involvement in GPPs as systematically as it does its country programmes of cooperation with governments. This effort will require a strategic approach to deciding in which GPPs to engage and at what level of intensity.
- UNICEF will work for the right balance among the priorities of staying engaged in a wide range of child-related issues, maintaining a strategic focus in managing its GPPs portfolio, and allocating optimal human and financial resources to chosen GPPs. Decisions can be made only on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the global role and reputation of UNICEF as well as donor preferences.
- UNICEF needs to fully integrate the national and international dimensions of its engagement in GPPs. For this purpose, UNICEF will need to make greater use of its strong relationships with other global actors, including governments, in order to seek greater alignment of GPPs with national development strategies.

While these high-level policy frameworks on UNICEF engagement in GPPs have been established, these frameworks need to be translated into operational terms. There is a distinction between formal and effective mandates: “A formal mandate is an agreed statement of the organisation's overall purpose, or raison d’être, usually encapsulated in a constitution, charter, or articles of agreement… An effective mandate refers to how formal mandates have been interpreted over time as the purpose and functions of the organisation become operationalized into more concrete and specific activities. This process is generally carried out by those who implement activities, either at headquarters or regional or country levels. Although an effective mandate may be found in part within policy documents describing organisational operations, its interpretive nature means that it is defined in an unstructured and evolutionary manner according to prevailing policy actors, contexts, and processes.”

Building on the previously discussed guiding principles and approaches, the report therefore proposes the following model as an attempt to operationalize these high-level goals and principles (see Figure 8). This model is informed by literature on global partnerships and partnership engagement and was developed with selected UNICEF staff and external respondents with conceptual knowledge and practical experience of these issues.

In this model, the outer arrows (‘Genesis’, ‘The First Mile’, ‘The Journey’, ‘The Last Mile’) represent the partnership life cycle. The inner wheel represents a results-based and human rights-based engagement planning and management process, divided into three segments (‘Assess and Define’, ‘Manage and Broker’, ‘Review and Realize’). The quality of each segment and the quality of its interaction condition the overall quality (relevance and effectiveness) of engagement, determined according to the principles of RBM and the human rights-based approach to programming. The conceptual model for UNICEF engagement is depicted in Figure 8 and each element of the model is discussed in the sections that follow.

---

5.2 The partnership life cycle

It is widely accepted that the life cycle of GPPs is evolutionary. The Partnering Initiative\textsuperscript{58} has identified 12 phases in the partnering process. The World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook\textsuperscript{59} distinguishes between an ‘Early Stage’ (first two to three years), an ‘Established Stage’ (more than years old) and a ‘Mature Stage’. This description of the partnership’s life cycle is based on lessons learnt from successful collaborations in global health\textsuperscript{60} and distinguishes between the ‘Genesis’, ‘The First Mile’, ‘The Journey’ and ‘The Last Mile’. The authors emphasize that collaborations and partnerships have the best chance for success when members lay the foundation in the first mile for the last mile’s success and when they take mutual responsibility along the journey for leadership, management and culture within the partnership.

Table 5. Partnership life cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>The genesis of a partnership lies in the realization by individuals that they have an opportunity to make a real difference in the world. This moment of realization typically has a catalyst, such as a report that confirms cause-effect linkages or a technological breakthrough. In the case of GPPs, such catalysts occur at key points in the evolution of addressing a global public good issue, and partnerships are often born at these points. The impetus may begin with an entrepreneurial individual who has a vision, a social organization of like-minded associates, or a donor organization that identifies a need it would like to address. It may even arise out of a group’s desire to have its voice heard. Whatever the source, a programme idea emerges, and from that seed a partnership begins to form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The First Mile | Because of the optimism and sense of possibility that characterize the beginning of a partnership, the first mile is an opportunity that will not come around again. In this phase, it is essential that the partners define their roles and make specific commitments very early on as to what resources (e.g., staff, technology, money, facilities) each will contribute to the alliance. Likewise, the partners should share a concrete view of what success will look like at different points in the future—for instance, at the end of years two and five—by implementing specific performance metrics. While discussions of goal and strategy might logically come before a discussion of structure, in reality when people arrive for a first meeting they typically want to know who will be in charge, so partnerships often prefer to resolve structural issues first. Key elements include:  
- Choosing the right membership  
- Developing a shared goal  
- Selecting the appropriate structure  
- Shaping a big-picture strategy  
- Clarifying organizational roles |
| The Journey  | Once members of a partnership have agreed on the foundational elements, they begin the arduous work of moving toward the goal, dealing with hazards and obstacles every step of the way. The experience is one of constantly dealing with opposing forces—one force field moving the partnership forward and another countering every movement. Key elements include:  
- Bringing discipline and flexibility to management  
- Developing complementary leadership |
| The Last Mile | The last mile refers to the final stage of a partnership, when achievement of the goal is in sight. Key elements include:  
- Adapting approach to sustain momentum  
- Transferring control in a supportive way  
- Capturing and communicating lessons learned  
- Dissolving the partnership when the goal is achieved |

Whether or not to engage in a GPP is a decision that UNICEF can take at any given time during the partnership lifecycle. In some cases, UNICEF will play a catalytic role in the genesis of a partnership, either on its own initiative (e.g., UNGEI) or with other actors (e.g., GAVI). In other cases, UNICEF may decide to engage during the first mile or the journey phases or, more rarely, during the last mile phase.

Since the purpose and the scope of institutional engagement are likely to be different at different stages of the partnership life cycle, this should be correctly documented for evaluability purposes. For example, the nature of UNICEF engagement in GAVI has evolved over the years. UNICEF is no longer lending its legal status to GAVI, or hosting the secretariat or managing the trust fund. Conversely, UNICEF has strengthened its role as procurement agent, notably through its recently agreed procurement role in the Pneumococcal Advance Market Commitment Initiative. Thus, a review of UNICEF engagement in GAVI should reflect on the evolving roles and responsibilities of UNICEF, which are themselves a reflection of the evolving nature of GAVI as an alliance.
As noted before, the results-based engagement planning and management process is divided into three interactive segments (‘Assess and Define’, ‘Manage and Broker’, and ‘Review and Realize’). Each segment comprises five successive steps.

The partnership life cycle and the UNICEF engagement management cycle interact with each other, with the former providing the broader context within which the latter is defined and operates. UNICEF will need to test this process model in practice and further improve it through learning by doing. It is important to realize that it may take time to get this process model right and to make it fully relevant to the business culture of UNICEF. One private-sector partner described how it took the company approximately four years to undertake the prioritization and planning processes, to develop appropriate portfolio criteria and results indicators, and to test and validate the strategic and operations framework, before a full portfolio management system could be implemented.

### 5.3 The engagement cycle

The three engagement modes or segments that constitute the inner wheel of the conceptual model each comprise a series of engagement activities. These engagement activities are briefly outlined below. The chapter that follows then appraises the evaluableity of UNICEF engagement in GPPs with reference to this conceptual model.

**Figure 9. Assess and define**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asses and Define</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The significance of GPPs as an approach to address UNICEF strategic priorities is compared to other programming alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Existing GPPs are assessed in terms of their relevance, legitimacy and representativeness, accountability and transparency, and overall effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Options (co-create, join, modify, disengage, co-dissolve) are considered in terms of desirability, strategic relevance and political feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A value proposition for UNICEF engagement is developed. Transaction costs and potential risks are compared against expected benefits for children resulting from UNICEF engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The value proposition is reviewed by Senior Management and either rejected or approved with/without modifications. The results of the review process are communicated to external and internal stakeholders and kept in a central file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manage & Broker**
Figure 10. Manage and broker

Manage and Broker

1. The value proposition is translated into a detailed engagement plan with a results framework, a budget and a M&E plan. Ensure the design conforms with evaluability criteria.

2. Clarify which management structure will oversee UNICEF engagement. Develop group and individual work plans. Secure catalytic funding if needed. Ensure that relevant business processes, authorizing environments and tools are in place.

3. Build social capital, internally and with partners. Ensure that engagement objectives and roles are understood, adapted and supported by a network of staff who will determine the ultimate success of UNICEF engagement. Establish ground rules for interaction. Develop partnering skills including negotiation and conflict management.


5. Make course adjustments as needed.

Review and Realize

Figure 11. Review and realize

Review and Realize

1. Take advantage of independent GPP reviews and/or evaluations to assess the effect of UNICEF engagement on partnership processes and results.

2. Ensure that the design of GPP evaluations and/or reviews includes an assessment of institutional engagement and follows international standards for evaluating GPPs as well as HRBAP/RBM evaluation principles.

3. With partners, assess the implications of evaluation results and agree on next partnership phase (dissolve, intensify, modify).


5. Identify and disseminate good practices, lessons learnt and share credit.
6. APPRAISING THE EVALUABILITY OF UNICEF ENGAGEMENT

This chapter appraises the existence and design quality of current engagement planning and management processes, and information towards evaluation of the same, using the proposed conceptual framework described in the previous chapter as an analytical template. The quality of the three phases that compose the engagement cycle condition the future evaluability of the engagement, by ensuring that:

- Objectives, causal assumptions, activities and resources are required for effective engagement are articulated in a plausible manner.
- There is unity of purpose across UNICEF management levels and sufficient organizational capacities to achieve the objectives.
- There are agreed-upon measures and data sources and well-defined uses for information on progress toward measurable objectives.

6.1 Assess and define

6.1.1 The value of investing in GPPs as compared to other programming alternatives.

One important finding in this study was that some UNICEF staff in the field and at regional and global levels have played useful and varied roles in fostering a greater child focus among GPPs and that, through their involvement in social capital building, they have contributed to building more effective partnering platforms. However, this engagement has mostly been carried out either out of individual interest or as part of an organizational commitment that, in most cases, was reactive and not supported by clear engagement strategies and plans. Given the reputational risks and legal liabilities incurred, engagement in GPPs should be seen as a serious business and should be treated as such. At the start of this evaluation, many respondents felt that an organization-wide strategy to guide UNICEF participation in GPPs and internal accountability frameworks, linked to dedicated resources, was missing. Without such a strategy, it was difficult to effectively manage the rapidly expanding UNICEF portfolio of GPPs.

Until recently, GPPs were not featured in UNICEF policy documents as a distinct partnership category. While a number of these partnerships are listed in the UNICEF MTSP for the period 2006–2009, they are not referred to as being part of a family of partnerships sharing similar features. This situation was corrected in the midterm review of the MTSP where the concept of GPPs was introduced for the first time in a UNICEF strategic planning document.

An important policy gap has now been filled with the recent adoption by the UNICEF Executive Board of a SFPCR. However, the SFPCR acknowledges that more work needs to be done in terms of making UNICEF systems and resources more optimally configured to support the new UNICEF vision. This is more relevant in the case of GPPs, the organizational mainstreaming of which is lagging behind other forms of partnerships and collaborative engagement. The potential of the ongoing organizational improvement initiatives to facilitate this mainstreaming is noted in the SFPCR.

*I am not convinced that UNICEF and UN organizations make systematic, strategic decisions in joining global partnerships. It is more often a case of: If we are not there, it will seem that we do not count or that we do not care.* (Source: external partner)

As UNICEF develops operational guidelines to back up its strategic vision on partnerships and collaborative relationships, one aspect requiring further attention will be to define the conditions under which engagement in a GPP is the most appropriate choice compared to other programming alternatives that may or may not include a partnership dimension. One element in favour of engagement in GPPs is when the development objective under consideration can only be achieved through a global multiple stakeholder response that ad-

---

addresses issues or involves activities of worldwide reach and sometimes of multigenerational scope.\textsuperscript{64} Only limited information is available on this issue in existing MTSP support strategies in health and nutrition; water, sanitation and hygiene; basic education; and child protection. The education strategy is slightly more explicit than the other MTSP support strategies in so far as it makes the choice of limiting UNICEF engagement in four GPPs: EFA-Global Action Plan, EFA/FTI, UNGEI and the IASC education cluster approach.

Making a strategic choice in favour of GPPs requires a good understanding of the pros and cons associated with their high-level purposes, their supporting strategies, and their related management and governance structures. UNICEF does not currently have guidance on these issues, but such guidance could be developed in collaboration with other organizations sharing similar partnership portfolios.

6.1.2 Existing GPPs are assessed in term of their relevance, legitimacy, representativeness, duplicative potential, accountability, transparency and overall effectiveness.

Assessing existing GPPs is a key step in any engagement decision.

When there is reasonable ground to think that a GPP is the right approach to address a global development concern, the tendency among international actors is to create a new partnership rather than to verify if an existing partnering platform could host the new initiative. Many incentives drive the preference for creating something new, such as:

- The need for political profiling
- The notion that the optimism and sense of possibility that characterize the beginning of a partnership will be better served by a new instrument rather than by an existing one
- The desire of the group of partners behind the new initiative to be in charge—something more difficult to achieve if an existing partnership is used to host the initiative
- The notion that creating a new partnership will make it easier to ensure that the right structure follows the desired function
- The realization that no existing GPP has the potential to address effectively the development issue under consideration

Incentives in favour of using existing partnerships include avoiding fragmenting further an already complex aid landscape and recognizing the need to reduce transaction costs for donors and recipient countries.

Assessment of existing GPPs should be part of a more dynamic approach to portfolio management. The baseline portfolio provided by this report is a step in the right direction, but it will need to be further developed, notably by taking into consideration the characteristics of ‘successful’ GPPs. The characteristics listed in Table 6 were synthesized using triangulated information from published literature, interview results and case studies and can serve as a basis for developing decision trees adapted to the five strategic decisions that UNICEF will typically need to consider: co-create, join, modify, disengage, or dissolve. An example of a decision tree is given in Annex 12.

One important aspect to assess is the existence of GPPs with overlapping mandates. UNICEF could now take a more critical look at this issue and suggest to other partners that the time may have come to seek greater alignment, if not consolidation, of partnerships with overlapping mandates. To play this role effectively, UNICEF will need political savvy, a good understanding of the sometimes complex power structures underpinning the governance of GPPs, and outstanding brokering skills.

