



**Executive Board of the
United Nations Development
Programme, the United Nations
Population Fund and the United
Nations Office for Project Services**

Distr.: General
29 November 2012

Original: English

First regular session 2013

28 January to 1 February 2013, New York

Item 1 of the provisional agenda

Organizational matters

**Report of the second regular session 2012
(4 to 10 September 2012, New York)**

Contents

| <i>Chapter</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Organizational matters | 2 |
| <i>UNDP segment</i> | |
| II. Statement by the Administrator and financial, budgetary and administrative matters | 2 |
| III. UNDP country programmes and related matters | 5 |
| IV. Evaluation | 6 |
| V. Programming arrangements | 10 |
| <i>UNFPA segment</i> | |
| VI. Statement by the Executive Director and evaluation | 11 |
| VII. UNFPA country programmes and related matters | 14 |
| <i>UNOPS segment</i> | |
| VIII. United Nations Office for Project Services | 15 |
| <i>Joint segment</i> | |
| IX. Follow-up to UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board meeting | 16 |
| X. Financial, budgetary and administrative matters | 18 |
| XI. Field visits | 21 |
| XII. Other matters | 21 |



I. Organizational matters

1. The President opened the second regular session 2012 and welcomed all delegations. The Secretary of the UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS Executive Board, and the Officer-in-Charge, Executive Board and External Relations Branch, UNFPA, provided overviews of the agenda items under the UNDP, UNFPA, UNOPS and joint segments. The Executive Board adopted the agenda and the workplan for the session. One delegation stated that to reduce costs and enhance efficiency, the agenda of the Board should be structured in such a way that informal consultations pertaining to specific agencies would take place under their respective segments.

2. In a joint statement, recalling a statement made earlier at the annual session 2012 on the functioning of the Executive Boards, several delegations drew attention to the potential for cost efficiencies that could be realized, inter alia, through improving the planning, management and the conduct of meetings, including effective sequencing and scheduling of sessions and documentation management. The delegations encouraged UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS to review and learn from the UNICEF Executive Board “PaperSmart” experience in order to minimize the costs related to documentation and to promote environmentally friendly practices.

3. The Executive Board approved the report of the annual session 2012 (DP/2012/15); reviewed the draft annual workplan 2013 (with amendments); and adopted the tentative workplan of the first regular session 2013. Decisions adopted by the Executive Board in 2012 appear in document DP/2013/2.

UNDP segment

II. Statement by the Administrator and financial, budgetary and administrative matters

4. In her opening remarks to the Executive Board (available on the [Executive Board website](#)), the Administrator, introducing the annual review of the financial situation 2011 (DP/2012/17, Corr.1 and Corr.2) detailed information relating to the annual review of the financial situation (DP/2012/17/Add.1) and the annex: explanation of terms used in DP/2012/17 and DP/2012/17/Add.1.

5. Referring to evolving challenges in international development, she focused her comments on the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), held in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012, work on the post-2015 development agenda and the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (QCPR) process. She also touched on the next UNDP strategic plan, the integrated budget, programming arrangements as well as on transparency, accountability and the funding situation.

6. She was pleased to inform delegations that UNDP was webcasting the Executive Board meeting live and was conducting its first Global Twitter Marathon with the participation of more than 24 country offices and regional centres.

7. On Rio+20, she noted that while the summit received mixed reviews from governments and civil society, the outcome document was comprehensive, covering all relevant issues of sustainable development. Although light on firm decisions, its

thrust was fully consistent with the triple-win approach to development policy, based on the concept of people-centred development, strongly endorsed by UNDP.

8. She stressed the importance of action on Rio+20 in the following areas: (a) the Sustainable Energy for All Initiative; (b) the ambitious challenge of achieving zero hunger; (c) going beyond gross domestic product (GDP) using broader measures of progress to inform policy; (d) stronger commitment toward the triple-win approaches; (e) phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and encouraging use of clean fuels; (f) building on the scale of voluntary commitments at Rio+20; and (g) devising the post-2015 development agenda.

9. On the post-2015 agenda, UNDP was focusing in particular on its co-chair role with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), leading the United Nations Post-2015 Task Team. The organization had also accepted and would play an important convening and cooperation role both globally and through the Resident Coordinator system working among all stakeholders in the post-2015 process.

10. She noted that QCPR negotiations would build on post-Rio+20 follow-up and set directions for the United Nations system in the deliberation of the post-2015 development agenda. Given global development challenges, she stressed that QCPR had to give the United Nations the mandate to fulfil its role, including its normative role, convening power and universality. Ideally, QCPR would help to strengthen national ownership, building on the experience of Delivering as One, and stress the role of South-South cooperation, its importance for capacity-building, inclusiveness and diversity of partners. Member States could boost QCPR by expanding its applicability across the United Nations system. UNDP was working closely with the United Nations Development Group, which stood ready to assist Member States in the QCPR process.

11. On the UNDP strategic plan, she highlighted that UNDP work on its results framework was set to take a quantitative leap forward by being more straightforward and strategic. Pilots were already under way to test ideas. The integrated resource plan and the integrated budget would serve as a comprehensive resource allocation mechanism in support of the new plan. The first integrated budget would come to the Executive Board for approval at the second regular session in 2013. She was optimistic that the Board would reach consensus on programming arrangements at the current session on the preferred target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC)-1 eligibility option and TRAC-1 allocation model. This was important as the Board needed to focus on other issues related to programming arrangements in anticipation of its approval of the integrated budget at the second regular session 2013. The strategic plan would be ready for preliminary review by Board members early in 2013.

12. The Administrator highlighted that in 2011 total contributions to UNDP, inclusive of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), were \$5.1 billion, a 3 per cent decrease from 2010 after adjusting for the move of activities of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) to the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women). Total expenditure in 2011 was \$5.57 billion, a decrease from 2010. Regular resource contributions rose slightly from the previous year by 1 per cent to \$975 million after three years of consecutive falls, due mainly to favourable exchange rates. Projections for 2012 foresaw continuing decrease. The overall

balance of unexpended resources at the end of 2011 continued to fall to \$4.69 billion, reflecting delivery rates on excessive income, leaving a net total amount of unexpended resources at \$333 million. She stressed that the great majority of resources had been programmed and had a multi-year programming arrangement and underlined that the ability of UNDP to fulfil its mandate depended on predictable, multi-year core resources.

