**UN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM REFORM – CHECKLIST FOR UNSDG ENTITIES’ GOVERNING BODIES**

In response to Member States request in General Assembly resolution 76/4 on the review of the functioning of the reinvigorated resident coordinator system, including its funding arrangement, the Chair of the UN Sustainable Development Group has developed a checklist for the consideration of the governing bodies of the United Nations development system entities, to “facilitate their oversight role, including monitoring alignment and entity adherence to the dual reporting model.” The proposed checklist aims to inform the oversight of the Resident Coordinator system performed by Member States in the General Assembly and the Operational Activities Segment of the Economic and Social council, including through the Resident Coordinator system results framework currently being finalized, as also requested by Member States in General Assembly resolution 76/4.

The checklist covers the elements of the repositioning of the UN development system, as set out in General Assembly resolution 72/279, and as such, applies to all entities of the UN development system. For each question, entities are requested to briefly explain how the entity is implementing the requirement, or, if it is not implemented, briefly set out the plans and timeline to do so. If a question does not apply to an entity, the last column offers the space for the entity to elaborate why, and provide any other relevant information relating to the implementation of the specific aspect of the reform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A NEW GENERATION OF UN COUNTRY TEAMS</th>
<th>Yes/No/Not Applicable</th>
<th>Please elaborate (Explain how the entity is implementing the requirement, or, if not implemented, plans and timelines to do so; or, provide rationale if deemed not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmes at the country level/Strategies and UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity have guidance or process in place to ensure implementation of the Management and Accountability Framework (MAF) requirement to “consult with the Resident Coordinator at key stages of entity-specific strategic planning”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If yes, please briefly describe how your entity monitors adherence to this requirement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity’s guidance or processes require that your country-level development activities/engagement derives from the Cooperation Framework, and, as a result, that it is developed after, or in parallel with Cooperation Framework priorities and outcomes that have been agreed with Government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: Management and Accountability Framework and UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework guidance

1The present document focuses on the implementation of UN development system reform mandates. It is complementary to other oversight tools at the disposal of governing bodies to assess entities’ implementation of their mandates and legal obligations.
• Does your entity provide the governing body with the opportunity to review the derivation of country programmes from the Cooperation Framework?

• Are all the development activities of your entity at the country level captured in the Joint Workplan of the Cooperation Framework?

**UN Country Team Configuration**

• What proportion of your entities’ country offices have engaged in a country configuration exercise in line with the agreed Cooperation Framework, in accordance with national development policies, plans, priorities and needs and in consultation with the host government?

• In how many countries did this exercise lead to a change in your business models, country-level footprint and/or programming?

• In how many countries did this exercise lead to an increase in the relative share of policy advice vis-à-vis project implementation, including large-scale procurement support?

**Multi-Country Office Review**

• Has your entity reviewed and adjusted its **programme responses and resource allocations** in support of the priorities of **Small Island Developing States**?

• In response to the Multi-Country Office review, has your entity taken concrete steps to **review the appropriateness of expertise and organizational arrangements in MCO settings**, where required?

**Efficiencies**

• What % of your entity’s country offices participate in the country’s Business Operations Strategy (BOS)?
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2 Source: UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Guidance

3 UNHCR’s contribution is without prejudice to the responsibilities conferred on it by the General Assembly, including those outlined in the Statute of the Office and relevant legal instruments such as the international refugee and statelessness conventions
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• Has your entity put in place a **process to track efficiency gains**, achieved individually, as well as jointly with other UN entities?
  • If yes, does the process use the agreed UNSDG common methodology for measuring the impact of efficiency initiatives?

• Does your entity **report annually to its governing body on (a) entity-specific efficiency gains and (b) contributions to system-wide efficiency gains**?

• What % of your entity’s premises are **common premises**?

• What % of your entity’s country offices participate in a **Common Back Office**?

• Does your organization provide services to other entities through **Global Shared Services**?
• Does your organization obtain services through another entity’s Global Shared Service Centers or through other global shared means?
• To what extent have you had to front load investment in order to support joint efficiency gains?