\textsuperscript{64} Kaul and Conceição, op. cit.
Successful GPPs should:

- Contribute to the realization of IADGs, including the MDGs, and promote and protect children’s rights.
- Demonstrate clear added value in offering a unique evidence-based solution that avoids duplication with existing initiatives.
- Address specific priorities that are congruent and complementary to UNICEF organizational missions and strategic plans.
- Align with internationally agreed upon good development practice and aid effectiveness principles. This includes alignment with country-led development strategies and harmonization of international development approaches.
- Arise from the partners’ self-interest and maintain partners’ autonomy. Ensure adequate and voluntary representation of relevant public and non-public partners in decision making, based on a situational and stakeholder analysis (at global, regional and national levels).
- Define partnership objectives and related partner roles, responsibilities, and risks. These definitions should also explicitly state what the partnerships and the partners will not do.
- Match the appropriate partnership structure with function, including with respect to technical, legal and financial considerations to achieve programme objectives.
- Pose little, or manageable, risk with respect to partners’ business practices that may not be compatible with core values of the United Nations and with standards in internationally agreed treaties such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
- Conform to principles of good governance, including transparency, accountability and sound financial management. Have in place appropriate and adequate strategies, policies, guidelines and mechanisms for day-to-day management of the programme, including for assessing, acknowledging and reconciling different expectations. Statutes or bylaws should include a sunset clause.
- Assess partnership transaction costs and the extent to which the partnership has converted, or is expected to convert, its resources and inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) economically into results.
- Have metrics and mechanisms for M&E that inform decision making for development and children’s rights and that are linked with appropriate incentives.
- Show satisfactory progress and potential for achieving programme objectives.
- Demonstrate sustainability of programme benefits and management of risks towards the progressive realization of children’s rights. This includes strengthening the capacities of duty bearers and rights holders.
- Have an exit strategy in place, for both partners and the partnership, agreed upon by all partners. This includes mechanisms for phasing out on reaching objectives and for redesign if the partnership fails to make satisfactory progress.
- Address context specific questions on the partnership, sector, topic and proposed intervention.

6.1.3 Options (co-create, join, modify, disengage, co-dissolve) are considered in terms of desirability, strategic relevance and political feasibility.

The assessment of existing GPPs will also help determine whether an existing partnership can be a natural candidate to host a new initiative or whether it is justified to create a new partnership. It also helps determine whether a new or existing partnership provides an institutional and performance environment conducive to UNICEF engagement; UNICEF should consider modifying the depth and nature of its engagement, including the possibility to cancel its participation in a partnership; or the moment is propitious for considering closing down a partnership, either because it has achieved its objectives or because its overall performance is poor.

6.1.4 A value proposition for UNICEF engagement is developed. Transaction costs and potential risks are compared against expected benefits for children resulting from UNICEF engagement.

‘Whole child’ approach

When developing its internal guidelines, UNICEF could emphasize that engagement in GPPs should be in line with its ‘whole child’ approach (i.e., avoid ‘slicing’ the rights of the child and favour a continuum of care across the developmental stages of a child, across the social determinants that influence these stages, and across sectors and humanitarian and development phases).
Comparing expected benefits and transaction costs

Assessing and comparing expected benefits and transaction costs should be part of any engagement analysis. UNICEF, like many other organizations participating in GPPs, does not currently have methods and tools to support such analysis. Developing these instruments should be a management priority of UNICEF, ideally pursued in collaboration with other like-minded organizations.

Defining depth of engagement

UNICEF needs to make deliberate decisions about the depth of its engagement, a process that calls for a nuanced approach on a case-by-case basis. The concept of engagement covers several dimensions: political, programmatic, technical, administrative and operational. In many cases, UNICEF can fulfill an appropriate role through only a limited involvement. However in other cases, there is a strong argument for full engagement, taking a leadership role and devoting considerable resources for a long period. Deciding on the depth of engagement will also have a bearing on the level of seniority of staff members representing UNICEF in the governance structures of these partnerships.

Understanding the complexity of governance

Understanding the complexity of governance is critical to making sound engagement decisions. During this study, significant discussions took place on the advantages and disadvantages of loose collaborations compared to more formal forms of governance. Annex 6 lists several structural models ranging from the simple affiliation model to the joint venture company model. Annex 7 provides additional notes on the pros and cons of formal partnerships and loose collaborations.

There is no perfect model and, in making engagement decisions, UNICEF needs to understand the advantages and the limitations of each model. For example, diverse partners can bring richness and legitimacy to a programme but only if the voices of partners are heard in partnership governance. If the voices and expectations of diverse partners are overlooked and the agenda is seized by dominant partners or by the secretariat, then the original intent of the partnership as an instrument for development is lost. Similarly, different governance structures have different advantages and disadvantages. A relationship between peers, such as in the case of an alliance (e.g., UNICEF and GAVI), differs from a principal and agent relationship (e.g., UNICEF and UNITAID). In both cases, UNICEF is referred to as a partner even though this terminology reflects distinct modes of engagement. From interviews conducted with UNICEF staff members, these tradeoffs are not widely understood. Given that these issues are complex, UNICEF might want to look to a specialized institution to support the development of specific guidelines or to collaborate with other like-minded organizations facing similar issues. This effort would need to take advantage of the rapidly growing body of literature on this subject, particularly on the specific case of global health partnerships.65

Involvement in governance structures carries special authorities and risks. The leveraging interest that UNICEF pursues through its engagement in these partnerships is best served when UNICEF can actively participate in decisions related to the partnerships’ evolving goals, strategies, activities and resource mobilization efforts. In exercising its governance role, particularly in formal partnerships governed by a board or a steering committee, one important set of decisions for UNICEF senior management concerns the appointment of representatives to serve on these structures. The stakes, complexity and risks associated with these functions will normally vary depending on several factors such as the strategic importance of the partnership, its legal status, its financial throughput, its stage of maturity and the size of UNICEF involvement — both managerially and programmatically. Risks are mainly reputational (for the individual and the organization he or she represents) and legal depending on the fiduciary duties involved. Partnerships’ statutes and bylaws should be scrutinized to ensure that representatives of UN organizations are entitled to act in a manner consistent with the obligations they owe to their respective organizations and as directed by their organizations. UNICEF senior managers recommend that, in some cases where risks linked to fiduciary duties are particularly significant (e.g., global funds), adequate arrangements should be requested to limit the liability of multilateral organizations and their representatives, for instance through insurance requirements.

An evaluation of UNICEF engagement in GPPs should thus be able to ascertain the existence and effectiveness of internal systems that would ensure that:

---

Terms of reference for staff serving on partnership boards and steering committees are available. Board representatives should understand their roles and be correctly briefed. Currently, UNICEF does not have standard terms of reference.

There is a conflict of interest policy. Conflicts of interest facing UNICEF can be at the organizational level or at the individual staff level. The potential for conflict of interest in partnerships can be mitigated in five ways: requiring greater clarity on UNICEF roles and partnership policies and procedures; making partnership decisions on the basis of more objective criteria that take account of a diversity of relevant viewpoints; disclosure of material information; appropriate management; and avoidance strategies as appropriate.

Senior management appoints the ‘right person in the right place’, based on a correct reading of the partnership context.

Feedback is effective and follow-up actions are implemented.

Effectively discharging these responsibilities is reflected in individual work plans and monitored by supervisors.

**Assessing reputational risks**

UNICEF policy is to avoid partnering with organizations or other entities in breach of core UN norms, including with entities involved or complicit in the violation of human rights and those posing serious risks to the reputation of UNICEF. Private-sector participation in GPPs needs to be scrutinized by UNICEF in terms not only of the added opportunities that private-sector involvement brings to these partnerships but also of the challenges it may pose in cases where business practices are non-compliant with principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In the partnerships in which it participates, UNICEF should ensure that in-kind donation policies are in place that prohibit donations from companies in breach of core UN norms.

6.1.5 The value proposition is reviewed by senior management and is either rejected or approved with or without modifications. The results of the review process are communicated to external and internal stakeholders and kept in a central file.

“The urgent need to sharpen the strategic focus of UNICEF engagement within global programme partnerships to achieve greater results for children entails a rationalization of UNICEF engagement in partnerships, vetted through corporate criteria for engagement. High-level opportunities to bring about positive change among key partners will be pursued to proactively introduce child-centred policy approaches in the global arena. Analytical and technical tools will be designed to support the organization’s ability to identify the comparative advantages of existing and potential partners, provide the rationale for collaboration, and anticipate opportunities.” (Source: UNICEF Biennial support budget for 2010-2011)

**Vetting process**

The SFPCR indicates that engagement decisions should be subject to a vetting process involving internal stakeholders. There is, at present, no such procedural requirement. Lack of a proper authorizing environment more or less inevitably leads to a fragmented decision-making process, exposing UNICEF to several types of risks, such as:

- Engagement decisions are made without sufficient quality control
- Considerations for political and legal dimensions are minimized
- Engagement decisions lack sufficient backing from senior management, thus making it challenging to back up commitment with adequate resources
- Engagement decision may reflect conflicts of interest

While the idea to co-create a new partnership or to engage in an existing partnership may be promoted within UNICEF by anyone, the ultimate decision to commit the organization to a global programmatic partnership should be made by UNICEF senior management and should be informed by the result of a standardized appraisal process involving relevant in-house expertise. Being clear about what constitutes the authorizing environment is an important condition to ensure unity of purpose across management levels. This authorizing environment should be linked to improved criteria and standards for the identification, appraisal and funding of UNICEF engagement in GPPs.
Experience of other organizations is that political considerations often tend to trump the internal review process. Thus, review processes and the implementation of any selectivity methodology can run into resistance and require the support of senior management.

“From UNICEF senior management we get vague messages like ‘lead from behind in partnerships’. Does this mean that we need to push other people, or that we sit at the back of the room and let others take the lead?” Formally we are told to collaborate with these global partnerships, but informally, they are seen as the enemy. There needs to be much more clarity and consistency in the organization.” (Source: UNICEF staff)

Keeping records of engagement decisions

One finding of this study is that UNICEF does not currently have a central repository of information where past engagement decisions in GPPs are recorded. This makes formal evaluations of UNICEF engagement difficult since it is not possible to relate current achievements with initial expectations and commitments.

Communicating engagement decisions

Whenever the collaboration involves the transfer of funds or other resources, supporting documentation exists in the form of a legal agreement. However, these types of collaborations reflect principal and client relationships, which concern only a limited number of roles played by UNICEF and which come into play only in a limited number of the GPPs in which it participates. In most cases, it was not possible to ascertain whether engagement decisions had been communicated to and acknowledged by the partnerships, either in the form of an exchange of letters or of a more formal memorandum of understanding. The process of communicating and acknowledging UNICEF engagement decisions is important from a partnership accountability point of view and also because it allows UNICEF to express the motives and the objectives it will pursue through its engagement, the roles it will be playing, and its expectations regarding the defining features of the partnership.

Engagement decisions should also be communicated to internal stakeholders, thus ensuring unity of purpose across all organizational levels.

6.2 Manage and broker

The SFPCR notes that UNICEF will look for greater organizational coherence and effectiveness in its management of partnerships and collaborative relationships. In the case of GPPs and from an evaluability perspective, it is important to ensure that the following parameters are in place.

6.2.1 The value proposition is translated into a detailed engagement plan with a results framework, a budget and an M&E plan. Ensure that the design conforms to evaluability criteria.

Although engagement in GPPs is mentioned as a crosscutting strategy in the midterm review of the current MTSP, there are no specific and quantifiable targets relating to this aspect in the results frameworks of the revised focus areas and in the integrated M&E framework. Several of these partnerships are listed in the ‘key partnerships’ and in the ‘areas of cooperation’ sections of focus areas, but no engagement targets and related indicators are specified. There were difficulties in trying to define engagement targets in the absence of an overall partnership strategy and a conceptual framework to guide engagement. It would now make sense to fill this gap with an M&E framework based on more specific results frameworks.

An examination of recent annual work plans of several Headquarters sections with specific GPP portfolios shows tremendous variations of treatment both within and across sections. For a minority of partnerships in which UNICEF participates, engagement activities and corresponding budget lines are clearly earmarked. However, in a majority of cases, it was difficult to ascertain whether the sections had planned any activities in support of UNICEF official participation in the GPPs falling under their managerial responsibilities. This situation may reflect varying depths of engagement, ranging from significant to marginal. However, from an

---

66 The midterm report of the MTSP and the subsequent revisions of the annexes (E/ICEF/2008/19) preceded the formulation of SFPCR.
evaluability perspective, once an organizational commitment has been made and a section has been designated as institutional host, appropriate action should be taken and documented to translate a corporate commitment into a multi-year engagement strategy that spans the MTSP time-frame and that is reflected in annual work plans and budgets.

In the case of partnerships where the depth of UNICEF engagement is politically, programmatically and operationally significant and cuts across global, regional and country levels, more elaborate results and accountability frameworks should be developed, reviewed and vetted at appropriate decision-making levels.

**Setting engagement targets**

In developing engagement targets and indicators, consideration will need to be given to the type of results that UNICEF would consider reflective of a relevant and effective engagement.

Effective engagement can be defined as: the extent to which UNICEF has attained or is expected to attain the objective of fostering a child-focused development agenda and has built the capacity of partners and societies to execute effective and efficient social policies for children in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact.

There are at least three approaches that may be used to set engagement objectives and targets, depending on the following attribution criteria:

- **Holistic or integrated approach**: Results for children that are achieved by the partnership as a whole without specific reference to the contributions of individual organizations in casu UNICEF
- **Assessing individual contributions to partnership results**: Results that are achieved by UNICEF and other partners in contributing to the agendas, approaches and implementation capacity of the partnership
- **Value-added or counterfactual of the partnership and UNICEF engagement compared with alternative programming**: Results that are achieved with respect to the value-added or counterfactual of the partnership and individual partners (i.e., what results the partnership could have achieved if UNICEF had not been engaged, and what results UNICEF could have achieved had it opted for an alternative programming approach or partnership)

**Holistic or integrated approach**: The first approach to assessing the effectiveness of UNICEF engagement would consider the partnership as constituting more than the sum of its parts and would look beyond brands, contribution and attribution issues with regards to individual members. It would require adequate design of GPPs with a clear articulation of results at the output, outcome and impact levels. Preferably, it would have a clear reference—to address UNICEF accountability challenges—as to how these results would benefit children. The evaluability of these results would depend not only on adequate design, but also on the existence of monitoring and reporting systems and practices. The large diversity of GPPs makes it unlikely that this level of design might be achieved across all of them. Possible exceptions are those that aim to support the attainment of child-related MDG targets (e.g., UNGEI and FTI in relation to MDG 2/Target 3: Achieving universal primary education/ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling; or GAVI and the Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative in relation to MDG 4/Target 5: Reducing child mortality/reduce by two-thirds the mortality rate among children under five). In certain cases, UNICEF may want to initiate evaluations of specific GPPs. However, these would likely need to be decided jointly with other partners.