13. She noted that following Executive Board endorsement of public disclosure of internal audit reports at the annual session 2012, UNDP had been posting executive summaries of audit reports on its website since July 2012. The full reports would be posted beginning in December 2012. Larger amounts of data would also be made available publicly online in line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative by end 2013. UNDP had been taking the lead in promoting transparency within the United Nations system, encouraging other organizations to join.

14. Thanking the Administrator for her comprehensive remarks, delegations concurred that the outcome of the QCPR negotiation would provide important guidelines in the preparation of the next UNDP strategic plan and the integrated budget. They also stressed the need to define the parameters for programming arrangements, processes and institutional arrangements. The QCPR, it was noted, should focus on strengthening the role of the United Nations, specifically with regard to funding and operational activities. There were also calls for UNDP to step up its work on South-South cooperation and improve capacity within the Resident Coordinator system so that UNDP could ensure its coordination role. A number of delegations reiterated that poverty eradication was the very purpose of development cooperation, with the economy-poverty nexus at its centre, and should be clearly reflected in the QCPR.

15. Delegations continued to express concern for the decline in predictable, long-term core resources, stressing that the continued decline would jeopardize the ability of UNDP to fulfil its mandate. Developing countries, they noted, had already been hit hard by setbacks owing to crises, conflict and climate change. Delegations also urged UNDP to make every effort to mobilize additional resources. A number of delegations urged countries to honour their funding commitments, especially with regard to core resources. Delegations fully supported and sought the expansion of the continued universal presence of UNDP in programme countries.

16. Delegations commended UNDP for its progress in the area of audit transparency and programme accountability, stressing that the next strategic plan should also benefit from a robust accountability framework. Results-based management principles should also guide allocation of resources and all levels of programme management should be subject to independent evaluations. Delegations stated that they were ready to work closely with UNDP in finalizing the strategic plan and the integrated budget.

17. In response, the Administrator thanked Executive Board members for the goodwill expressed in their statements across the board for the work of UNDP. She reiterated the importance of 2012 for the organization, highlighting again its vital work on Rio+20, the post-2015 development agenda, the QCPR and its work on the new strategic plan. She stressed that UNDP was ready to live up to Board members' expectations but could only do so with their full support, in particular in developing a relevant and effective strategic plan buttressed by a strong accountability framework. She thanked Board members again for their active engagement in

refining the strategic plan and assured them that the organization was fully committed to building a monitoring and reporting framework that would allow it to report to the Board effectively in implementing the plan. She emphasized again the importance of reaching consensus on programming arrangements, which would also feed into concurrent discussions on the next strategic plan and the integrated budget.

18. On funding, she noted that a number of delegations referred to a 7 per cent decrease from 2010. However, the Administrator stressed that the 7 per cent figure reflected the inclusion of UNIFEM as a UNDP-associated programme in total funding, which was the practice in the past. When taking into account the subsuming of UNIFEM into UN-Women, the actual decrease, she noted, was 3 per cent.

19. Turning to the issue of the balance between non-core and core resources, the Administrator underscored that her main concern was that the quality of core resources would be enough to give the critical mass for UNDP to fulfil its mandate and be strategic, maintaining a meaningful universal presence in programme countries. In that regard, she drew attention to the importance of its universal presence for South-South and triangular cooperation initiatives. In highlighting the importance of non-core resources, which UNDP greatly appreciated, she affirmed that the organization took whatever measures necessary to maintain the reserve requirements set by the Executive Board. She noted that UNDP continued to review its cost structures for greater efficiency and was dedicated to mobilizing additional resources to ensure its ability to fulfil its mandate. In that regard, she stressed that core resources were reserved for programme activities, not management or administrative functions.

20. She again thanked Executive Board members for their engagement, comments and feedback and stated that UNDP would be fully engaged with them throughout the QCPR and post-2015 processes.

21. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/21 on the annual review of the financial situation, 2011.

III. UNDP country programmes and related matters

22. The Associate Administrator, UNDP, introduced the following 12 draft country programmes: Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia and South Africa from the Africa region; Myanmar and Nepal from the Asia and the Pacific region; Libya, Sudan and the United Arab Emirates from the Arab States region; and Haiti and Nicaragua from the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

23. She also introduced the draft common country programme for Pakistan from the Asia and the Pacific region, as well as the draft subregional programme document for the Pacific Island countries and territories. She also presented the request by Eritrea to present, on an exceptional basis, the UNDP and UNFPA draft country programme documents for Eritrea at the first regular session 2013. In turn the UNDP regional directors for Africa, the Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean elaborated on the programmes from their respective regional perspectives.

24. Delegations thanked UNDP for its ongoing cooperation, commitment and support to their respective countries. They commended the organization for the scope and ambition of the country programmes, noting that they had been developed in close consultation with the government and other development partners and were aligned with national priorities and plans. Reflecting on areas for improvement, they encouraged UNDP to focus on: (a) reinforcing country analysis and assessment capacities; (b) ensuring systematic country analyses and assessments of country programmes as a standard part of the programme cycle; (b) building stronger monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems; (c) devising tighter, more useful results and resources frameworks with targeted results statements; (d) ensuring better culling of lessons learned to inform management decisions and the development of future programmes; and (e) working toward stronger synergies with partners at the country level. Specific comments made by a number of delegations on some of the draft country programme documents would be conveyed to the concerned countries.

25. The Executive Board took note of the following 12 draft country programme documents and the comments thereon: Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, South Africa, Myanmar, Nepal, Libya, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Haiti and Nicaragua. The Board also took note of the draft common country programme for Pakistan and the draft subregional programme document for the Pacific Island countries and territories.

26. The Board adopted decision 2012/22 to review and approve, on an exceptional basis, the UNDP and UNFPA draft country programme documents for Eritrea at the first regular session 2013.

27. In accordance with decision 2006/36, the following 13 country programmes, which were discussed at the annual session 2012, were approved by the Executive Board on a no-objection basis, without presentation or discussion: Guinea, Lesotho, Mauritius and Sierra Leone from the Africa region; India, Malaysia and Sri Lanka from the Asia and the Pacific region; Djibouti and Jordan from the Arab States region; the Republic of Moldova from the Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States region; and Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Costa Rica from Latin America and the Caribbean region.