### REINVIGORATING THE ROLE OF THE RC SYSTEM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Please elaborate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the <strong>job description</strong> of your entity country representatives been revised as appropriate, following the reform, to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Recognize the role and responsibility of the Resident Coordinator?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Reflect their accountability to the Resident Coordinator for their contribution to agreed results as defined in the Cooperation Framework and other inter-agency development agreements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Reflect the responsibility for active engagement in UNCT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Does your entity ensure that RCs have an opportunity to provide specific input to your entity’s regional directors on the **skillsets and leadership profile that would be relevant in a given country context ahead of the selection and deployment of new country representatives**?
• If yes, please briefly describe how your entity **monitors adherence to** this requirement?

• Does the **performance assessment system** of your entity’s country representatives:
  (a) Embed characteristics of the UN leadership framework?
  (b) Have at least one key result area linked to contribution to collective UNCT results?
  (c)

• In what % of countries has the RC provided input into the **performance review** of your entity representative?
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In what % of countries do your country representatives inform the performance assessment of Resident Coordinators by providing feedback on RC behaviours against the RC leadership profile?

**REVAMPING THE REGIONAL APPROACH**

- Yes/No
- Please elaborate

- Does your entity have guidance or a process in place to ensure your participation in RCP initiatives to allow countries and UNCTs to easily identify and access the expertise, experts, available assets, policy and strategy work, seated in a region in a unified system?
- Does your entity have guidance or a process in place to encourage the entity’s active engagement in regional rosters of experts?

- Do your entity Regional Directors / Executive Secretaries of the Regional Commissions, as members of the Regional Collaborative Platforms (RCPs), include in their individual **performance compacts**:
  - (a) their role in ensuring implementation of the Management and Accountability Framework at the regional and country level
  - (b) their responsibility in supporting UNCT members to drive joint results at the country level in line with the Cooperation Framework and other inter-agency agreements

- Do your Regional Directors or equivalent representatives of entities that comprise the UNCT contribute to the performance appraisal of the RCs?

**STRATEGIC DIRECTION, OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SYSTEM WIDE RESULTS**

- Yes/No
- Please elaborate

**Strategic Plans**

- Do your **entity’s strategic planning documents** set out how the entity is working as part of the repositioned UN development system at the global, regional and country level?
- Does your entity systematically communicate to all staff and representatives the new working methods needed in line with the **reform of the UN development system**? If yes, please provide details in the comments section.

**Results Reporting**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FUNDING THE RC SYSTEM AND DELIVERING ON FUNDING COMPACT COMMITMENTS</strong>&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th><strong>Yes/No</strong></th>
<th><strong>Please elaborate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Purpose Trust Fund for the RC System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity adhere to the UNSDG guidance on the 1% levy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do the amounts contributed by your entity as part of the <strong>1% levy</strong> tally with the last available CEB estimates (also published as a funding annex at the ECOSOC OAS annually) of overall tightly earmarked contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If no, how do you explain the difference and what steps within the entity’s remit have been taken to reduce the gap?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Compact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity hold a <strong>structured dialogue with its governing body</strong> on how to finance the development results in the current strategic planning cycle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity report on its implementation of relevant entity and Member States Funding Compact commitments to its governing body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizing the respective responsibilities of RCs and UNCTs in that regard&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt; do your entity’s have guidance or a process in place for your country representatives to work with the RC to promote a coherent approach to funding as per the principles, objectives and commitments of the Funding Compact (in particular, flexible and strategic-level funding and funding that supports and facilitates common results and joint activities)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What % of your entity’s programming expenditures consists of <strong>Joint Programmes</strong>&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does your entity have guidance or processes and instruments in place to facilitate use of relevant global pooled funding mechanisms (e.g., Joint SDG Fund, Spotlight Initiative, Peacebuilding Fund) by country representatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12 As set out in the Joint Programme Guidance, “joint activities” referred to in the Funding Compact should be understood as Joint Programmes