**Assessing individual contributions to partnership results**: The second approach would focus on results of UNICEF engagement in GPPs throughout the full cycle from inception to preparation, implementation and completion—where plausible. It would require conceptual clarity of results to be achieved at least at output and outcome levels. This approach might be justified in cases where UNICEF contribution is a determinant for the achievement of results of the partnership. It may also be required in certain cases, e.g., when a member organization like UNICEF needs to justify the use of its resources to donors. For example, if UNICEF had the main responsibility for supplies in the GPEI, then there would be benchmarks against which the performance of this function could be assessed, such as maintaining the cold chain for vaccines, cost efficiency and timeliness. In many cases, it would involve more complex calculations in order to attribute specific UNICEF contributions to overall results. Using the GPEI example, assumptions would have to be made as to what per cent of GPEI impact is attributable to the supply of vaccines by UNICEF. Some would argue that claims of contribution and attribution would run counter to the spirit of true partnership.
Value-added or counterfactual of the partnership, and UNICEF engagement, compared with alternative programming: The five strategic options that UNICEF typically needs to consider when making engagement decisions (co-create, join, modify, disengage, dissolve) might involve the assessment of the value added or counterfactual. Here UNICEF would have to compare results expected to be achieved: by the partnership in the absence of UNICEF engagement; and by UNICEF using other programming approaches or acting through other partnerships. The assessment of outcomes in terms of institutional changes induced in these partnerships by UNICEF engagement (including the performance of the partnership from UNICEF’s vantage point) would lead into, and possibly benefit from evaluations conducted through, the first approach.

The three approaches are by no means mutually exclusive but are probably complementary.

6.2.2 Clarify which management structure will oversee UNICEF engagement. Develop group and individual work plans. Secure catalytic funding if needed. Ensure that relevant business processes, authorizing environments and tools are in place.

The fact that GPPs are mentioned in key strategic documents, such as the MTSP, the new SFPCR, and the Biennial Support Budget for 2010-2011, is an indication of senior management buy-in and commitment to optimizing the UNICEF portfolio of GPPs.

Engagement objectives and corresponding budgets are derived from higher authority. It is necessary to juxtapose the expectations of senior management with the expectations of line managers and to alert senior managers to discrepancies in perceptions. If not reconciled, significant disagreements on engagement objectives can adversely affect the acceptability of future evaluations.

At the senior management level, the authority to oversee overall UNICEF engagement in these partnerships is delegated to the Deputy Executive Director responsible for the Programme Group. The Division of Programmes provides policy guidance and coordinates the management of UNICEF engagement through the complementary efforts of its technical sections and the newly established GPP policy hub in Geneva. In carrying out its work, the Division of Programmes collaborates with the UNICEF legal office and with other divisions such as the Division of Communication, the Division of Policy and Practice, the Public Alliances and Resource Mobilization Office, the Private Fundraising and Partnership Division, and the Supply Division. The GPP policy hub serves as the UNICEF interface with a number of Geneva-based GPPs and funds and supports the Director of Programmes in advocating for greater organizational mainstreaming of UNICEF engagement in these partnerships.

This policy hub has played a useful role in increasing senior management’s attention not only to the leveraging opportunities offered by this category of partnerships but also to the emerging challenges posed by a rapidly expanding portfolio. The unit has ensured that GPPs were appropriately featured in the midterm review of the MTSP and in the new SFPCR. The unit collaborates with similar policy hubs established by several other organizations. A business practice within the Division of Programmes is that the GPP unit and the technical sections work collaboratively through a matrix management approach, whereby the technical sections manage UNICEF engagement in the GPPs falling under their sectoral responsibilities while looking to the GPP unit for policy advice.

SFPCR notes that achieving the new vision will require strengthening the organization’s capacity and internal structures. In this context, the following issues pertaining to UNICEF work in GPPs will need to be addressed:

- While matrix management may have its virtues, its application in the absence of clearly delineated accountabilities often relies on individual goodwill and leads to excessive time spent in interpersonal negotiations to interpret roles and mitigate turf issues.
- Senior management decisions are not always followed through expeditiously at the working levels, leading to problems of credibility.
A strong commitment to certain partnerships at lower managerial levels is not necessarily seen by outside partners as sufficient institutional commitment by UNICEF.

In the absence of a who-does-what in GPPs’ compendium, there is a lack of understanding by external partners and internal stakeholders, particularly at regional and country levels, about the roles of the various actors at Headquarters. Greater transparency and communication about the roles of Headquarters, fields and regions and about how they could most effectively work together with respect to partnership engagement would contribute to stronger linkages and overall efficiency.

A majority of UNICEF staff interviewed perceive that specific guidance on GPP engagement is lacking. Relevant manuals, most importantly the Programme and Policy Manual, should be updated and complemented with issue-specific guidance notes. These guidelines should be developed with the participation of internal stakeholders and be harmonized with those procedures, when they exist, of partner organizations.

6.2.3 Build social capital, internally and with partners. Ensure that engagement objectives and roles are understood, adopted and supported by a network of staff who will determine the ultimate success of UNICEF engagement. Establish ground rules for interaction. Develop partnering skills including negotiation and conflict management.

Brokering consensus and building social capital: A key to successful engagement

When UNICEF has the right people involved in global partnerships, they can be transformational. We have noticed this with recent changes in UNICEF’s engagement with global initiatives in the WASH [waster, sanitation and hygiene] sector, and in the progress made in UNGEI after UNICEF appointed a coordinator for the programme. (Source: UNICEF donor)

There is ample anecdotal evidence that UNICEF has played a significant brokering influence in shaping the governance and management structures of the 42 GPPs in which it plays a governing role. Illustrative examples include the influence played by UNICEF during the genesis of several GPPs such as GAVI, UNGEI, Better Care Network, REACH, UNAIDS and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council. UNICEF is reported to have exercised an influence in the reengineering of several GPPs such as RBM; the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health; and the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition. UNICEF is also credited with having raised other partners’ awareness about the value of ‘partner-centric’ GPPs as opposed to ‘secretariat-centric’ GPPs. However, this evaluation was not able to verify the existence of a system that would have allowed UNICEF to document and aggregate information on internal decisions pertaining to this particular role, thus limiting its evaluability.

The High-Level Advisory Panel advised that it was important for UNICEF to take into account social and political capital in brokering effective partnerships.

Three classic definitions of social capital are proposed:

- The sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrues to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition
- Features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit
- The ability of people to work together for common purposes in groups and organizations

As such, GPPs could be considered as potentially comprising networks and norms that can support collective action to produce global benefits.

Annex 14 provides more extensive notes on this fundamental aspect of successful engagement.

Optimizing vertical and horizontal linkages

Optimizing linkages among UNICEF engagement at global, regional and country levels (vertical harmonization) is key to the effective leveraging of GPPs. Optimizing these linkages requires that UNICEF comparative advantages at these three levels be recognized and that they form the basis of partnership priorities and specific arrangements and agreements, based on an agreed-upon, effective, and enforceable strategic division of labour between UNICEF and other partners. For example, the five-year independent evaluation of the GFATM acknowledges that the GFATM approach during its first five years more accurately reflects a ‘friendship model’ than a genuine ‘partnership model’ and that “existing partnerships are largely based on goodwill and shared impact-level objectives rather than negotiated commitments or clearly articulated roles and responsibilities, and do not yet comprise a well-functioning system for the delivery of global public goods.” In 2008, UNICEF held bilateral consultations with GAVI and the GFATM, with a view to take stock of existing collaborations. Efforts are underway to define roles which UNICEF could commit to play as a member of the GAVI Alliance and as a major collaborator of the GFATM. Such efforts to clarify UNICEF engagement in GAVI and the GFATM are critical from an evaluability perspective and should be progressively expanded to other GPPs deemed of strategic importance for UNICEF.

UNICEF is an organization that operates at country, regional and global levels. The bulk of UNICEF financial resources are invested in country programmes that support the realization of children’s rights and the attainment of the MDGs. UNICEF country programmes are developed using RBM principles and a human rights approach to programming. The latter puts equal emphasis on the quality of processes and the quality of results, as development requires the satisfaction of at least two conditions: the achievement of a desirable outcome and the establishment of an adequate process to achieve and sustain that outcome. These principles have led UNICEF increasingly to pay attention to the system effects of its country programmes and to seek greater harmonization with the programmes supported by other UN organizations in the context of UN coherence efforts (horizontal harmonization). It is in this context that UNICEF, and other UN organizations with operational activities at the country level, could use their brokering capacities to help optimize the interactions between GPPs and funds on the one hand and country systems on the other hand. This role would be consistent with UNICEF commitment to use its influence and know-how to leverage the strategic and allocative priorities of these partnerships in favour of sustainable, system-enhancing, child-related outcomes. In doing so, UNICEF can capitalize on its recognized capacity to interact with governments and its partners at the interface between policy and implementation levels, and can help strengthen the necessary dialogue and interaction between these two levels.

Specific country-level opportunities include expanding current efforts by UNICEF and other development partners to help developing countries identify system bottlenecks that affect their progress towards the MDGs. National plans, strategies and budgets that link the need for additional and predictable resources to the achievement of MDG-related outcomes—and that do so in a system-enhancing manner—create strong incentives for GPPs to align their investments with these national frameworks. Other opportunities relate to UNICEF participation in various types of country-level coordination mechanisms. Participation in national mechanisms established to oversee grant application processes and management (e.g., Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee for Immunization, Country Coordinating Mechanism) offer UNICEF the possibility to influence the design of country applications, to increase their quality and to optimize their effects on country systems.

Annex 13 provides additional notes on the impact of GPPs on country systems.

**Strengthening internal capacities**

Effective engagement requires a number of skills that may require strengthening across the organization. It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to determine what these competencies should be and to assess

---

71 Guided by the principles of cooperation set forth in the updated memorandums of understanding between UNAIDS and the Global Fund, which opens the way for more varied and hands-on relationships between the UNICEF and the Global Fund.
organizational learning and development needs. Nevertheless, this is an urgent matter that will require follow up by qualified groups of staff.

A number of respondents highlighted the need for UNICEF to identify and promote individual partnership ‘engagement leaders’ across the organization. During the course of this study, there were several examples of individual UNICEF staff who had strategically and successfully positioned UNICEF to leverage partnership resources and achieve results.

Engagement leaders leverage social and political capital by developing strong networks and strengthening partnership working to ensure mutual benefit. Respondents, and analyses in the literature, indicate that individuals’ partnership engagement skills have a positive influence across a broad range of partnership functions and impacts.

It is important to realize that the skills needed to lead a single organization are often very different from the skills needed to lead a coalition or partnership. Often, the skills and abilities needed to lead a partnership are supplied by a number of different people who contribute to what has been called ‘shared’ or ‘complementary’ leadership. One analysis synthesizes a list of characteristics of effective engagement leaders. This list is adapted in Table 7 to reflect respondents’ inputs on this topic.

Table 7. Effective engagement leaders...

- Are well connected with global development and policy networks
- Mobilize actors and leverage resources, within UNICEF and with partners, to achieve results
- Provide timely, high-quality information on UNICEF approaches and activities to partners, which is updated and accessible, particularly on the UNICEF website
- Report to stakeholders on partnership-related accomplishments, opportunities, and challenges through formats such as newsletters and reports
- Make partners feel welcome at meetings
- Recognize and respect partners’ roles and comparative advantages and accomplishments, offering praise when it is due
- Solicit opinions and comments during meetings
- Ask for assistance with and coordinate organizational tasks
- Intentionally seek out and welcome views of partners
- Intentionally seek out and welcome perspectives from outside the partnership, particularly to keep up-to-date on GPP-related trends and technologies
- Provide partners with continuing education and learning opportunities, including through secondments of staff between partner organizations and through knowledge management to share evidence, best practices, etc.
- Organize social gatherings for partners to help build social capital, cohesion, communication and trust
- Design activities to strengthen partnership work and effectiveness, for example via comparative ‘tours’ of other GPPs
- Provide principled perspectives in partnership working and help ensure accountability of the partnership to its stakeholders

In addition to reviewing options to upgrade staff, partnering skills and competencies, UNICEF should also consider whether existing incentive structures are conducive to greater motivation of staff to engage effectively in GPP-related areas of work.

“UNICEF is not strategically equipped to deal with current global challenges. If you visit UNICEF country offices they have the same staff profiles that they had 20 or 30 years ago—health officer, nutrition officer, education officer and so on… UNICEF needs to update its staff-skills competencies” (for example on innovative financing, policy and advocacy, partnership management, brokering and negotiation.) (Source: External partner)

6.2.4 Monitor engagement in the context of an evolving partnership process and relationships. Continuously assess high-level risks and opportunities. Make course adjustments as needed.

**Conduct periodic portfolio reviews**

The process of monitoring engagement is important from a management and evaluability standpoint. UNICEF should explore the possibility of undertaking periodic reviews of its portfolio as part of a more dynamic portfolio management process. This process would favour proactivity over reactivity and would entail not only maintaining a database but also assessing the performance of the UNICEF portfolio, either at the aggregate level or at sub-category (sector or outcome) level. It would include a range of processes that would cover the three phases of UNICEF engagement.

For each important aspect of UNICEF engagement, there should be an indication of the types of evidence that would convince managers and superiors that engagement is operating successfully, both at the process and outcome level.

**Feedback mechanism**

Ideally, information on engagement performance should be used by UNICEF managers and policy-makers as a basis for taking corrective action. Given that collecting, processing and feeding back information has a cost, it is important to delineate what types of feedback would trigger what types of managerial reaction.

Establishing more uniform requirements and procedures to manage UNICEF engagement in GPPs, including the institution of a proper authorizing environment, would contribute significantly towards clarifying key management decisions and, as a consequence, the type of information required.

A regular and structured flow of information across the different organizational levels of UNICEF is key to ensuring that: UNICEF learns from the practice of engagement at global, regional and country levels; trends are detected in a timely manner; and good practices are documented to inform policies and strategies.

Information on UNICEF engagement in GPPs varies in form and substance across the organization. As part of this study, a review of country office documents produced during the last three years was conducted in 50 countries. This review provided illustrative examples of UNICEF country-level engagement in GPPs.

While these examples are helpful in illustrating that UNICEF engagement at the country level is significant and diverse, it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between activities reflecting UNICEF roles in various GPPs and more general country programme activities. As a result, the use of this information to detect trends and to document good practice is limited and reflects the absence of a mechanism that would address the specific reporting needs of UNICEF engagement in these partnerships. The mention of GPPs in UNICEF global corporate reports is often limited to a small number of cases for which there is either global evidence of impact (e.g., measles initiative) or evidence of results that can be attributed to a specific UNICEF intervention (e.g., improved success rate of malaria proposals in the context of the GFATM Round 8).

There is a need for updated annual report guidelines for country and regional offices. While UNICEF guidelines for the 2008 country office annual reports, regional analysis reports, and division annual reports75 include for the first time specific reporting requirements for GPPs, these requirements are limited to the regional analysis reports. Given that UNICEF engages in these partnerships at all three levels (global, regional, and country), it would make sense that the next iteration of these guidelines provide guidance for reporting at these three levels.