28. The Executive Board also approved the six-month extension of the country programme for Egypt, as well as the second one-year extension of the UNDP country programme and operations in the Syrian Arab Republic to support humanitarian assistance, livelihoods and coordination activities.

IV. Evaluation

29. The Director, Evaluation Office, UNDP, introduced the annual report on evaluation (DP/2012/20). The Associate Administrator, UNDP, provided an overview of the organization's work to strengthen its culture of evaluation and learning and presented the perspective of UNDP management on issues raised in the annual report on evaluation.

30. The Evaluation Adviser and Task Manager, Evaluation Office, UNDP, introduced the evaluation of the UNDP contribution to strengthening electoral systems and processes (DP/2012/21); the Director, Bureau of Development Policy,

UNDP, presented the management response to that report (DP/2012/22). The Evaluation Adviser and Task Manager, Evaluation Office, UNDP, introduced the evaluation of UNDP partnership with global funds and philanthropic foundations (DP/2012/23); and the Director, Bureau of Development Policy, UNDP, presented the management response to that report (DP/2012/24). The Director, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, provided additional comments to the management response to the evaluation of UNDP partnerships with global funds and philanthropic foundations.

31. Delegations commended UNDP and the Evaluation Office for its work to strengthen the quality of the evaluation function and to reinforce a culture of evaluation among management and staff through useful guidance tools, capacity building at both the national and global levels, and the development of an online evaluation tool. The work of UNDP to build national-level evaluation capacity was particularly appreciated. Delegations stressed that high quality evaluations were a key component of programme cycles, essential for informing and developing policy, ensuring efficient, effective results-based management, assessing the impact of results, gaining lessons learned and encouraging and motivating staff.

32. They were pleased with the increased number of evaluations conducted in 2011 and were encouraged that country-level evaluations were feeding into country programme documents. They also appreciated the evaluation finding, with regard to the 15 assessments of development results, that UNDP was clearly contributing to the development process at the national level and was generally viewed as a valued partner. They encouraged UNDP to provide greater analysis of the root causes and trends of development challenges in future annual reports and to integrate a human rights-based approach in the evaluation function. They looked forward to future evaluations that would benefit from the new evaluation tools that the organization was setting up.

33. A number of delegations noted with concern that the annual report brought to light a number of shortcomings. They pointed in particular to the finding that almost a third of decentralized evaluations were deemed moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory and to the finding that UNDP needed to do more at the country level to build capacity, improve efficiency and ensure sustainability of development results. On sustainability, while recognizing that government's limited capacity and resources might often impede sustainability of development results, it was stressed that the organization was ultimately responsible for ensuring the achievability of results from the outset. With that in mind, UNDP was urged to reinforce its partnerships as a first step towards ensuring sustainability, especially with government, and aligning with national development priorities.

34. Delegations requested that UNDP provide a framework with clear actions and a time frame of implementation to address those shortcomings. They also asked for information on what UNDP was doing to assess its own capacity to meet evaluation demands, strengthen inter-agency cooperation and develop a strategic plan with clear objectives and results. They also wished to know how UNDP was assessing the implementation of its management responses, stressing that management responses to decentralized evaluations were crucial. In that regard, more information was requested on the function and role of the national reference groups.

35. One delegation regretted the lack of information on joint evaluations. Expressing interest in thematic evaluations, it wished to learn more about the

evaluation of the organization's poverty reduction mandate. Another delegation encouraged UNDP to build mechanisms into country level programming to offset potential setbacks and capacity gaps, with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities for all partners.

36. On the evaluation of electoral systems and processes, delegations were pleased with the report. Given the organization's vital work in this area and the broad recognition of the positive results it had achieved, delegations encouraged UNDP to reinforce its electoral support capacities and further integrate them in its next strategic plan and integrated budget. They were pleased to see strategic planning in the management response to address the challenges identified by the evaluation.

37. Delegations expressed concern with the report's findings that the organization had not fully utilized its good knowledge and electoral support capacities. They noted, in that regard, the finding that UNDP did not adequately focus on the electoral cycle approach and at times applied costly and not always context-specific appropriate interventions. UNDP, they noted, needed to better capitalize on evaluation findings for learning purposes to devise ways to ensure the sustainability of its capacity-building work. In that regard, they urged UNDP to pay greater attention to the broader governance framework within a country to support democratization, especially the long-term capacity of governance institutions. They urged UNDP to work closely with national authorities to set up a proper monitoring and evaluation system with nationally established benchmarks as part of its electoral support strategies.

38. There was a call for UNDP to undertake its country-level activities, including evaluations, only under the leadership and approval of national governments as expressed in the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (TCPR). In that regard, the primacy of multilateralism was stressed. It was also noted that evaluations would allow the organization and its partners to determine if UNDP was fulfilling its mandate, which would only be further hampered as a result of the ongoing decline in core resources.

39. On the evaluation of global funds and philanthropic foundations, delegations were pleased to note growing UNDP partnerships in this sector. In response to the challenges noted in the evaluation findings, they strongly encouraged UNDP in its partnership with global funds to strengthen its work to build capacity at the national level and to engage more closely with civil society partners in programme delivery. They sought further information on what UNDP was doing to strengthen those partnerships within the next strategic plan.

40. One delegation, focusing on UNDP evaluation work with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), requested clarification on three points made in the management responses to the annual report on evaluation: (a) the adoption of innovative services; (b) reducing fees for services; and (c) reducing dependency on GEF, especially in terms of direct access. On the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the delegation stressed that the UNDP role as principle recipient should be interim and time-limited, with a clear capacity-building role, including exit and capacity-building plans to support greater, long-term country ownership.

41. Delegations provided additional comments on the annual report on evaluation. They encouraged UNDP to strengthen its evaluation capacity and function,

especially for decentralized evaluations, in order to build national evaluation capacity. They noted that UNDP needed to do more to feed evaluation findings and lessons learned into its programming and thematic areas of expertise. They also saw evaluations as a useful tool for building the confidence of partners and stakeholders. The Evaluation Office should therefore be adequately funded and staffed. A number of delegations requested further information on the evaluation capacity of United Nations Volunteers in particular. They also sought clarification on how UNDP intended to enforce evaluation compliance for country programmes.

42. In response, the Director, Evaluation Office, UNDP, highlighted, with regard to the issue of quality control, that UNDP was in the process of setting up an experts' panel to peer review and critique its work, thereby helping to ensure long-term oversight of the evaluations conducted in the Evaluation Office. He noted that the finding of poor quality of decentralized evaluations was generally consistent with findings from past annual reports on evaluation. The 2011 annual report piloted the use of a rating scheme for the first time, allowing a more calibrated set of findings on decentralized evaluation quality. The Evaluation Office would continue to use that rating scheme in the future and would track year-by-year changes in country office performance. Reflecting on an Executive Board request for more analysis in annual reports on programme best practices, he indicated that the Evaluation Office would do so, with more in-depth analysis included in the 2012 annual report. The Director also noted that in 2013 the Evaluation Office intended to set up regional advisory panels, involving evaluation experts and institutions, which could be called on to support the Evaluation Office, as well as UNDP bureaux and country offices, in the implementation of future evaluations at the regional and local level. He noted that while joint evaluations were performed at the headquarters level they were less frequent at the country level, although the organization was seeking to expand the number of joint evaluations, where appropriate. He highlighted that UNDP was indeed committed to maximizing the use of national capacity when conducting evaluations while at the same time seeking to ensure the highest degree of objectivity, which the use of national capacity may at times compromise. UNDP was also fully committed to culling lessons learned from the various evaluations conducted.

43. The Associate Administrator, in sharing the perspective of UNDP management, began by addressing the issue of the sustainability of development results, indicating that UNDP had approached the issue from different angles given its level of complexity. In that regard, she stressed the importance of building and maintaining partnerships and focusing heavily on capacity-building. She tackled the issue of decentralized evaluations from two different perspectives: (a) building national capacity to perform evaluations, after which evaluations would be conducted and managed by entities outside UNDP; and (b) maintaining a reliable and strong roster of expert evaluators, over which UNDP had direct control. With regard to the latter, UNDP was reinforcing its roster of expert evaluation consultants at the regional level. She concurred with and highlighted that UNDP was working to ensure the integration of the human rights-based approach in evaluations. She assured delegations that UNDP was committed to ensuring that all its country offices would include decentralized evaluation plans and budgets in their country programmes.

44. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/23 on the: (a) annual report on evaluation and the management response; (b) evaluation of the UNDP contribution

to strengthening electoral systems and processes and the management response; and (c) evaluation of the UNDP partnership with global funds and philanthropic foundations and the management response.

V. Programming arrangements

45. The Associate Administrator, UNDP, introduced the report on programming arrangements 2014-2017 (DP/2012/25 and Corr.1) and the Deputy Assistant Administrator and Chief Financial Officer, Bureau of Management, UNDP, made a more detailed presentation of the options put forward.

46. Delegations commended UNDP for its work in the last two years to adjust the programming arrangements to reflect the concerns and needs of Executive Board members, especially with regard to the target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC)-1 eligibility options and TRAC-1 allocation models. While several delegations expressed concern with respect to the impact of the UNDP proposal on TRAC-1 resource levels for low-income countries (LICs) and least developed countries (LDCs), a number of other delegations supported the UNDP proposal, stating that it favoured LDCs, LICs, and Small Island Developing States (SIDs) while meeting the needs of middle-income countries (MICs).

47. Delegations overall stressed that UNDP proposals should not negatively affect LDCs and LICs. Noting the UNDP proposal on its global strategic presence, delegations requested further information with regard to its impact on MICs. Executive Board members recognized the need to reach consensus on the UNDP proposal for programming arrangements at the session, stating that failing to do so would make it difficult to finalize and approve the next strategic plan and integrated budget by the second regular session 2013.

48. Executive Board members looked forward to further consultations on other elements of the programming arrangements framework to include regional, global and fixed programme lines, in order to present a draft proposal for Board review at the first regular session 2013.

49. In response, the Associate Administrator, UNDP, noted that the \$350,000 allocation for MICs with gross national income (GNI) per capita below the \$6,660 threshold was a minimum but it did not represent the full allocation they would receive. Most MICs, she stressed, would receive higher TRAC-1 allocations, especially those MICs with lower GNI per capita and/or higher population. Furthermore, she highlighted that the UNDP proposals were enhanced to address key concerns highlighted in earlier Executive Board sessions with respect to the vulnerability of those countries that were transitioning from LIC to MIC status in the 2014-2017 period. The MICs with GNI per capita above the \$6,660 threshold, she noted, would receive the minimum allocation of \$150,000 only. In summary, she stated that the balance which UNDP had achieved under Board guidance ensured that greater emphasis would be given to TRAC-1 resource allocations to LICs and LDCs, including the SIDs, while at the same time ensuring increased support to MICs through the organization's continued programmatic presence.

50. The Deputy Assistant Administrator and Chief Financial Officer, Bureau of Management, UNDP, stressed that countries in transition from LIC to MIC status, while possibly receiving less money as a result of their graduation, would in the end

receive an equal amount to what they would have received if they had retained LIC status, thanks to the predictability parameter outlined in the report.

51. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/28 on programming arrangements, 2014-2017.

UNFPA segment

VI. Statement by the Executive Director and evaluation

52. In his statement (available at <http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/exbrd/pid/11625>), the Executive Director recalled that in his first address to the Executive Board as the UNFPA Executive Director, in February 2011, he had declared that transparency and accountability would be fundamental principles of his leadership. He stated that twenty months later, the mission remained unwavering. He updated the Board on key issues and developments since the annual session 2012, including on country programmes and the Fund's field focus; evaluation; the UNFPA humanitarian strategy; progress towards the new strategic plan and the integrated budget; the unqualified audit opinion; UNFPA funding; the London Summit on Family Planning; the post-2015 development agenda; and the ICPD¹ beyond 2014 review. Focusing on evaluation issues, he underscored the importance of rigorous evaluation for the overall effectiveness of UNFPA operations and the delivery of programme results. He elaborated on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation reports submitted to the Board and presented his reflections on the way forward. He appreciated the valuable guidance from the Board members and assured them that UNFPA would continue to closely engage them in the process of revising the UNFPA evaluation policy. He underscored that under his leadership, evaluation would be a more systematic and strategic endeavour; and the quality, impartiality and independence of the function would be ensured together with its contribution to accountability. Furthermore, the evaluation function set-up would be guided by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards. The Executive Director stated that he would serve as the champion for evaluation in UNFPA. He introduced the new Director of the UNFPA Information and External Relations Division.