Taking advantage of the One ERP Initiative76, the Division of Programmes has proposed to the One ERP team to insert the following questions in the business blueprint on country programme implementation:

---

76 ERP stands for Enterprise Resource Planning. The One ERP initiative aims at designing and implementing a single ERP software application system to provide UNICEF with an organization-wide platform to manage its business processes, as well as to incorporate changes to UNICEF policy and processes necessary to streamline its approach for
What GPPs are active at the country level?
What roles has UNICEF played as part of its global membership?
What results have been achieved by these partnerships that can be attributed to UNICEF?

If implemented effectively, this system may provide the critical information that is currently lacking for UNICEF to assess more correctly the many different facets of its engagement across organizational levels.

6.3 Review and realize

6.3.1 Take advantage of independent reviews and evaluations of GPPs to assess the effect of UNICEF engagement on partnership processes and results.

The increasing emphasis on good governance principles places an onus on partners to periodically evaluate the performance of GPPs. Most of these partnerships undergo independent reviews and evaluations on a periodic basis, dictated by statutes and bylaws in the case of formally structured partnerships, or dictated by circumstances and partnership maturity. The latter often occurs when there is a feeling among the partners that a partnership is struggling to make progress or when a partnership is transitioning from one phase to another phase.

In 2007, the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank and the OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation issued the World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook, which has been cited repeatedly in these discussions. It appears that UNICEF has played a positive role in promoting the principles contained in this Sourcebook. In all the GPPs in which it participates, UNICEF should continue to raise awareness about the existence of this Sourcebook and should work with partners to ensure that the evaluation design conforms to existing international standards.

The World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook makes useful but limited reference to human rights principles and gender issues. Human rights are mentioned only once in relation to corporate social responsibility. When the Sourcebook is revised, UNICEF could lend its support to strengthen its gender equality and human rights components.

6.3.2 Ensure that the design of evaluations and reviews of GPPs includes an assessment of institutional engagement and follows international standards for evaluating GPPs as well as a human rights-based approach to programming and RBM evaluation principles.

Most of the GPPs in which UNICEF participates have been subjected to independent reviews or evaluations. While the main purpose of these evaluations is to assess the overall performance of the partnership, in a limited number of cases there is also an attempt to assess the performance of individual partner organizations.

The World Bank/OECD-DAC Sourcebook, while helpful in evaluating the performance of GPPs, does not provide sufficient guidance for evaluating institutional engagement. The development of internationally accepted criteria and methods to evaluate institutional engagement in GPPs would be a very helpful complement to the current Sourcebook. Development of such criteria would have two main objectives:

- To ensure that evaluations of GPPs include an assessment of the roles played by partners in contributing to the partnership’s goals and objectives. Expected benefits of conducting this kind of assessment more systematically would be greater institutional accountability and buy-in and clearer division of labour based on partners’ comparative advantages.
- To guide meta-evaluations of institutional engagement in GPPs. Aside from helping organizations evaluate their engagement across multiple GPPs, development of internationally accepted criteria would also strengthen the comparability of these evaluations across organizations.

UNICEF could play a useful role in collaborating with other parties on the development of a standard methodology for evaluating institutional engagement in GPPs. In the meantime, UNICEF should advocate to its

partners that the evaluation design of GPPs should include an assessment of the roles played by institutional partners.

6.3.3 With partners, assess the implications of evaluation results and agree on the next partnership phase (dissolve, intensify, modify).

The results of independent reviews and evaluations often lead to major strategic adjustments. It is important to realize that it takes time for any partnership, including a GPP, to achieve a satisfactory level of maturity. When the partnership dynamic is less than optimal, discussions among partners can rapidly become polarized and lack objectivity. Independent reviews and evaluations, if well designed and conducted by qualified evaluators, can provide unbiased partnership scenarios. These moments provide UNICEF with critical windows of opportunity to advocate for more evidence-based and child-friendly objectives and strategies, and for sound governance processes.

6.3.4 Provide a management response to evaluation findings on institutional engagement. Reassess and redefine UNICEF engagement.

UNICEF management does not seem to systematically review the results of independent reviews and evaluations of the GPPs in which it participates with the view to make potential engagement adjustments. If these internal reviews take place, they are not documented. UNICEF should consider establishing such a standard practice. Any decision to modify the nature of its engagement as a result of such internal reviews should be communicated to the partners and to the chair of the board or steering committee (in the case of formal partnerships). These internal reviews should be documented and records kept in a central file.

6.3.5 Identify and disseminate good practices and lessons learned and share credit.

The multiplication of independent reviews and evaluations conducted during the last 10 years has led to a growing body of knowledge and evidence on the performance of a large number of GPPs in which UNICEF participates. Given that UNICEF and several other organizations share similar portfolios, these organizations may want to consider commissioning a meta-analysis or synthesis of these evaluations with the view to deriving common trends and good practices. Such a synthesis of evaluations of GPPs would take into account qualitative and quantitative data, and would help identify the factors that matter in ensuring that effective institutional engagement leads to better partnership results. This collaborative effort could be of major interest to further assess the overall value of GPPs as a development instrument.
ANNEX 1. METHODS AND ADVISORY MECHANISMS

Data collection and analytical methods

An iterative and consultative process was used to organize, analyse and integrate the data from the different methods used in this study. The analysis and the approach were both inductive and deductive. Throughout the process, an inductive approach was used to generate and modify analytical themes in light of the emerging data from the interviews, country visits, case studies and document review. A deductive approach was used to analyse the emerging findings in relation to previous related assessments and evaluations. The final analysis was guided by a triangulation of consultative process and the two approaches.

This allowed for two levels of analysis or inference: direct findings from the primary data collected, and a determination of the extent to which these data were congruent with theoretical perspectives and previous empirical analyses.

Methods included: baseline definitions and GPP portfolio development; interviews with UNICEF staff, GPP partners and other stakeholders; GPP case and country sampling and selection; GPP cases selected for in-depth analysis; country visits to UNICEF regional and country offices; review of country programming documents, annual reports and GPP-related literature; guidance from the UNICEF senior management Steering Committee; feedback from a high-level advisory panel; and developing a conceptual model to guide UNICEF engagement in GPPs highlighting the management changes required for effective engagement.

Baseline definitions and portfolio development: Key operational definitions had to be developed to inform the study. These definitions were discussed, modified and tested throughout the course of the study. The study also included the development of a GPP sampling universe that includes all global initiatives that match the GPP definition adopted by the Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs (Annex 3). This led to the development of a baseline portfolio of GPPs in which UNICEF was de facto engaged. This was an initial attempt to describe the UNICEF GPP portfolio, something which had not been done before for UNICEF. The baseline portfolio is included in Annex 11 of this report.

Interviews: More than 250 people were interviewed during this study in face-to-face, group and telephone interviews (Annex 4). Interviewees included UNICEF staff, GPP partners, government officials and analysts who had evaluated GPPs. The support of the Programme Partnerships Unit in Geneva and the Evaluation Office in New York played an important role in identifying key respondents and scheduling interviews. Semi-structured interview guides were used to facilitate the interviews, with topics explored and added to greater or lesser extents depending on the specific respondents.

GPP cases: Seven GPPs were selected for more in-depth assessment of UNICEF engagement. Besides reviewing secondary data on the selected GPPs, including websites, evaluations, and other reports, interviews were conducted with related UNICEF focal points and GPP partners to understand their perspectives on UNICEF engagement. These GPP cases were particularly important in identifying and analysing issues related to UNICEF engagement in GPPs, given the lack of baseline and monitoring data on this topic. However, we did not develop individual case studies per se given the varied and incomplete data on UNICEF engagement. One objective of the case studies was to allow UNICEF to start to formulate more precisely the questions that would need to be asked in the next stage of evaluating the effectiveness of UNICEF engagements and to formulate recommendations applicable to assessing and improving the entire UNICEF GPP portfolio.

The GPP Evaluation Steering Group made the following recommendations for GPP case selection:

- GPP selection should reflect the breadth and scope of the ‘GPP universe’.
- GPPs selected for case study should match the approved definition of GPP.
- To the extent possible, there should be a mapping of local partners who have strategic linkages with the GPP studied and, therefore, a consideration of the GPP as operating in a wider network of influence.
- GPP selection should include the low- and middle-income context to all for comparison across the depth of engagement that UNICEF exercises at these different levels.
- GPPs for which recent external evaluations have been conducted could be prioritized. These evaluations usually provide useful information on the effectiveness of partner engagement.
- There should be a balance between loose and structured partnerships.

---
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The GPP case and country selection was also guided by the feasibility, time and cost considerations of the evaluation.

The inception report for this evaluation provides further details on the sampling and selection strategies of GPP cases. The following GPPs were selected:

- Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers (CSUCS)
- Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)
- International Health Partnership and Related Initiatives (IHP+)
- Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
- United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI)
- Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP)

**Country visits to UNICEF country and regional offices:** For each selected GPP case, the EA examined the modalities of UNICEF engagement at the country level. Country visits were conducted to cover four UNICEF country offices and four regional offices, in addition to visits to UNICEF Headquarters in New York and Geneva:

- Thailand – Bangkok (regional and country office)
- Indonesia – Jakarta (country office)
- Senegal – Dakar (regional office)
- Mali – Bamako (country office)
- Kenya – Nairobi (regional and country office)
- Switzerland – Geneva (regional office and Programme Partnership Unit)
- United States – New York (Headquarters and Steering Group)

Through the country visits, the study examined UNICEF Headquarters, regional office and country office linkages that affect UNICEF engagement in GPPs. Aspects related to application of Paris Declaration Principles on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action were explored as well. The country visits involved consultations with UNICEF staff, central and local government officials, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, multilateral and bilateral agencies, and other key stakeholders such as experts who had conducted GPP-related evaluations. Each country visit included a debriefing presentation for UNICEF senior management at the end of the visit. The country visits also informed the mapping of GPPs in UNICEF’s baseline portfolio.

**Document review:** To supplement the limited number of country visits, planning and programme documents from UNICEF Headquarters, regional offices and more than 50 country offices were reviewed. These planning and programming documents included the UNDAF reports, UNICEF country programme documents, and country and regional annual reports. These documents were searched using a key word search tool (DT Search) based on the GPPs in the UNICEF baseline portfolio. The search results were reviewed and the results categorized and collated by GPP, region, sector and country.

In addition, documents from the UNICEF intranet, websites of GPPs, and other documents were consulted, including UN General Assembly Resolutions, the World Summit Outcome documents, UNICEF Executive Board papers, programming guidelines and documents, and evaluation reports. Additionally, the team also consulted reviews and evaluations of GPPs, the Paris and Accra documentation on aid effectiveness, MDG progress reports, and other documents relevant to GPP performance and UNICEF engagement, including with respect to their sectoral focus.

**Briefings and feedback on the study:** Regular briefings on the study were conducted to elicit feedback from external respondents and UNICEF staff to help validate, contextualize and fill in gaps in the emerging findings and recommendations. Drafts of the report were also circulated to members of GPPs in which UNICEF is engaged to get input into the findings and final recommendations for UNICEF engagement in GPPs. Additionally, the UNICEF Steering Committee provided guidance and support to the evaluation team throughout the process.

**Advisory and steering committees**

*Two key mechanisms for the validation of findings and generation of recommendations were the UNICEF Steering Committee and the high-level advisory panel.*

**UNICEF Steering Committee:** The UNICEF Director of Programmes chaired the GPP Steering Committee, which comprised senior management across several Headquarters’ divisions (Office of the Executive Direc-
High-level advisory panel: A high-level advisory panel (Annex 15) was established to review the evaluation findings and provide strategic guidance for UNICEF engagement in GPPs. Advisory panel members were selected to include perspectives from public and non-public sectors, as well as experience with, and analysis of, UNICEF engagement in GPPs.

Quality considerations

Relevance and communication: Regular consultations with external experts and communication with the UNICEF Programme Partnerships Unit, Evaluation Office and Steering Committee aimed at ensuring the quality, completeness and relevance of the study. The Steering Committee was particularly important in broadening UNICEF input to, and ownership of, the process in that it included as members both senior management and technical staff, from different divisions and sections at Headquarters and, on a more limited basis, consultation with regional and country through phone and e-mail.

Confidentiality and acceptability: The Evaluation Office handled the initial introductions with respondents and set up interviews. During the interviews, respondents were informed of the purpose of the interview, asked for their consent, and were assured confidentiality in the reporting of findings. In certain instances, respondents were comfortable with, or even requested that, their name or project be explicitly identified. Interviews were continually adapted for clarity and usability. Response times were assessed to avoid respondent burden.

Triangulation, reliability and validity: The use of multiple data sources and methods served to address gaps and limitations that were associated with any single source or method. Developing operational definitions, evaluation questions, baseline portfolios and a conceptual model helped ensure consistency and reliability across the evaluation methods. Regular feedback from interview respondents, the high-level advisory panel, the UNICEF Programme Partnership Unit, the Steering Committee, and the Evaluation Office helped ensure the validity and utility of emerging findings. The introduction of the advisory panel as a sounding board for the preliminary analysis and emerging findings and recommendations was valuable in informing and shaping this final report.

Generalizability: This study referred to previous empirical and theoretical GPP-related analyses, allowing for analytic generalizability, and adopted several quality assurance steps. These steps helped generalize the findings and recommendations to a wider context of UNICEF-GPP engagement and GPPs, beyond the specific case studies, country visits and interviews conducted. Documentation from the World Bank and WHO were particularly helpful in this regard.
## ANNEX 2. PRIORITIZED EVALUATION QUESTIONS: ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS, AVAILABLE KNOWLEDGE AND GAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Relevance and alignment</th>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is UNICEF engagement in GPPs aligned with the organization’s medium-term strategic priorities? | - Purpose of engagement in GPPs is explained in UNICEF strategic documents.  
- Participation in specific GPPs is mentioned in the results frameworks of MTSP focus areas.  
- Engagement decisions include reference to relevant MTSP focus areas.  
- GPP portfolio analysis includes a classification of GPPs by MTSP focus area.  
- Details on how UNICEF engagement contributes to strategic priorities are included in specific engagement strategies and results frameworks. | - The midterm review of the MTSP and the strategic framework on partnerships and collaborative relationships mention engagement in GPPs as a crosscutting strategy.  
- The revised annexes to the MTSP mention a number of GPPs in the results frameworks of focus areas. However, not all GPPs in which UNICEF participates are indicated.  
- No systematic record of past engagement decisions exists. When available, documentation does not always include reference to relevant MTSP focus areas.  
- GPP-specific engagement strategies and results frameworks are not currently an organizational requirement. |
| 2. Are GPP activities competing with, or substituting for, activities that UNICEF would otherwise implement through its standard programming approach? | - Existence of standard criteria and methods.  
- Engagement decisions are based on a proactive assessment of alternative scenarios, ideally using a counterfactual analysis approach.  
- Engagement monitoring and reporting mechanisms include information on substitution and/or displacement effects. | - Existing UNICEF guidelines do not include standard criteria and methods for the counterfactual assessment of UNICEF engagement in GPPs.  
- No systematic record of past engagement decisions exists. When available, documentation rarely includes counterfactual analysis.  
- Providing information on substitution and/or displacement effects is not a requirement of existing monitoring and reporting mechanisms. |
| 3. How relevant, effective and sustainable are GPPs as partnership instruments to advance the MDGs? | - Evidence from published literature.  
- Findings from independent reviews of specific GPPs.  
- Standard methods for evaluating GPPs and institutional engagement. | - Growing body of literature on GPPs. The literature contains analyses of desired GPP characteristics and respondents made recommendations on these criteria.  
- Existence of a standard methodology for evaluating global and regional partnership programmes. This should be complemented by a standard method to evaluate institutional engagement.  
- Growing number of independently conducted GPP reviews using standard World Bank/OECD-DAC methodology.  
- Future efforts to strengthen the evidence base could include the realization of a meta-analysis of all independent reviews conducted so far. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Coherence and integration</th>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is the UNICEF approach to GPP engagement aligned with that of other UN organizations in keeping with the need for harmonization across the UN system? | • Policy documents and engagement decisions and strategies include information on harmonization.  
• Existence of harmonization criteria and indicators.  
• Existence of information on interagency process to harmonize engagement. | • Documented harmonization efforts concern several GPPs (e.g., GAVI, GFATM, UNAIDS, RBM, FTI, etc.). Harmonization efforts relate to partnership development, preparation of board meetings, strategic and evaluation planning, and resource mobilization.  
• Limited information available on harmonization of organizational policies.  
• Information available on nascent efforts to develop interagency harmonization working group. |
| 2. How do decisions to engage at the global level affect regional and country-level UNICEF programming practices? | • Existence of generic field guidance on GPPs.  
• Information on engagement decisions and programming implications is communicated to regional and country offices. | • Generic field guidance on GPPs is not available.  
• Information is limited to major GPPs, such as global funds and coordination platforms like UNAIDS. |
| 3. How well is UNICEF engagement in GPPs harmonized with other partnering and collaborative roles played by UNICEF, as perceived by UNICEF staff and GPP partners? | • Existence of feedback information system on UNICEF comparative performance in different partnership categories. | • No such system in place. Nascent efforts to strengthen communications between partnership functions as part of implementation of the SFPCR. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Efficiency and effectiveness</th>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does UNICEF have an agreed definition of effective and efficient engagement? If not, how do UNICEF staff define effective and efficient engagement in GPPs?</td>
<td>• Relevant information included in UNICEF policy documents.</td>
<td>• Not available. A definition is proposed in Chapter VII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. To what extent have GPPs produced results that support UNICEF corporate priorities? | • Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.  
• Findings from the MTSP Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. | • GPP reviews and evaluations available. These studies provide limited information on the relationship between partnership achievements and their impact on partners’ institutional priorities. This situation reflects evaluation designs that give marginal emphasis to ‘partner-centric’ benefits.  
• With the exception of the UNGEI evaluation, no other GPP evaluations are mentioned in the revised MTSP Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways have GPPs contributed resources to support UNICEF country programmes?</td>
<td>• Information from contribution management system.</td>
<td>• Information is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Have UNICEF programming practices in selected countries influenced the alignment and operations of selected GPPs? | • Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.  
• Country office annual reports. | • Evidence available for a limited number of GPPs (e.g., RBM, HMN, FTI).  
• Country office annual report guidelines need updating. |

### D. Role and nature of UNICEF engagement and influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevant information included in UNICEF policy documents.  
Engagement decisions and strategies include information on roles and comparative advantages.  
Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.  
• There is limited documentation on engagement decisions. When available, documentation does not always include reference to roles UNICEF commits to play as part of its engagement.  
• Limited evidence available from GPP independent reviews and evaluations.  
• GPP-specific engagement strategies and results frameworks are not currently an organizational requirement.  
• No feedback information system in place. |
| Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.  
Existence of feedback information system. | • Information on partners’ perceptions of the performance of UNICEF in its engagement in GPPs is limited to the feedback obtained from the interviews conducted during this exercise. |
### E. Communication and dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of dedicated systems to ensure that relevant information is communicated to internal and external stakeholders in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Nascent efforts exist to establish dedicated GPP information systems that can build on existing platforms such as the UNICEF intranet and website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of dedicated systems to ensure that relevant information is communicated to internal and external stakeholders in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Corporate reporting on engagement results is often limited to a small number of cases for which there is either global evidence of impact (e.g., measles initiative) or evidence of results that can be attributed to a specific UNICEF intervention (e.g., improved success rate of malaria proposals in the context of the Global Fund Round 8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Management, oversight and monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a vetting process involving all relevant internal stakeholders.</td>
<td>There are at present no such procedural requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are recorded and kept in a central file.</td>
<td>Information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial GPP inventory and baseline GPP portfolio available for comparison purpose.</td>
<td>No systematic recording and filing of engagement decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement decisions.</td>
<td>Completed independent GPP reviews and evaluations provide useful but limited evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of relevant business processes, tools and guidelines.</td>
<td>The need to improve business processes and develop relevant tools and guidelines is identified in the SFPCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings from independent GPP reviews and evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. How well is the UNICEF management structure suited and resourced to effectively manage its engagement in GPPs?

- Adequacy analysis of current management structure compared to what would be required to implement the new vision expressed in the SFPCR.
- Availability of information on approaches used by UNICEF to manage its engagement in GPPs has improved significantly since 2007. There was no information relevant to UNICEF engagement in GPPs in biennial budget documents established for the current biennium. The descriptive of the biennial support budget for 2010-2011 now contains information on the strategic intents that will be pursued by UNICEF during the 2010-2011 biennium in its engagement in GPPs.

### 6. What are the most important organizational changes that UNICEF needs to put in place to make its engagement in GPPs more effective?

- Assessment of current engagement planning and management processes based on a conceptual approach to guide UNICEF engagement in GPPs.
- The descriptive of the biennial support budget for 2010-2011 contains information on the most important organizational changes that will be pursued by UNICEF during the 2010-2011 biennium in its engagement in GPPs.

### G. Sustainability, risks and exit strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information requirements</th>
<th>Available knowledge and gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. What are the transaction costs of UNICEF engagement in GPPs, specifically as related to the selected GPP cases?</strong> Based on the data, does UNICEF senior management view this engagement as sustainable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of methods to measure costs of engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information on planned and actual costs of engagement, disaggregated by type of role and level (global, regional, country) of engagement, and source of input (e.g., staff time, cash-based support).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information on the availability of methods to measure costs of engagement and engagement sustainability points to the absence of such methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. What risks have arisen from UNICEF engagement in GPPs? How well did UNICEF handle these risks? What are the key recommendations to mitigate such risks?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement decisions and strategies include risk assessment and mitigation plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement monitoring includes a risk detection component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information on organizational expectations for managing risks within the risk categories commonly identified within UNICEF (‘financial’, ‘hazard’, ‘strategic’ and ‘operational’) is contained in the UNICEF Risk Reference Guide issued in 2008, notably in relation to partner relations and management of third parties but this information lacks specificity with regards to the management of risks associated with UNICEF engagement in GPPs. Information on risk assessment of GPPs is available on a case-by-case basis, often triggered by specific events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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ANNEX 3. DEFINITIONS RELEVANT TO GPPs

Global Fund and Partnership—An initiative that transcends national boundaries and involves a group of participants working on a common set of activities to further progress towards the achievement of global development goals.  

Global Health Partnership—A collaborative relationship that transcends national boundaries and brings together at least three parties, among them a corporation (and/or industry association) and an intergovernmental organization, so as to achieve a shared health-creating goal on the basis of a mutually agreed division of labour.

Global Programmes—Partnerships and related initiatives, the benefits of which are intended to cut across more than one region of the world and in which the partners: reach explicit agreements on objectives; agree to establish a new (formal or informal) organization; generate new products or services; and contribute dedicated resources to the programme. Global programmes provide dedicated resources to achieve a high priority objective, with the potential of private-sector partnerships, results-based approaches and innovations...at the cost of adding a supply led instrument likely to complicate donor harmonization and the alignment of government priorities.

Global Programme Funds (GPFs)—These are large multi-country funds that contain a significant element of earmarked funding for specific objectives with thematic, sectoral or subsectoral breadth. GPFs are financing instruments of global programmes, which are generally structured as ‘partnerships’ involving shared decision making by several different organizations or partners. (However, some may be bilateral programmes.) GPFs often take a ‘vertical’ approach that targets the programme funds to a specific issue (with thematic, sector, or subsector breadth), compared to the ‘horizontal’ approach of traditional aid instruments (bilateral and multilateral) that cover a broad range of development issues, and to the country-based model of aid. They lead to an increase in the importance of the specific interventions they support in the overall financing for a given country.

Global Programmes and Partnerships—Partners commit resources (financial, technical, personnel, or reputation) towards a common objective. The programme is organized at the regional, global, or institutional level (although activities may be delivered at the country level).

Global Programme Partnerships (GPPs)—GPPs are voluntary and collaborative relationships that:

- Reach an explicit agreement at the global level on programmatic objectives that are relevant to the promotion and protection of children’s rights and the achievement of internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs. This was a criterion developed during the course of the evaluation, in consultation with the high-level advisory panel. In the course of discussing this definition, the question arose whether GPPs should also be defined in relation to their relevance to the promotion and protection of children’s rights, given the importance of this issue to UNICEF. Adding the promotion and protection of children’s rights as a desirable attribute of GPPs is potentially useful as a selectivity criteria to guide UNICEF engagement.

- Involve multiple public and non-public stakeholders who are actively engaged in the partnership and programmatic decision making at the global level. The terms public and non-public are used to align with the UN definition of partnerships. UNICEF has established mechanisms for engaging in bilateral partnerships, for example with corporations, civil society organizations and with the UN system. There are different programmatic and management implications for UNICEF if multiple stakeholders are
collectively and continually involved in programmatic decision making at the global level, and if UNICEF is one among several voices.

- **Have programmatic objectives that extend across more than one region of the world.** This criterion is important for UNICEF because this goes beyond the country programming approach that is the mainstay of UNICEF decentralized management. The need to coordinate across multiple countries and regions raises specific management issues for UNICEF with reference to coherence, communication, and coordination in the organization—both horizontally and vertically. This criterion includes programmes of a global public good nature, for example, in which all countries have a direct stake, either in terms of costs (i.e., of not acting) or benefits (i.e., in mitigating climate change or containing communicable diseases), and international programmes the intended benefits of which are targeted largely to developing countries (e.g., MDGs).

- **Establish formal or informal modalities of cooperation to meet these objectives in a medium-term or long-term framework.** Specifying the requirement that GPPs establish modalities for ongoing cooperation and that the objectives are of a medium- or long-term nature would be useful for UNICEF, as it would preclude more short-term and transient initiatives that do not warrant the same type of institutional support as part of UNICEF engagement.

**Global Public-Private Partnership**—The five defining characteristics of global public-private partnerships are: voluntary—arising from the partners’ self-interest; horizontally organized—maintaining the partners’ autonomy; participatory—involving joint governance and specifying the issues on which partners will consult or decide jointly; multi-actor based—bringing together different actor groups, such as government and intergovernmental organizations, business, academia, civil society, and charitable or philanthropic foundations; and global—addressing issues or involving activities of worldwide reach and sometimes of multigenerational scope.

OR

True public-private partnerships begin by identifying the central problem, then asking who should help solve it. They may be initiated from the private, government or civil society sector, but they are not about the narrow plan of any one partner. Public-private partnerships are about shared agendas and combined resources, risks, rewards, and linkages that can magnify scale. True public-private partnerships: are voluntary and build on the respective strengths of each partner; optimize the allocation of resources; achieve mutually beneficial results over a sustained period; and involve written agreements that specify the purpose and duration of the partnership, governance, and exit arrangements.

**Global and Regional Partnership Programmes (GRPPs)**—These are programmatic partnerships in which: the partners contribute and pool resources (financial, technical, staff and reputational) toward achieving agreed-upon objectives over time; the activities of the programme are global, regional or multi-country (not single-country) in scope; and the partners establish a new organization with a governance structure and management unit to deliver these activities.

**Multi-stakeholder Partnerships**—Involve two or more organizations from across the public, private and civil society spheres that enter into a collaborative arrangement. Multi-stakeholder partnerships move beyond unilateral actions and conventional contracts by pooling complementary resources and genuinely sharing the risks and benefits.