53. Delegations appreciated the Executive Director's insightful statement and applauded his leadership, transparency and commitment to according accountability top priority in UNFPA. The Executive Director's openness in engaging in dialogue with Member States was appreciated. Several delegations underlined their confidence in the Executive Director's reform programme that had already yielded results, including a clean audit opinion. Delegations commended the work of UNFPA staff, often undertaken in challenging settings.

54. Several delegations noted the success of the London Summit on Family Planning and the contribution of UNFPA, including in such areas as reducing maternal mortality, addressing family planning barriers, promoting reproductive health and rights, and supporting countries in reaching Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) 4 and 5. The growing role of UNFPA in the global health agenda was

¹ ICPD — International Conference on Population and Development (1994).

acknowledged and UNFPA was urged to strengthen global policy and consolidate support around family planning and development.

55. Delegations commended the work under way to ensure a successful and meaningful ICPD beyond 2014 review. The delegation of Indonesia informed the Executive Board that the ICPD beyond 2014 Global Youth Forum would take place in Bali, Indonesia, from 4 to 6 December 2012. The new youth and adolescent initiatives of UNFPA were welcomed, including the pilot engagement in Brazil on addressing teenage pregnancy. UNFPA was urged to continue investing in young people — in their health and education, and in providing them opportunities for decent employment. It was noted that such investments should aim to empower young people to be advocates for sustainable development.

56. A number of delegations focused on the opportunities presented by the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (QCPR) and the post-2015 development agenda. It was noted that the post-2015 development agenda should be formulated in such a way as to effectively utilize the lessons learned from the process of implementing the current MDGs, taking advantage of the new kinds of partnerships and stakeholder participation that had arisen over the last decade. UNFPA was asked to continue giving attention to the issue of ageing, which was increasingly important for both developed and developing countries. It was stated that demography, HIV and AIDS and reproductive health must continue to stay at the top of the development agenda, including through accelerating interventions on child mortality and maternal mortality.

57. Delegations welcomed the biennial report on evaluation (DP/FPA/2012/8); the independent review of the UNFPA evaluation policy (DP/FPA/2012/17) by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS); the respective management responses; and the biennial evaluation plan. Delegations underscored the importance of a clear and well-managed evaluation process for the effectiveness and efficiency of UNFPA. They noted the need for independence of the evaluation function, including a proposal by some delegations that the Evaluation Branch report directly to the Executive Director (as was the case in other organizations). Delegations emphasized the importance of coordination and the need for clarity regarding roles and responsibilities pertaining to evaluation. The need for clear differentiation between audit and evaluation was underlined. Delegations underscored that the revised evaluation policy should address the identified gaps, particularly regarding the independence of the evaluation function and an adequate institutional framework. UNFPA was encouraged to start a mapping process to inform the development and implementation of the revised evaluation policy.

58. Delegations highlighted the need for the Executive Board to ensure sufficient core resources and capacity for the UNFPA evaluation function to carry out its responsibilities. Some delegations mentioned having a separate budget line for evaluation. The Board recognized the good progress achieved by UNFPA since the approval of the evaluation policy in 2009, including the increase in country programme evaluation coverage, which was 100 per cent in 2011. Enhancement of the quality of evaluations, including through capacity-building, strengthening results-oriented monitoring, and establishing a trigger mechanism that would avoid system-wide failure, was called for. Concern was expressed regarding the formulation of indicators and outputs; and inadequate time, planning and resources

for evaluation. The importance of evaluation guidelines and staff training was emphasized.

59. Delegations emphasized the importance of credible and reliable data and analysis on programme performance; and noted that the scheduling of midterm reviews and programme evaluations should facilitate optimal use of results for programming. They underscored that the evaluation function was a central element of exercising governance and oversight, and of ensuring substantive accountability. They also noted that evaluation was key to collective learning regarding development activities.

60. Delegations called for ensuring a strong linkage between the evaluation function and the strategic priorities of UNFPA. They underscored the need for establishing a commonly understood vision for evaluation in UNFPA, based on the Fund's mandate and strategic priorities; and for clarifying the purposes of centralized and decentralized evaluations. The importance of integrating human rights-based approaches and gender equality in the evaluation function by using UNEG guidance was stressed. It was proposed that the plan for thematic evaluations and the results of thematic and large evaluations be discussed at the Executive Board sessions; and the maternal health evaluation be included in the agenda of the first regular session 2013. It was recommended that the biennial report on evaluation be submitted to the Board on an annual basis. Also, more joint evaluations with other United Nations funds and programmes were encouraged.

61. Delegations were pleased to note that the Executive Director planned to play the role of champion of evaluation at UNFPA. They requested information on the timeline for the revision of the evaluation policy. They acknowledged that reform would require time and noted that the Executive Director had already taken some steps to address the recommendations of the OIOS review. Delegations recognized the challenges, offered to support UNFPA in addressing those challenges and looked forward to seeing a revised UNFPA evaluation policy.

62. The Executive Director thanked the Executive Board members for their support and valuable comments. He reiterated his personal commitment, as champion in UNFPA, to addressing evaluation challenges and critical gaps in the current evaluation policy. He committed to sharing a road map for the revised UNFPA evaluation policy and assured the Board members that UNFPA would continue its engagement with the Board, including through informal consultations. He acknowledged the specific comments from delegations relating to strengthening coherence and coordination among UNFPA units and noted that UNFPA would work with Board members to improve the quality of evaluation. He agreed with the need to strengthen results-oriented programme design and monitoring; and the evaluability of country programmes. He took note of the recommendation to adequately resource the evaluation function. The Executive Director responded to various specific queries, including noting that UNFPA was leading or participating in several joint evaluations with other United Nations organizations. He thanked delegations for their continuing guidance and willingness to collaborate with UNFPA. He concluded by appreciating the contribution of the Director of the UNFPA Arab States Regional Office, who would be retiring later in 2012.

63. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/26 on UNFPA evaluation.

64. Following the adoption of decision 2012/26, the Vice-President, African States, speaking on behalf of the African countries members of the Executive Board, highlighted that while the African Group had joined the consensus on decision 2012/26 on UNFPA evaluation, it wished to place on record that with regard to paragraph 16 of decision 2012/26, the allocation of resources for evaluation should not adversely affect the resources available for programming activities.

ICPD beyond 2014 review

65. The UNFPA Executive Director briefed the Executive Board on the status of the ICPD beyond 2014 review, underscoring that it was important to rebuild a global partnership and consensus to facilitate implementation of a cutting edge ICPD agenda beyond 2014. He highlighted the importance of linking the ICPD beyond 2014 review to the post-2015 development agenda and noted the various global and regional consultations that had been held over the last year involving Governments, civil society, including young people, and the United Nations system. He emphasized that the regional processes represented a critical component of the review, including the regional reports that would be prepared for the regional conferences in 2013. Furthermore, at the country level, UNFPA country offices had worked closely with Governments to involve civil society and other relevant stakeholders in the review exercise in 2012, with an emphasis on the global survey on ICPD implementation.

66. The Executive Director stated that one key area of engagement with Governments was to include representatives of non-governmental organizations and young people in national delegations to the regional population conferences in 2013 and the global meetings in 2014. He noted that the Government of Indonesia would host the Global Youth Forum in Bali, Indonesia, from 4 to 6 December 2012. Other global thematic conferences were being planned, including on human rights in partnership with the Government of the Netherlands. The Executive Director appealed to all Governments that had made commitments to expedite payments and he urged Member States to fill the current \$15 million gap in funding for the ICPD beyond 2014 review.

67. The Executive Board members appreciated the briefing as well as the inclusive process evident in engaging all stakeholders in the ICPD beyond 2014 review.

VII. UNFPA country programmes and related matters

68. The Deputy Executive Director (Programme) provided an overview of the following eight draft country programme documents (CPDs) and one draft common country programme document (CCPD): Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia and South Africa from the Africa region; the Sudan from the Arab States region; Pakistan (draft CCPD) from the Asia and the Pacific region; and Haiti and Nicaragua from the Latin America and the Caribbean region. Following that, the UNFPA Regional Directors for Africa; Arab States; Asia and the Pacific; and Latin America and the Caribbean elaborated on the programmes from their respective regions.

69. Several delegations thanked UNFPA for its cooperation and the support provided to their respective countries. They noted that the country programmes had been developed in close consultation with the respective Governments and other

development partners and were well aligned with national plans, priorities and frameworks. They underscored that UNFPA support was necessary, now more than ever, to assist countries in reaching the Millennium Development Goals. A number of delegations made specific comments on some of the draft country programmes and these would be conveyed to the concerned countries.

70. The Deputy Executive Director (Programme) and the UNFPA Regional Directors thanked the Executive Board for the comments and the support. They assured the Board members that, in accordance with decision 2006/36, the comments on the draft CPDs and draft CCPD would be conveyed to the concerned countries to take into account in finalizing the programmes.

71. The Executive Board took note of the following eight draft CPDs and one draft CCPD and the comments thereon: Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Liberia, Nicaragua, Pakistan (draft CCPD), South Africa and the Sudan. The comments would be conveyed by UNFPA to the respective countries. The Board approved the programme extension for Egypt. The Board adopted decision 2012/22, through which it decided to review and approve, on an exceptional basis, the UNDP and UNFPA draft CPDs for Eritrea at the first regular session 2013 of the Executive Board.

72. In accordance with decision 2006/36, the following 12 country programmes, which were discussed earlier at the annual session 2012, were approved by the Executive Board on a no-objection basis, without presentation or discussion: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Costa Rica, Djibouti, Guinea, India, Jordan, Lesotho, Nepal, Pacific Island countries and territories, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka.

UNOPS segment

VIII. United Nations Office for Project Services

73. The Executive Director, UNOPS, introduced the midterm review of the strategic plan (DP/OPS/2012/7); the Deputy Executive Director, UNOPS, introduced the annual statistical report on the procurement activities of United Nations system organizations 2011 (DP/OPS/2012/8) and the supplement on transparency in public procurement.

74. Delegations expressed support for the conclusions reached in the midterm review, which they evaluated positively. They stated that the midterm review findings pointed to the clear need for UNOPS and the importance for it to focus on its areas of specialization: procurement, project implementation services and physical infrastructure development with management advisory services and national capacity development being essential cross-cutting themes. They encouraged UNOPS to build on the findings of the midterm review and to focus on its recognized comparative advantages in order to ensure the sustainable growth of its operations.

75. With this in mind, UNOPS was encouraged to expand its partnerships, which would help to improve developing countries' productivity and provision of services while working towards poverty eradication and sustainable development. It was hoped that UNOPS would help to identify technology and capacity bottlenecks that

developing countries encounter and come up with targeted recommendations and solutions.

76. Delegations reaffirmed the importance of fair, competitive and equal opportunity for all firms participating in procurement exercises. They also stressed that competition with other United Nations agencies should be avoided and a clear division of labour between United Nations agencies was crucial. Delegations stressed that the strategic plans of UNOPS and partner agencies should be reviewed with a view to avoiding overlap and duplication.

77. Delegations supported UNOPS aspirations to incorporate sustainability objectives into all its services by integrating criteria in favour of environmental, social and economic aspects. One delegation, however, stressed that UNOPS (and the United Nations system in general) could introduce new standards on environmental protection only after Member States had agreed on them.

78. The increasing number of UNOPS projects in least developed countries and crisis countries was welcomed and encouraged. Delegations were pleased to note that the vast majority of UNOPS procurement was with developing countries and urged the organization to continue to strengthen the link between sustainable development and the local economic development agenda. Noting that its reporting focused on the output level, there was a call for UNOPS to intensify its work with partners in order to reflect its results at the outcome level as well.

79. The importance of working in developing countries according to the principle of national ownership was reiterated. In that regard, UNOPS was urged to extend the scope of its activities that help to build national capacities and countries' abilities to bring their own resources into play. One delegation thanked UNOPS for its achievements in the area of transparency and urged UNOPS to intensify its outreach to the governments, institutions and other local entities in developing countries to allow them to better understand the work of UNOPS beyond serving merely as the implementing partner agency for the United Nations system.