---
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ANNEX 4. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

UNICEF STAFF

New York Headquarters

**Division of Programmes**

*Child Protection*
Rebecca Symington, CSUCS Focal Point
Anne Grandjean, Child Protection Specialist
Sharif Baaser, Child Protection Specialist
Stella Schumacher, Child Protection Specialist
Julie Myers, Child Protection Specialist

*Nutrition*
Werner Schultink, Chief, Nutrition Section
Nita Dalmiya, Micronutrients Specialist
Ian Darnton-Hill, Senior Adviser

*Education*
Changu Mannathoko (Standing in for Cheryl Gregory Faye as UNGEI Focal Point)
Dina Craissati, Senior Adviser
Anna Maria Hoffmann, Project Officer

*Health*
Peter Salama, Chief, Health Section
Renee van de Weerdt, Chief Maternal, Newborn and Child Health
Mark Young, Senior Health Specialist
Maritel Costales, Senior Adviser
Ahmed Magan, Chief, Immunization

*HIV/AIDS*
Corinne Woods
Thilly de Bodt, HIV/AIDS Adviser
Moira Wilkinson, Consultant (Education)

*Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)*
Clarissa Brocklehurst, Chief, WASH Section
Therese Dooley, Senior Adviser
Henk Van Norden, Senior Adviser
Oluwafemi Odediran, Senior Adviser

*Office of Emergency Programmes*
Annalies Borrel, Senior Adviser

*Division of Policy and Practice*
Richard Morgan, Director
Balaji Narasimhan, Chief, Strategic Planning

*Governance, UN and Multilateral Affairs Division*
Bjorn Gillsater, Chief, Multilateral Affairs

*Office of the Executive Director*
Bernt Aasen, Chief of Staff
Peter Mason, Principal Adviser
Division of Communication
Sharad Shapra, Director

Public-sector Alliances and Resource Mobilization Office
Afshan Khan, Director
Jonathan Cauldwell, Senior Adviser

Geneva

Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States
Maria Calivis, Regional Director
Shahnaz Kianian-Firozqar, Deputy Regional Director

Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division
Philip O’Brien, Director
Michael Klaus, Project Manager, Strategic Framework for Partnerships and Collaborative Relationships

Office of Emergency Programmes
Dermot Carty, Deputy Director

Indonesia
Marcoluigi Corsi, Deputy Representative
Niloufar Pourzand, Planning, M&E
William Hawley, Health, Malaria, RBM, GFATM
Vinoz Bura, EPI, GAVI
Anne Vincent, Nutrition
Sri Sokotjo
Douglas Booth, Water and Sanitation
Jasmine Byrne, Child Protection
Sharifah Tahir, HIV/AIDS
Pak Jiyono, UNICEF Education Officer

Thailand
Chris Davids, UNICEF EAPRO
Mark Henderson, UNICEF EAPRO (WES)
Sawon Hong
Amalee McCoy
UNICEF EAPRO, Social and Child Protection
Cliff Meyers, UNICEF EAPRO, Education
Laura Bill
Mary, UNICEF EAPRO (IASC)
Wing Se Cheng, UNICEF HIV/AIDS EAPRO
Andrew Morris, UNICEF Thailand Country Office

Kenya
Per Engebak, Regional Director (ESARO)
Dorothy Rozga, Deputy Regional Director (ESARO)
Tesafaye Shiferaw, Health (ESARO) (IHP)
Saba Mebrahtu, Nutrition (ESARO)
Jan Heeger, IASC (WASH) (ESARO)
David Delienne, WSP (ESARO)
Penny Campbell, HIV/AIDS (ESARO)
Peter Hailey, Nutrition (ESARO)
Lisa Doherty, IASC Education (ESARO)
Aster Haregott, UNGEI (ESARO)
Yumiko Yokozeki, Education (ESARO)
Olivia Yambi, Representative (KCO)
Juan Ortiz-Iruri, Deputy Representative (KCO)
Sarah Cameroon, Communication (KCO)
Noreen Prendiville, Chief, Nutrition (KCO)
Radhika Chandrasekhar, Social Budgeting (KCO)
Sanjiv Gupta, Health (KCO)
Kennedy Ongwae, Health (KCO)
Linda Beyer, Nutrition (KCO)

Senegal – West and Central Africa Regional Office
Esther Guluma, Regional Director, UNICEF WCARO
Barbara Bentein, Deputy Regional Director, UNICEF WCARO
Heide Richter-Airijoki, Principal Adviser CSD WCARO
Christina Bierring, Regional Chief of M&E, Planning Section, UNICEF WCARO
Eric Mercier, Regional Chief of HIV
Macoura Oulare, Senior HIV-PMTCT/Paediatric Care Specialist
Christine Naré Kaboré, HIV Specialist, CABA
Tifenn Humbert
Thomas Munyuzangabo, Young People and AIDS Prevention Specialist
Katrien Ghoos, Nutrition Manager
Joachim Theis, Chief Child Protection
Catherine Flago thi er, Programme Officer, Child Protection
Pierre Ferry, Child Protection Specialist
Dede A. Houdedakor Odette, Child Protection Adviser
Vigdis Cristofoli, Education Specialist
Chris Cormency, Regional Adviser WES

Mali
Marcel Rudasingwa, Représentant UNICEF
Deborah McWhinney, Représentante Adjointe
Robert Ndamobissi, Point Focal UNICEF de l’évaluation
Christine Sow, Chef Programme Survie de L’Enfant
Adam Zakari, Chef de Section Protection
Assane Amadou, Chef de Section Education
Idrissa Diarra, Point Focal UNICEF de l’Education
Aminata Sangare, Point Focal Genre
Assitan Hanguine, l’Administrateur de HIV/AIDS

GPP Partners

United States

World Bank
Joy Phumaphi, Vice President, Human Development Network, PMNCH Board Chair
Sophia Sdrewnowski, Senior Partnerships Specialist
Jae So, WSP Manager

UNFPA
Purnima Mane, Deputy Executive Director
Hedia Belhadj, Deputy Director, Reproductive Health Branch

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Dan Kraushaar, Deputy Director, Integrated Health Solutions Department

Becton, Dickinson and Company
Gary Cohen, Executive Director
Krista Thompson, Vice President, GM Global Health
Renuka Gadde, Director, Global Health

_Centers for Disease Control and Prevention_
Stephen Blount, Acting Director, Center for Global Health
Director, Coordinating Office for Global Health

_Save the Children, USA_
Ann Tinker, Director, Saving Newborn Lives Programme

_Boston_
Julio Frenk, Dean, Harvard School of Public Health
Gerald Keusch, Associate Provost, Global Health Initiative, Boston University

_United Kingdom_

_DFID_
Peter Colenso, Head of Profession, Education Human Development Group, Policy and Research Division

_London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine_
Gill Walt, Professor, Public Health and Policy

_University of Aberdeen_
Wendy Graham, Principal Investigator, Immpact, University of Aberdeen

_Geneva_

_UNAIDS_
Michel Sidibe, Deputy Executive Director
Elhadj As Sy, Director, Partnerships and External Relations
Denis Broun, Chief, Partnerships Division

_WHO_
Denis Aitken, Assistant Director General
Ian Smith, Adviser to the Director General
Alex Ross, Director, Partnerships and UN Reform
Elizabeth Mason, Director, Child and Adolescent Health
Bruce Aylward, Director, GPEI
Bob Fryatt, International Health Partnership Core Team

_Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases_
Robert Ridley, Director

_Roll Back Malaria_
Awa Coll-Seck, Executive Director
Boi-Betty Udom, Technical Officer
Richard Carr, Technical Officer

_Health Metrics Network_
Sally Stansfield, Executive Secretary

_Global Health Workforce Alliance_
Mubashar Sheikh, Executive Director

_Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research_
Sara Bennett, Manager
Global Alliance on Vaccines and Immunization
Julian Lob-Levyt, Executive Secretary
Nina Schwalb, Deputy Executive Secretary, Director of Policy
Carole Presern, Director Change Management

Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
Hind Othman, Director, EECA/LAC/MENA/LFA Management
Christoph Benn, Director External Relations
Sandii Lwin, Manager, Bilateral and Multilateral Team
Madeleine Leloup, Senior Adviser

Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition
Bérangère Magarino, Partnerships Program Director

UNITAID
Elizabeth Hoff, Chief of Operations

Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative
Dr. Pécoul, Executive Director

Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council
Jon Lane, Executive Director

Medicines for Malaria Venture
Chris Hentschel, President and Chief Executive Officer

World Economic Forum
Tanya Mounier, Associate Director, Global Health Initiatives

Eli Lilly and Company
Patrizia Carlevaro, Head of International Aid Unit

Indonesia

Government
Pak Arum Atmakwikarta, Director of Public Health and Nutrition, Bappenas
Professor Soekirman, Indonesia Fortification Coalition
Kenny Peetosutan, Ministry of Health, Indonesia
Dr. Sigit, Director CDC, AIDS Ministry of Health
Ms. Dayah, CDC, AIDS, Ministry of Health
Mr. Haikin, Executive Secretary, CCM, Department of Health
Hamid Muhammad, Director General, Ministry of National Education
Dr. Gutama, Secretary of Education

Other GPP Partners
Faisal Madani, Coordinator EFA
S. Nomi, Technical Officer
Dr. Madan, WHO Jakarta
Steven Bjorge, WHO Indonesia
Mr. Asri, WHO Indonesia
Nancy Fe, UNAIDS
Isabel Blackett, WSP Indonesia
Feisol Muslim, UNESCO
Thailand

Government of Thailand
Sompomp Sensir, EFA
Dr. Pornjun, EFA
Mrs. Pathoomrat, UNGEI
Manit Teerantikonnont, Ministry of Public Health

Other GPP Partners
Patrick Brenny, UNAIDS Thailand
Leotes Lugo, UNESCO EFATWG

Kenya

Mette Kjaer, AMREF Country Director
Rikka Trangsrud, PATH Country Director

Senegal

Meskerem Grunitzky Bekele, Director, UNAIDS Regional Support Team, Dakar
Placie Gbedonou, EPI Focal Point, OMS/IST, GAVI
David Bulman, Senior Regional Programme Adviser, WFP Regional Bureau
Sonia Munoz, Administrateur Principal, Regional de Protection, Representation Regionale du HCR
Youcef Ait-Chellouche, DM Coordinator, IFRC West/Central Africa Zone
Rokhaya Diawara, Education Officer, UNESCO
Victorine Kemonou Dijirimou, International Education Advocacy and Campaign Coordinator, Action Aid
Stefanie Conrad, Plan International
Claude Emile Rwagacondo, RBM/UNICEF WCARO

Mali

Government of Mali
Salif Samaké, Directeur de CPS
Excellence Touré, Ambassadeur-Ancien Ministre, Directeur de la Coopération Internationale au Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Malick Sene, Secrétaire Exécutif du Haut Conseil de Lutte contre le VIH/SIDA

Other GPP Partners
Monique Kamphuis, Public Health Adviser, First Secretary, Netherlands
Mamadou Diallo, Représentant du FNUAP (Point Focal IHP Nations Unies)
Moctar Hanne, Chargé National des Affaires Humanitaires, UN-OCHA
Yamina Chakar, Coordinatrice de ONUSIDA
Ousmane Diadié Haidara, Specialist en Santé Développement Humain, Banque Mondiale
Mme Alice, Représentante du PAM
Fatou Keita-Guindo, UNESCO
Valérie Dsioze-Gallet, UNESCO
Vincent Seck, UNESCO
Maraiam Fofana, UNESCO
Directeur de l’entreprise privée ORANGE pour le partenariat en faveur de l’éducation

Représentants de:
Stop Sahel, HKI, Africare, Delta Survie, World Education, Bureau International, Catholique pour le jeune enfant

India

Rajan Sankar, GAIN

Philippines

Ryan Silverio, CSUCS, South East Asia Regional Office
Note: AMREF indicates African Medical and Research Foundation; EAPRO, East Asia and Pacific Regional Office; EECA, Eastern Europe and Central Asia; ESARO, Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office; IHP, International Hydrological Programme; IFRC, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; LAC, Latin America and the Caribbean; MENA, Middle East and North Africa; PATH, Program for Appropriate Technology in Health; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; UNOCHA, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs; WCARO, Regional Office for West and Central Africa; WES, Water, Environment and Sanitation; WFP, World Food Programme; and WSP, Water and Sanitation Program.
# ANNEX 5. ACTIVE GPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPP Title</th>
<th>Inception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Access Initiative</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Research Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeras, Global TB Vaccine Foundation</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Global Elimination of Trachoma by the Year 2020</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Communicators for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Care Network</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone and Joint Decade</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Partnerships for Development in Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building for Integrated Water Resources Management</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Online Protection Initiative</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Rights Information Network</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children without Worms</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Alliance</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Initiative</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Munition Coalition</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition on Children Affected by AIDS</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities and Small-Scale Mining</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Industrial Collaboration in Contraceptive Research</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group to Assist the Poor</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countdown to 2015</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors Working Group on Female Genital Mutilation and Cutting</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative DPP</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fast Track Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for All Initiative</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Capacity Building Project</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sector Management Assistance Programme</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Trading Initiative</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Malaria Vaccine Initiative</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour Fortification Initiative</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Resources on Effective School Health</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Water Action Network</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates Foundation/University of North Carolina Partnership for the Development of New Drugs</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Water Alliance</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global AIDS Alliance</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance against Chronic Respiratory Diseases</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for TB Drug Development</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Workers and Communities</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance on Livestock Vaccines</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Eliminate Leprosy</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Prevent Prematurity and Stillbirth</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Buruli Ulcer Initiative</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Campaign Against Epilepsy</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Campaign for Microbicides</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Coalition on Women and AIDS</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Collaboration for Blood Safety</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Collaboration for Development of Pesticides for Public Health</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Corporate Governance Forum</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Donor Platform for Rural Development</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Early Warning System for Zoonotic Diseases</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Forum for Health Research</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund for Community Foundations</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight Aids, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Gas Flaring Reduction Public-Private Partnership</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Guinea Worm Eradication Programme</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Workforce Alliance</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative on Children's Environmental Health Indicators</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative to Eliminate Unnecessary Blindness</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Invasive Species Programme</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Land Tool Network</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Media AIDS Initiative</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Network for Neglected Tropical Diseases</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Disability and Development</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Output-Based Aid</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Polio Eradication Initiative</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Public-Private Partnership for Hand Washing with Soap</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Research Alliance</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Road Safety Forum</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Road Safety Partnership</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Salmonella Surveillance</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Task Force on Cholera Control</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Water Challenge</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Water Partnership</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Nutrition Tracking Service</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Metrics Network</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environments for Children Alliance</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Best Practices Initiative</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative for Cardiovascular Health Research in Developing Countries</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative for Maternal Mortality Programme Assessment</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Group on Violence Against Children</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Coordinating Panel on Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International AIDS Vaccine Initiative</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision for Epidemic Meningitis Control</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision for Yellow Fever Control</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Drug Purchase Facility to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety Authorities Network</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Forum for Rural Transport and Development</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Health Partnership</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Household Survey Network</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Land Coalition</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Initiative/Fund/Programme</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Medical Products Anti-Counterfeiting Task Force</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Network to Promote Household Water Treatment and Safe Storage</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Partnerships for Microbicides</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rainwater Harvesting Alliance</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tax Dialogue</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Group on Innovative Financing to Fund Development</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming Nutrition Initiative</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria No More</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicines for Malaria Ventures</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Initiative</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Foundation for Innovative Finance for Health</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetHope</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Sustained Elimination of Iodine Deficiency Disorders</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners for Parasite Control</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Child Development</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Clean Indoor Air</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Principle 10</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Research on Private Pensions</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Transparency Fund</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Dengue Vaccine Initiative</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTCT Donation Programme</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Environment Partnership</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme on Forests</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype Carbon Fund</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProVention Consortium</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Back Malaria</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Education Fund</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water Supply Network</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Injection Global Network</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small States Network for Economic Development</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee on Nutrition</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Tuberculosis Partnership</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Sanitation Alliance</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Safe Drinking Water Alliance</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sphere Project</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Collaboration on Road Traffic Injury Prevention</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Global Compact</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Girl Education Initiative</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Prevention Alliance</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Integrity Network</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Business Council for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Water Council</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Hearing Care for Developing Countries</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6. EXAMPLES OF GPP TYPOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-level purpose</th>
<th>Supporting strategies</th>
<th>Degree of partnership integration</th>
<th>Structural models</th>
<th>Funding models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Facilitate communication, advocate policy change, and generate and disseminate knowledge and good practices. ▪ Provide country- or local-level technical assistance to support national policy and institutional reforms and capacity strengthening, and to catalyze public or private investment in the sector. ▪ Provide investment resources to support the provision of global, regional or national public goods.</td>
<td>▪ Knowledge development. ▪ Policy advocacy. ▪ Good practice and knowledge sharing. ▪ Awareness and education. ▪ Coordination and harmonization. ▪ Financing. ▪ Product development and technology transfer. ▪ Convening and brokering.</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Coordination:</strong> Shared information. Common purpose. ▪ <strong>Cooperation:</strong> Shared information. Common purpose. Aligned efforts. ▪ <strong>Close collaboration:</strong> Shared information. Common purpose. Aligned efforts. Integrated team.</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Simple affiliation:</strong> Loosest form of alliance. ▪ <strong>Lead partner:</strong> One partner assumes a strong—but not dominant—leadership role. ▪ <strong>General contractor:</strong> One partner is the clear leader, decision maker, and controller of funds—and its staff operates the alliance. ▪ <strong>Secretariat:</strong> Quasi-formal alliance organization and staff, a group of partners operating as more or less equals, and generally having centralized funding. ▪ <strong>Joint venture company:</strong> The partners create a separate legal entity with its own staff and resources, and allow the entity to operate more or less independently.</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Single funder:</strong> One funder supports the initiative. ▪ <strong>Multiple funder:</strong> Multiple funders support an initiative, but do not work together to shape the initiative. ▪ <strong>Funding alliance:</strong> Multiple funders work together to shape the strategy and/or implementation of the initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Categories developed based on strategies indicated in GPP websites.


ANNEX 7. LOOSE AND FORMAL COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

There was much discussion in this study about the merits and challenges of formal and informal organizational structures for GPPs. McKinsey introduced five different models based on the formality of the structure, on the purpose of the initiative and partner and team characteristics. The Department for International Development (DFID) distinguishes between independent (formal) and hosted (less formal) arrangements. A simple distinction, and one explicitly included in UNICEF definition of GPPs, is the distinction between formal and informal organizational structures.

An important dimension to the structure of partnerships is how explicit and legal the structure is. Informal arrangements do not mean unstructured. The structure of the organization can be described as having several different dimensions: whether roles are defined for individuals or for organizations; whether roles for different members are differentiated and described in the formal charter of the organization; and whether partners are legally bound to adhere to the charter and its provisions. It would be an over-simplification to describe a partnership simply as ‘formal’ or ‘informal’, but it is worth looking at the two ends of this dimension in more detail.

A formal organizational structure is one in which the social positions and the relationships among them have been explicitly specified and are defined independently of the personal characteristics of the participants occupying these positions. This is usually done through legal documents, organizational charts, and diagrams and work flow charts. According to organization theory, the “degree of formalization is the extent that roles are independent of specific personal attributes of individuals occupying the roles. Formalization tries to standardize and regulate behaviour.” It also is an attempt to make structure of relationships more visible and explicit.

The advantages of a formal organizational structure are:
- The use of organizational structure as an instrument that can be modified to improve performance.
- Prior formalization can reduce the stress of trying to build relationships between participants, and make roles and relationships more objective and external to participants.
- It can separate personal feelings between participants from the work activities.
- Formalization allows succession to organizational roles and positions to be made routine, and makes personal abilities like charisma less critical to performance in a certain role.

Informal structures are those based on the characteristics or resources of the specific participants. In an informal structure it is difficult to separate the role from the person, and as participants enter and leave the system their roles develop and change as a function of their personal characteristics: “Individual participants...enter the organization with individually shaped ideas, expectations, and agendas, and they bring with them differing values, interests, and abilities.” These informal structures are fairly stable as they form based on individuals’ power and status, work relationships, communication patterns and so forth. Informal structures rely heavily on personal abilities, interests, motivations to cooperate with others, and personal characteristics that may enhance or undermine formal positions. Because positions and relations are not formalized, it might be more difficult to undertake modifications to the network, ensure accountability, and deal with attrition and replacement of key members.

Informal mechanisms constitute a crucial, supplementary role in all formal organizational structures, “Traditionally, governance has focused on the quality of the structure. This has been important in gaining legitimacy in both the corporate and non-governmental settings. However for partnerships, what has often been crucial is how well the structure of the governance supports the informal processes of the organization as it evolves.”

95 Ibid.
96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
98 Ibid.
One criterion to guide UNICEF decision making on engaging with, or developing, a GPP is whether the GPP has the appropriate match between its structure and function. The head of the UNICEF Programme Partnership Unit suggested the following guidelines based on an analysis of the related literature and discussions with other senior UNICEF managers involved in GPPs.

Choose an informal organization structure or loose network when:
- The purpose of the GPP is simple coordination, information sharing, improving partner alignment, policy development or coordination with a well-defined task focus.
- The GPP can be set up in a short time and there are low set-up costs.
- Partners prefer lower transaction costs in their GPP engagement and greater flexibility for individual partner organizations.

Choose a formal organizational structure when:
- The purpose of the GPP is implementation through active and accountable project management teams.
- The GPP involves significant financing and requires clear accountability for funding decisions.
- There is great discrepancy between the different partners' contributions, especially when the majority of financial resources are contributed by one single donor. Also, the more in line the GPP is with the dominant partner's core business, the more this partner will want to control the partnership. Formal organizational structures can create more balanced governance while enhancing credibility and legitimacy among stakeholders.\(^\text{102}\)
- The perceived risk and impact on the organization are deemed to be high, especially when the GPP concerns partners' (in this case UNICEF's) core business. The GPP may also involve 'deep asset mixing' (combination of resources), risk taking, and speedy decision making. Explicit arrangements for shared risk taking and a clear organizational structure and legal framework to identify and mitigate risks, and locate accountability become important in this situation.
- Partners accept the higher costs and time required to establish a GPP with a formal structure and are willing to pay for the coordination services.

A related discussion on GPP structure concerns the 'partner-centric' versus 'secretariat-centric' business models. Examination of the founding principles of GPPs shows almost invariably that GPP secretariats are supposed to be 'lean and mean' and have responsibilities limited to day-to-day operations, communication with partners, and servicing the needs of steering bodies. The reality is slightly different. Most partnerships underestimate the effort required to manage the partnership effectively. However some secretariats tend to be affected by 'mission creep', which often leads to increased competition with partners for policy-making and implementation responsibilities and resources. The ability of governing bodies to provide adequate checks and balances is often affected by the asymmetric power relationship that characterizes their composition, confusion as to whom the partnership secretariat represents, the degree of independence sought by the secretariat and its leaders, and what constitutes the partnership programme. There is not a dichotomous choice to be made between the involvement of the partners and the involvement of the secretariat. Instead, it can be looked at as a two-dimensional array, with four boxes representing four possible levels of input from secretariat and partners: low secretariat and low partners; low secretariat and high partners; high secretariat and low partners; and high input from both secretariat and partners. To truly involve partners in many aspects of the partnership requires significant effort, with active management either by one partner or a secretariat, but the results with active input can often far exceed the results that can be achieved when partner input is dominated by a single partner or a secretariat. Increasingly, the active participation of developing countries will be critical factors in the success of these GPPs and it becomes harder—if not impossible—to imagine a partnership where these members do not have an important say in the partnership.

Partner-centric partnerships primarily rely on the ability of partners to take responsibility for most of the added-value activities collectively identified as being critical to the achievement of the partnership's goals. Agreeing on these added-value activities and related division of labour based on an assessment of comparative advantages is a significant programmatic undertaking, the difficulty of which should not be underestimated. More secretariat-centric business models are indicated in the case of partners agreeing to entrust the secretariat with a neutral brokering role and agreeing to devolve programmatic and operational responsibilities to the secretariat.

---


\(^{101}\) Ibid.

\(^{102}\) Zadek and Radovich, op. cit.
## ANNEX 8. BEST PRACTICE PRINCIPLES FOR ENGAGEMENT OF GLOBAL HEALTH PARTNERSHIPS AT THE COUNTRY LEVEL

Global Health Partnerships (GHPs) commit themselves to the following best practice principles:

### Ownership

| 1 | To respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it: GHPs will contribute, as relevant, with donor partners to support countries in fulfilling their commitment to develop and implement national development strategies through broad consultative processes; translate these strategies into prioritized results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets; and take the lead in coordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources in dialogue with donors and encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector. |

### Alignment

| 2 | To base their support on partner countries’ national development and health sector strategies and plans, institutions and procedures. Where these strategies do not adequately reflect pressing health priorities, to work with all partners to ensure their inclusion. |
| 3 | To progressively shift from project to programme financing. |
| 4 | To use country systems to the maximum extent possible. Where use of country systems is not feasible, to establish safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures. Country systems in this context would include mechanisms such as sector-wide approaches and national planning, budgeting, procurement, and monitoring and evaluation systems. |
| 5 | To avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of GHP projects and programmes (e.g., Project Management Units). |
| 6 | To align analytic, technical and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies; make effective use of existing capacities; and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly. |
| 7 | To provide reliable indicative commitments of funding support over a multi-year framework and disburse funding in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules. |
| 8 | To rely to the maximum extent possible on transparent partner government budget and accounting mechanisms. |
| 9 | To progressively rely on country systems for procurement when the country has implemented mutually agreed standards and processes, and to adopt harmonized approaches when national systems do not meet agreed levels of performance. To ensure that donations of pharmaceutical products are fully in line with WHO Guidelines for Drug Donations. |

### Harmonization

| 10 | To implement, where feasible, simplified and common arrangements at the country level for planning, funding, disbursement, monitoring, evaluating and reporting to government on GHP activities and resource flows. |
| 11 | To work together with other GHPs and donor agencies in the health sector to reduce the number of separate, duplicative missions to the field and the number of diagnostic reviews assessing country systems and procedures. To encourage shared analytical work, technical support and lessons learned, and to promote joint training (e.g., common induction of new board members). |
| 12 | To adopt harmonized performance assessment frameworks for country systems. |
| 13 | To collaborate at the global level with other GHPs, donors and country representatives to develop and implement collective approaches to crosscutting challenges, particularly in relation to strengthening health systems including human resource management. |

### Managing for results

| 14 | To link country programming and resources to results and align them with effective country performance assessment frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with partners’ national development strategies. |
| 15 | To work with countries to rely, as far as possible, on countries’ results-oriented reporting and monitoring frameworks. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To work with countries in a participatory way to strengthen country capacities and demand for RBM, including joint problem solving and innovation, based on monitoring and evaluation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>To ensure timely, clear and comprehensive information on GHP assistance, processes and decisions (especially decisions on unsuccessful applications) to partner countries requiring GHP support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 9. INTEGRATING GPPs WITH COUNTRY-LED NATIONAL PROGRAMMES: SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Improvement in the integration of global programmes at the country level will require reforms and actions by donors including bilateral and multilateral donors, foundations and other private and civil society institutions, global programmes, and partner countries.

The main findings of this report suggest reforms to address the challenges of ownership at global and country levels; alignment of policies and procedures; harmonization and coordination of actions; sustainability and predictability of finance; and programme governance, in order to achieve results and promote accountability. These findings are as follows for the respective players:

For donors to global programmes

1. Exert greater selectivity before establishing new GPPs. Rationalize the number of global programmes by taking into account activities and performance of those already operating at global, regional and country levels. Promote complementarities and synergies to increase efficiency and reduce transaction costs. Consolidate through mergers or close down global programmes that have achieved their purpose or are ineffective. Evaluate performance and mandate of existing global programmes before engaging in new activities or in new GPPs.

2. Promote participatory involvement of partner-countries in defining new GPP objectives to ensure better alignment of objectives with partner countries’ needs.

3. Promote coordination between all institutions involved in development assistance at the country level. Foster coordination through regular and transparent exchange of information among global programmes, multilateral and bilateral institutions, and private foundations.

4. Review current funding arrangements of global programmes to promote use of innovative instruments to enhance flexibility and sustainability of resource flows to achieve results.

5. Review financing terms of global programmes to include incentives for effectiveness and achieving results.

6. Develop a shared methodology to assess performance and effectiveness of different funding outlets at the country level (global programmes and traditional aid agencies). Calibrate donors’ support to them on the basis of performance and achieved results. Institute a global monitoring and evaluation system of global programme performance along the lines of the system developed on a pilot basis by OECD-DAC for ODA donors and partner countries.

7. Align global programmes policies and strategies with countries’ national and sector plans and country budgeting and management systems (programme execution, fiduciary responsibilities, audits and coordination).

For the GPPs

1. Align and harmonize programmes' strategies and policies with national and sector plans. Integrate operational procedures to country systems by using national structures for programme implementation. Avoid the use of parallel implementation structures. In the case of weak national institutions in fragile states, use delegated assistance within the framework of national institutions with the clear intention to phase out special arrangements adopted for programme execution over a reasonable time-frame.

2. Support and promote country leadership in programme and project execution, including coordination at national and local levels.

3. Promote inter-agency coordination during preparation and implementation of programmes and projects. Agree on the modalities of effective coordination with all partners, donors and executing agencies. Develop a standardized format of reporting procedures that increases accuracy and transparency and substitute joint reviews for individual reviews.

4. Promote **sustainability and predictability of funding** by synchronizing disbursement with national budgets. Adapt financing modalities and amounts to programme and project requirements and financing contributed by other sources. Engage in **pooled and programmatic financing** with multilateral and other financing institutions when programme activities are in the context of a sector-wide approach and are underpinned with sound fiduciary policies and procedures.

5. Promote sound **governance** by establishing a clear division of labour between programme management entities. Ensure separation of oversight and management responsibilities and develop an accountability system supported by annual independent audits. Establish in close coordination with country and aid partners a result-based, independent monitoring and evaluation system which includes qualitative and quantitative outputs, outcomes and impacts.

**For the partner countries**

1. **Develop sector strategies** that could serve as the framework for global programmes and other donors’ assistance programmes and projects.

2. Consistently include all global programme assistance programmes in the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

3. **Ensure financial sustainability** of programmes and projects during and after the global programme funding phase.

4. Institute **sound management systems** at programme and project execution levels covering financial management, programming and budgeting, procurement, internal and external audits, and monitoring and evaluation systems.