80. In response, the Executive Director, UNOPS, thanking delegations for their comments and support, assured them of UNOPS commitment to continue working with them in finalizing the strategic plan in the following year. He took the opportunity to thank Denmark, UNOPS host country, for developing a new United Nations complex using the highest sustainability standards.

81. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/24 on the UNOPS midterm review of the strategic plan, 2010-2013; and decision 2012/25 on the UNOPS annual statistical report on the procurement activities of the United Nations system, 2011.

Joint segment

IX. Follow-up to UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board meeting

82. The Deputy Executive Director (Programme), UNFPA, and the Director, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, presented the report on the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Programme Coordinating Board of the Joint

United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) (DP/2012/26-DP/FPA/2012/18).

83. Delegations recognized the progress made by UNDP and UNFPA in addressing HIV and AIDS. They noted that the UNAIDS joint programme was a critically important partner in addressing HIV. They reiterated Executive Board decision 2011/41 from the second regular session 2011 stating that UNAIDS strategies and policies must be integrated in the development of the next UNDP and UNFPA strategic plans, emphasizing that AIDS must remain a continuing priority for both organizations. They offered strong encouragement to UNDP and UNFPA for their support to country-level processes related to the investment approach. It was underscored that country-level coordination not only within the United Nations family, but also with and among stakeholders in countries, would require special attention to ensure success.

84. Delegations drew attention to the upcoming UNAIDS guidance on critical enablers and development synergies for strategic investments in the AIDS response and welcomed the UNDP role in its development. They noted that it would provide important guidance on how to focus and prioritize country-level efforts, save more lives and ensure better, more cost-effective treatment. They supported the new approaches and principles proposed by UNAIDS and its partners to invest funds in measures to combat HIV, ensure sustainability of the measures at the country level and improve the system of results-based reporting.

85. Delegations were pleased with efforts to promote comprehensive access to programmes for prevention, treatment, care and support and to build countries' capacities to combat HIV and mitigate the impact of AIDS on women and children. They also emphasized the importance of promoting preventive activities among youth, encouraging the use of social networks to broadcast the message further.

86. Delegations expressed concern about the reduced funding to UNAIDS projects and urged traditional donors to continue funding, emerging economies and countries to play their part and developing countries to lead and share responsibility. They emphasized, however, that funding from the UNAIDS secretariat should not diminish or replace HIV contributions and investments from co-sponsors. In that regard, they also stressed the importance of honouring commitments to the newly negotiated UNAIDS division of labour. Highlighting the importance of shared accountability among co-sponsors, delegations urged greater commitment by joint United Nations teams on AIDS and United Nations country teams in monitoring and reporting the results of the 2012-2015 UNAIDS unified budget results and accountability framework.

87. In response, the Director, HIV/AIDS Group, UNDP, thanked delegations for their comments and spoke of the implications of the delayed Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria funding round, as noted from the floor. He highlighted the work of UNAIDS in advocacy for sharing the burden of financing and ensuring the diversification of funding sources, including the strong investment from programme countries themselves. He looked forward to the continued show of funding from donor countries. He noted the organizations' support for implementation of programmes funded by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, including technical and operational partnerships to ensure its effectiveness and ability to instil confidence in its donor base, building on lessons learned. On that final note, he highlighted the importance of the UNAIDS

investment framework in ensuring the effectiveness and impact of funding. He also assured delegations that the lion's share of funding for UNDP and UNFPA HIV activities came from outside the UNAIDS secretariat. The secretariat funds were used specifically to ensure coherence across the system. He encouraged Executive Board members through their oversight to ensure alignment between UNAIDS strategies and plans and those of UNDP and UNFPA, and urged them to make every effort to honour commitments to the core budget, without which the organizations would be unable to fulfil their mandates on HIV.

88. The Deputy Executive Director (Programme), UNFPA, thanked delegations for their interest and commitment to the critical work on HIV and AIDS. She echoed the UNDP response and went on to underscore UNFPA commitment to ongoing work, drawing attention to the Fund's focus on the prevention of mother-to-child transmission, especially within family planning services; young people, especially young women; and the integration of a comprehensive response to HIV under the broad umbrella of sexual and reproductive health. Noting that HIV reflected some of the gravest marginalization that occurred in society, she affirmed that the human-rights approach was the correct approach to take the work forward. She underlined that "getting to zero" was a target pertaining to the incidence of infection not financing. In urging Member States and other donors to contribute to the work on HIV and AIDS, she emphasized that solutions were available and "getting to zero" was a plausible goal. However, it required courage and commitment, including financial commitment, with a focus on strategic priorities. In conclusion, she reaffirmed that UNFPA would continue to work closely with the full UNAIDS partnership.

89. The Executive Board took note of the report on the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Programme Coordinating Board of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (DP/2012/26-DP/FPA/2012/18).

X. Financial, budgetary and administrative matters

90. On behalf of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF, the Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau of Management, UNDP, introduced the road map to the integrated budget: joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF review on the impact of cost definitions and classification of activities on harmonized cost-recovery rates (DP-FPA/2012/1). It was noted that UNICEF colleagues were present in the room to respond to queries, as needed.

91. Delegations thanked the organizations for their harmonized work to produce the report and the proposals therein. Overall, delegations were pleased that UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF had addressed the issues of cross-subsidization and the use of core resources to cover fixed indirect costs. They commended the organizations for being the first United Nations entities to propose a new calculation methodology for cost-recovery rates and encouraged them to bring the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) on board as well. They welcomed the proposal to forego the former distinction between indirect fixed costs and indirect variable costs. Delegations were pleased with the proposed methodology to harmonize cost-recovery rates, which they said would lead to increased transparency and clarity and improved burden sharing between core and

non-core resources. In addition, they noted that it would help to ensure minimum and increased levels of core resources.