5. Promote transparency and **clear assignment of responsibilities in management** and ensure that oversight and management functions are separated and delivered respectively by the representative governing body and competent management staff.
## ANNEX 10. LIST OF GPPs WITH UNICEF PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPP title</th>
<th>Legal status</th>
<th>Official member</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Access Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Research Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Global Elimination of Trachoma by the Year 2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Care Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Online Protection Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Rights Information Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children without Worms</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition on Children Affected by AIDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countdown to 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors Working Group on Female Genital Mutilation and Cutting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fast Track Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for All Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Capacity Building Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour Fortification Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Resources on Effective School Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Water Alliance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global AIDS Alliance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Eliminate Leprosy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Prevent Prematurity and Stillbirth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Coalition on Women and AIDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Collaboration for Blood Safety</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Forum for Health Research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Guinea Worm Eradication Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative on Children's Environmental Health Indicators</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Polio Eradication Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Public-Private Partnership for Hand Washing with Soap</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Road Safety Forum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Task Force on Cholera Control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Water Challenge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Nutrition Tracking Service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Metrics Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environments for Children Alliance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Group on Violence Against Children</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Coordinating Panel on Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provi-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision for Yellow Fever Control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Drug Purchase Facility to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Health Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Household Survey Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Network to Promote Household Water Treatment and Safe Storage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Group on Innovative Financing to Fund Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming Nutrition Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria No More</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Initiative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Sustained Elimination of Iodine Deficiency Disorders</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners for Parasite Control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Child Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTCT Donation Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProVention Consortium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Back Malaria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water Supply Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Injection Global Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee on Nutrition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Tuberculosis Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sphere Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Collaboration on Road Traffic Injury Prevention</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Girl Education Initiative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Integrity Network</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 11. GPPs WITH UNICEF PARTICIPATION, BY MTSP FOCUS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area 1: Young child survival and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Research Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Global Elimination of Trachoma by the Year 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children without Worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour Fortification Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Water Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Eliminate Leprosy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance to Prevent Prematurity and Stillbirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Collaboration for Road Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Forum for Health Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Guinea Worm Eradication Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative on Children's Environmental Health Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Polio Eradication Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Public-Private Partnership for Hand Washing with Soap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Road Safety Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Task Force on Cholera Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Water Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Nutrition Tracking Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Metrics Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environments for Children Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision for Epidemic Meningitis Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision for Yellow Fever Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Health Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Network to Promote Household Water Treatment and Safe Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming Nutrition Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria No More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Neonatal Tetanus Elimination Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Sustained Elimination of Iodine Deficiency Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners for Parasite Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Back Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water Supply Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Injection Global Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee on Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop TB Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Collaboration on Road Traffic Injury Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Integrity Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area 2: Basic education and gender equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for All Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Resources on Effective School Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Girl Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area 3: HIV/AIDS and children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition on Children Affected by AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 4: Child protection from violence and exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Care Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Online Protection Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors Working Group on Female Genital Mutilation and Cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Group on Violence Against Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Coordinating Panel on Juvenile Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area 5: Policy advocacy and partnerships for children’s rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Rights Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Household Survey Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Group on Innovative Financing to Fund Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-sector humanitarian coordination and disaster risk management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProVention Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sphere Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPPs relevant to focus areas 1 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Access Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to fight Aids, TB and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Drug Purchase Facility to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTCT Donation Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPPs relevant to focus areas 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Child Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPPs relevant to focus areas 1 and 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countdown to 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 12. SAMPLE DECISION TREE TO GUIDE UNICEF ENGAGEMENT IN EXISTING GPPs

Based on above decision tree, the PRC advises the Executive Director on:

- the establishment of a new global programme partnership
- major evolutions of partnerships, such as changes in hosting arrangements

Testing the principles...

1. Value proposition to create a new partnership is compelling and conforms with aid effectiveness principles
   - Yes
   - No

2. Proposed partnership addresses UNICEF priority area reflected in MTSP
   - Yes
   - No

3. Proposed partnership strategic approach is aligned with principles of best practice
   - Yes
   - No

4. Legitimacy of proposed partnership ensured through participation of stakeholders
   - Yes
   - No

5. Roles and comparative advantages of partners clearly identified and agreed
   - Yes
   - No

6. Potential conflicts of interest can be identified and addressed
   - Yes
   - No

7. Proposed structure appropriately reflects main functions of partnership
   - Yes
   - No

Submit partnership proposal to Partnership Review Committee

...and institutional arrangements

1. Hosting partnership serves interests of UNICEF and partners. Partners accept UNICEF institutional arrangements
   - Yes
   - No

2. Arrange memorandum of understanding between UNICEF and partnership for hosting arrangements
   - Yes
   - No

Identify alternative hosting arrangement. Fully engage with partnership

Disengage from partnership development process

ANNEX 13. IMPACT ON COUNTRY SYSTEMS

The way in which GPPs impact country-level policy frameworks and systems has been the subject of considerable, and often polarized, debate in the context of the aid effectiveness principles adopted in Paris in 1995 and reconfirmed in Accra in 2008. These principles “place a premium on country ownership, achieving results and country based coordination and harmonization” (OECD-DAC, 2006). The Paris Declaration notices the insufficient integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries’ broader development agendas, including critical areas such as HIV/AIDS. The Accra Agenda for Action acknowledges that global funds and programmes make an important contribution to development and call upon all global programmes “to support country ownership, to align and harmonize their assistance proactively and to make good use of mutual accountability frameworks, while continuing their emphasis on achieving results.”

Efforts have been deployed by various actors, including GPPs themselves, to better document how GPPs interact with country systems. Most of these efforts focus on the health sector due to the concentration of GPPs and GPFs in this sector, and the use of health as a tracer sector to monitor implementation of the aid effectiveness principles.

In 2002, the Phase 1 report of the independent evaluation of the World Bank’s approach to global programmes already noted the lack of ownership of developing countries as implementers of global programmes.106 In November 2005, the third High-level Forum on the Health MDGs acknowledged both the achievements of global health partnerships as well as several concerns relating to the collective impact at the country level of a few major global health partnerships, including: coordination and duplication among GHPs; high transaction costs to government and donors; variable degrees of country ownership; and lack of alignment with country systems.107 The cumulative effect of these problems risked undermining the sustainability of national development plans, distorting national priorities, diverting scarce human resources, and establishing uncoordinated service delivery structures. In addition, the High-Level Forum noted that without increased support to help build health system capacity in almost all developing countries, the resources mobilized by GHPs and initiatives are unlikely to achieve their full potential. The Forum adopted a series of best practice principles for engagement of global health partnerships at the country level (Annex 8).

In 2007, one recommendation of the OECD-DAC policy workshop on ‘Global Programmes and the Paris Agenda’108 was that donors “promote participatory involvement of partner-countries in defining new GPPs’ objectives to ensure better alignment of objectives with partner-countries needs.” This recommendation acknowledged that country ownership should start at the GPP identification and design stage. Other recommendations to GPPs and to partner countries are listed in Annex 9. In 2008, a report prepared by the World Bank for the Accra High-Level Forum109 acknowledged that most GPFs are increasingly integrating into country level development processes. The report proposes several principles to guide GPFs.

Guidance on GPFs

When there are new initiatives:
- Think twice about whether a separate new funding channel is needed.
- Strengthen the voice of partner countries.
- Maintain balance between vertical and horizontal approaches.
- Avoid intense verticality.
- Contribute to the provision of Global Public Goods.

When implementing existing or new GPFs:
- Funding should be on-plan and on-budget.
- Align to country systems and harmonize approaches.
- Ensure sustainability and predictability.
- Integrate into sector strategies and measure sector results.
- Help bridge gaps between global/regional needs and country capacities.

New GPPs, such as the International Health Partnership Plus, have been established with the intended purpose to forge country-level compacts around broader health strategies and to work against fragmentation and narrow earmarking by bringing most of the key players, including many GPFs, into one national health programme. In the water, sanitation and hygiene sector, the Global Framework for Action, currently in the design phase, is pursuing similar objectives.

In June 2009, The Lancet published an article110 with the aim to review the evidence base of claims that global health initiatives (GHIs)111 burden health systems that are already fragile in countries with few resources, as well as claims that weak health systems prevent progress in meeting disease-specific target investments. The article confirms that GHIs and country health systems are not independent but are inextricably linked. The article shows a general absence of systematic, evidence-based or consensus-based policies that might accelerate the joint effectiveness of GHIs and country health systems with respect to improvement in health. It concludes that it is urgent to move away from the present situation, in which the broad ramifications of the interactions are largely unplanned. The authors acknowledge that efforts to generate productive interactions between GHIs and country health systems are increasing.112 The decision by some of the main GHIs to allocate discrete resources specifically for the purpose of funding country proposals for strengthening health systems is testimony to this new direction. The article ends with five recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1**: Infuse the health systems strengthening agenda with the sense of ambition and speed that has characterized the GHIs.
- **Recommendation 2**: Extend the targets of GHIs and agree indicators for health systems strengthening.
- **Recommendation 3**: Improve alignment of planning processes and resource allocations among GHIs, and between GHIs and country health systems.
- **Recommendation 4**: Generate more reliable data for the costs and benefits of strengthening health systems, and evidence to inform additional and complimentary investments to those of GHIs.
- **Recommendation 5**: Ensure a rise in national and global health financing, and in more predictable financing to support the sustainable and equitable growth of health systems

---


111 A majority of the GHIs reviewed in this article are GPPs.

112 Including through efforts by GAVI and the GFATM to invest in health system strengthening to rely on national strategy applications and to consider joint health system strengthening programming with the World Bank.
ANNEX 14. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CAPITAL

A partnership is like a marriage …it is very easy to get into it but very hard to make it work; and just like there are no perfect marriages, there are no perfect partnerships: what you should aim for is a process of continuous improvement. (Perspectives from advisory panel members and UNICEF staff)

Social capital comprises a variety of characteristics, depending on the analytical and institutional context, but many authors emphasize three main dimensions: social cohesion, through social interaction, shared knowledge, purposes, and norms; collective efficacy, the capacities and resources to solve social problems; and trust in other individuals, groups and organizations. Social capital is considered ‘capital’ because it putatively provides resources that enhance the operational efficiency and effectiveness of institutions and societies for the resolution of problematic situations and for development.

With respect to these three dimensions of social capital, the potential for collective efficacy and social cohesion are drivers in the formation of GPPs while trust is an essential component for a successful partnership. Building effective GPPs is not just a matter of getting the strategic focus and the governance structure right, it is also a matter of getting the human interactions that take place among the members of a coalition right. When these interactions are positive, trust results.

The concept of social cohesion comprising shared commitments and purposes is demonstrated in GPPs with respect to members of the Like Minded Donor Group, which came together in the mid 1990s with a common commitment to addressing issues of aid and development. Today, many GPPs reflect this phenomenon where like-minded stakeholders come together to form partnerships and address global issues. In other cases, like-mindedness may evolve over a period of time through ongoing interaction in partnerships around shared commitments.

GPP evaluation respondents painted a mixed picture of GPP partners’ motivations, mandates and models in setting up GPPs. Respondents noted that while achieving IADGs and promoting global public goods were formal commitments of many GPPs, there were more varied contributing factors leading to their development including:

- Lack of faith in the UN system to act efficiently and effectively to achieve development results, leading to the development of GPPs as alternative mechanisms.
- Desire of non-UN-DAC actors to influence international agendas and development programmes, whereas traditional multilateral processes did not always allow for such participation.
- Different development philosophies and models, for example those aligned with technological solutions and direct-to-consumer marketing, and those based on consensus building and brokerage.
- Personal ambitions of certain GPP founders and managers to stake out international development territory.
- Overall realization that global problems require global collective action.

In considering GPP engagement with respect to the composition of networks and partnerships, some analysts contend that the inclusion of public institutions leads to unequal power relationships and hierarchies that inhibit the voluntary nature of partnerships. Others argue that public institutions can play a significant role in stimulating social capital by encouraging engagement and participation, and adopting capacity building programmes. Beyond public institutions, GPPs provide the space for a range of non-public actors, not traditionally involved in UN and intergovernmental decision making, to participate in global development networks and to influence related agendas, policies and programmes. Different actors add different values to partnerships and can make complementary contributions to many aspects of a partnership. A synthesis of related analyses and GPP evaluation findings results in the following types of reasons various partners might be considered for membership:

- Rational-legal, based on legal or formalized mandates or requirements.

---

113 Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, available online at: www.sdc.org.vn/en/Home/Programmes/Governance/The_Like_Minded_Donor_Group_LMDG.
Political capital plays a significant role in GPPs. In analysing how political priorities for global health initiatives are generated, Shiffman and Smith asked the question, “Why do some global health issues attract extensive political support (i.e. attention and resources) while others remain neglected?” Issues such as immunization, HIV/AIDS, and malaria have generated political support and mobilized substantial resources. However, other high burden issues including malnutrition, pneumonia and diarrhea receive comparatively minimal support.

Four main factors seem to be determinants of whether an issue becomes a global priority: actor power, with respect to policy cohesion, leadership and civil society mobilization around the issue; ideas that frame the issue using internal policy or technical frames or external frames used by politicians and the general public; political contexts, including ‘policy windows’ and global governance norms and institutions; and issue characteristics, particularly the severity of the problem, availability of effective interventions, and credible indicators to measure progress.  

In alignment with the ethos of social capital, on developing norms to facilitate collective action for mutual benefit, the following partnership principles were developed at a UNICEF multi-stakeholder meeting to enhance the quality of UNICEF partnership engagement. These principles were validated in the UNICEF Civil Society Partnership Review and by GPP evaluation respondents.

- **Core partnership principles:** Partners share common objectives, values and interests; respect comparative advantages; fairly spread risks and benefits; operate with trust and transparency; and achieve intended results.
- **Operational partnership principles:** In the partnerships there are clear ‘lines of accountability’ for each partner, including to the constituency they represent; fair attribution of credit; shared investment; ongoing dialogue; joint monitoring and evaluation processes.
- **Management partnership principles:** There is agreement on and commitment to partnership standards and principles; and consistency and constancy of partners’ engagement.

UNICEF staff and external partners considered these principles critical to the quality of partnership engagement.

Political capital can be viewed as an extension of social capital. Political capital is the ability to leverage social capital and other socio-political and economic resources to reach high quality agreements and improvements in policy-making, achieve agreed-upon goals, and to develop further by building on the socio-political prestige and security that result from related innovations and achievements.  

Four main factors seem to be determinants of whether an issue becomes a global priority: actor power, with respect to policy cohesion, leadership and civil society mobilization around the issue; ideas that frame the issue using internal policy or technical frames or external frames used by politicians and the general public; political contexts, including ‘policy windows’ and global governance norms and institutions; and issue characteristics, particularly the severity of the problem, availability of effective interventions, and credible indicators to measure progress. 
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# ANNEX 15. COMPOSITION OF HIGH-LEVEL ADVISORY PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Institution</th>
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