92. While overall feedback was positive, delegations noted that the proposal to change the cost-recovery rate needed further consultations before reaching a decision. It was noted that while harmonization of the cost-recovery rate was valuable, the emphasis should fall on providing incentives to countries to contribute to core resources. There was also a request for clarification on the added value of an integrated budget for the organizations involved and the ultimate benefits to programme countries. One delegation asked about the rationale for the current cost-recovery rate of 7 per cent and if there was a clear reason to maintain that rate. Another delegation expressed concern that an increase in the cost-recovery rate may cause an overall decrease in resources for the three organizations. The delegation requested additional data on cost recovery.

93. One delegation expressed interest in knowing what the organizations had learned from comparative benchmarking exercises with other institutions on establishing cost-recovery rates. It also sought further information on the experience of Executive Board members in establishing cost-recovery rates, especially the mechanisms proposed and conceptual framework used at the national level. A Board decision, it noted, would require more detailed analysis and comparative analysis of models for cost distribution based on the current methodology. The delegation noted that it was better to have unified rates to avoid competition between the organizations.

94. Seeking clarification on which to base a decision, delegations requested additional information on the following by the first regular session 2013: (a) explanation of the pros and cons of applying a harmonized methodology with or without a harmonized cost-recovery rate for all agencies; (b) concrete proposals with explanation of the advantages and limitations of using differentiated rates for differentiated costs in managing different volumes in various operational contexts; (c) explanation of the cross-cutting functions to be covered by core resources for each agency; (d) explanation of how the new calculation methodology fosters cost efficiency; and (e) more detailed information on the proposal that special arrangements would be made for special-purpose activities like United Nations coordination, United Nations Volunteers and United Nations Capital Development Fund.

95. Delegations also requested a risk and impact analysis of consequences and operational implications for each organization, addressing: (a) differentiated rates in terms of volume, predictability and flexibility of funding to incentivize increased core contributions and to increase the quality of non-core resources; (b) risks and benefits of common and organization-specific cost-recovery rates; and (c) breakdown and further clarity on which parts of the cost classification categories would be covered by the cost-recovery rate.

96. In response, the Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau of Management, UNDP, thanking delegations, noted that the methodology proposed was quite different from the past and organizations were therefore keen to receive Executive Board guidance on the way forward. He stressed that the details of the new methodology still needed to be ironed out and further work was necessary to expound on the different approaches, harmonized versus non-harmonized and the impact on core resources, especially given the organizations' different models and

mandates. He also stressed that resource mobilization remained an important challenge, highlighting that the organizations had to focus equally on mobilizing resources for both core and non-core resources in order to achieve their strategic plans. It was envisaged that the new approach would also reduce the incentive to earmark funds and thereby reduce costs overall. Stressing the quality of non-core resources, he noted that cost recovery constituted the third pillar of the integrated budget, recognizing the need to view different funding sources together and their synergistic impact in terms of the quality of development results. The original aim of the integrated budget, as it was noted from the floor, was to view the institutional and programme budgets together with cost recovery as the third important element. On the request for financial information, he noted that the organizations would work together to provide that information to the Board.

97. The Director, Division for Management Services (DMS), UNFPA, thanked the delegations for their useful comments and for underscoring the importance of the predictability and reliability of core resources for the financial soundness of the organizations. He noted the request from delegations for information regarding the implications of harmonized and non-harmonized cost-recovery rates and for the specificities of the proposals concerning differentiated rates; as well as regarding how core functions would be defined by the three organizations. He assured the Executive Board that the organizations would revert with specific proposals and seek the guidance of the Board, as well as continue the close engagement with the Board in the period leading to the first regular session 2013. He recalled that the impetus to change the cost-recovery rates derived from the mandate given by the Board to ensure that core resources did not subsidize non-core resources. Responding to the query on the benefits of the integrated budget for programme countries, he noted that the benefits included greater transparency and clearer linkages between results and resources. Currently, the institutional budget provided linkages to the organization's management results but not to the development results. However, through the integrated budget the cycles of the strategic plan and the budget would be harmonized to a four-year cycle and a comprehensive framework would be provided linking the total proposed resources to the planned results.

98. Concerning the query on the existing 7 per cent cost-recovery rate, the Director, DMS, noted that the rate came from calculations based on the existing methodology (approved by the Executive Board) that the three organizations had deployed over the years. He added that the organizations would be recalculating and reverting to the Board concerning the rate. Regarding the query on harmonizing the rate across the United Nations system, he stated that the work of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF on cost recovery was being followed with great interest by the rest of the United Nations system and the outcome may influence other organizations in terms of their cost-recovery methodology. He recalled that the 7 per cent rate had in fact influenced the rate for the One United Nations Fund. He assured the Executive Board that in order to bring about greater harmonization, the endeavour of the three organizations would be to share the outcome of the exercise with others in the United Nations system through the High-level Committee on Management and the Finance and Budget Network.

99. The Executive Board adopted decision 2012/27 on the road map towards an integrated budget, beginning 2014: (a) joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF review of the impact of cost definitions and the classification of activities on harmonized cost-

recovery rates; and (b) joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF note on steps taken towards the integrated budget and the mock-up of the integrated budget.

XI. Field visits

100. The co-team leader of the joint field visit of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women and WFP, introduced the report of the joint field visit to the Republic of Djibouti (DP-FPA-OPS/2012/CRP.1) as well as the report of the joint field visit to Ethiopia (DP-FPA-OPS/2012/CRP.2).

101. The two rapporteurs highlighted the key findings and recommendations. The delegations of Djibouti and Ethiopia expressed appreciation regarding the joint field visit and the reports. They commended the work of the United Nations country teams in their respective countries.

102. The Executive Board took note of the two reports on the field visits to the Republic of Djibouti and Ethiopia.

XII. Other matters

103. The following informal briefings/consultations were held:

(a) Informal consultation on the UNOPS midterm review of the strategic plan, 2010-2013, and the road map towards the strategic plan, 2014-2017;

(b) Joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF informal consultation on the integrated budget and cost recovery;

(c) Joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS informal consultation on procurement;

(d) Informal consultation on the outline for the design for the cumulative review of the current UNDP strategic plan, 2008-2013;

(e) Joint UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS informal consultation on human resources policies;

(f) Joint informal briefing on the Report of the United Nations Board of Auditors for the biennium ended 31 December 2011 for UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS;

(g) Informal consultation on the UNFPA strategic plan, 2014-2017;

(h) Briefing on the ICPD beyond 2014 review.