






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 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.**

Yes	In progress	No	NA
			

A NEW GENERATION OF UN COUNTRY TEAMS	Yes/No	Please elaborate <i>(Explain how the entity is implementing the requirement, or, if not implemented, plans and timelines to do so)</i>
<i>Country Programmes/Strategies and UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks¹</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity have a policy to ensure compliance with the Management and Accountability Framework (MAF) requirement to “consult with the Resident Coordinator at key stages of entity-specific strategic planning”? 		<p>UN-Habitat’s strategic plan 2020/23, recently extended to 2025, did not include any specific guidance on compliance with MAF, which was still being defined as the SP was developed. Therefore, regional offices managers follow the general UN guidance on this. UN-Habitat relies on Regional Representatives (RRs) and senior staff in the regions to interact actively with Resident Coordinators (RCs) as appropriate bringing country-level urban knowhow into regional/country strategic planning. UN-Habitat also has institutionalized the practice of inviting RCs to several recent World Urban Forums Sessions, to engage in a strategic dialogue for future programming. While on missions, the Executive Director and senior management are</p>



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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, please briefly describe how your entity monitors compliance of this requirement? 		<p>encouraged to meet with RCs and UNCTs during meetings informal or formal meetings organized jointly. Regional offices are mandated to encourage country office managers to sign off for MAFs, as they collaborate with United Nations Country Teams. There are no formal standards, but compliance with the MAF in all regions is part of good practices in joint programming. In 2025, with the formulation of a new Strategic Plan, a new guidance will be issued to address shortcomings and gaps, and institutionalize MAF in UN-Habitat’s country programming and monitoring across all regions and in all country operations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity’s policy ensure compliance with the Management and Accountability Framework (MAF) requirement to “formally solicit feedback from Resident Coordinators on the alignment [of entity-specific country programming] to the UN Cooperation Framework”? <p>If yes, please briefly describe how your entity monitors compliance of this requirement?</p>		<p>This is gradually materializing although institutionalization should ensure full compliance. In fact, senior managers in Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean meet and communicate directly with RCs for feedback on UN-Habitat country programming. In Africa, UN-Habitat country programmes are now align with the UNSDCF and national development plans, owing to increased improved collaboration with other members of UNCTs in several countries. This also the case in the Arab States where all country programmes align with the existing UNSDCF and contribute to the development of new ones. Moreover, in countries where a CCA process was developed, UN-HABITAT was involved and provided substantive input. UN-Habitat COs also contribute to the regular reporting on the progress of the implementation of the UNSDCF).</p> <p>For a better monitoring of compliance, UN-Habitat’s will include in its next Strategic Plan in 2025, a special guidance under the means of its implementation ensuring that both UN-Habitat’s country managers confirm by means of reporting verified by RC offices on progress made in achieving this requirement.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity’s guidance require your country programme to be developed after 		<p>UN-Habitat’s country programme development aligns with priorities of the UNSDCF as well as national development plans. The UN-Habitat Country Programme Document (HCPD) template has been applied and amended depending on the</p>




<p>Cooperation Framework priorities have been agreed with Government?</p>		<p>context. RRs in ROAS and ROAP give directions and provide guidance to country managers to ensure they contribute to the CCA and UNSDCF timely. In 2025, UN-Habitat plans to update the existing policy guidance to align fully UN-Habitat country programming with CCA and UNSDCF processes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity governing body systematically review the derivation of country programmes from the Cooperation Frameworks? 		<p>The review of UN-Habitat’s country projects and programmes follows an internal process managed by the Programme Review committee (PRC), coordinated both at the Headquarters (HQ) and country (Regional PRC) levels. So far there has been no direct derivation of UN-Habitat’s programmes/projects from UNSDCFs, which necessitated review by the Governing Bodies. Governing Bodies are of course aware of the overall strategic orientations as they approve UN-Habitat’s work programme, but the day-to-day implementation at programme and project development level follows different processed. <i>Note:</i> The Executive Board may advise and decide to mandate for a systematic review of the current practice for full compliance. In that case, questions of format and nature of the review shall be clarified.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are all the development activities of your entity at the country level captured in the Joint Workplan of the Cooperation Framework? 		<p>It all depends on government requests and timelines. In principle this is sought all the time, but not always possible. In some countries programming of UN-Habitat follows UNSDCF. However, country specific UNSDCF do not necessarily capture all activities of entities, particularly when in non-resident status like UN-Habitat. Another challenge is the attempt to dominate the process of negotiation over the outputs/activities by some agencies. As UN-Habitat country offices can support the CCA exercise and prioritization, the majority of UN-Habitat activities are captured in the respective UNSCDFs. In Africa, UN-Habitat is part of the joint programming for the implementation of the UNSDCF in countries such Kenya, Mozambique, Cameroun, Somalia. In the Arab States, UN-Habitat country teams are required to closely work in the formulation and reporting of the UNSDCF, ensuring that activities are captured as required. In Asia and the Pacific, for instance in Indonesia, HSO ensures that UN-Habitat’s activities are annually planned and reported in UNINFO. In some cases, UN-Habitat engages and leads Priority Result and Working Groups (PWGs) and facilitates the implementation and monitoring of annual JWPs and report on their progress. UN-</p>

		Habitat plans to develop a Policy to guide systematically the alignment of country activities with UNSDCFs.
<i>Country Configuration²</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity’s policy require that your country representatives systematically engage with the UNCT to review configuration of your country-level capacities, in response to a new Cooperation Framework, as per the Cooperation Framework guidance? 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? 	<p>✓</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p>	<p>In countries where UN-Habitat has presence, the review of country level activities is conducted with UNCT under the leadership of RCOs, i.e in the case of ROAf. In Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC), a type of intervention and business model has been defined after negotiation with RC and government.</p> <p>In Asia and the Pacific, the configuration of capacity of UNH country teams are assessed and continuously adjusted to project needs, with a view of maintaining continuous senior leadership (HPM, CTA) for participation in UNCT processes. Given project resources, the capacity of UNH teams can significantly vary during a UNSDCF cycle.</p> <p>Recently our engagement in UNCT reconfiguration has led to more focus on urban resilience in Mauritius. In countries where UN-Habitat is not present, Inter-Regional Advisors have promoted UN-Habitat’s mandate as a non-resident agency. In Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia this model has been successful. In other contexts, urban advisors have been supporting similar tasks. However, as project funding has been the only resource available at country level so far, this exercise may not lead in implementation if project resources are not mobilized. In Arab States for example, all ROAS country offices are part of the UNCT and actively engage in the preparation of the CCA and UNSDCF. A better positioning of UN-Habitat within the UNCT in at least 4 COs in this region contributed to strengthening and improving its visibility (presence and alignment with national priorities) and the capacity of the CO to mobilize partnerships. At least 2-3 UN-Habitat’s Country Offices are regularly referred to by the UNCT and RCO to provide support and advice on project implementation. Moreover, UN-Habitat’s ROAS played a very important role and was</p>







² Source: UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Guidance

		able to provide substantive advise on procurement through substantive contribution to the BOMS in Egypt.
<i>Multi-Country Office Review³</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has your entity reviewed and adjusted its programme responses and resource allocations in support of the priorities of Small Island Developing States? 		Several programming initiatives on SIDS (slum upgrading, climate change, SDG cities, resilience). That is not the case for the Arab States/ROAS. As for Africa, ROAF is developing a strategy for support to SIDS countries on urban resilience. In Asia, ROAP has always included SIDS considerations in the regional strategic planning, despite the limited resources to support programming and implementation. With minimal resources, high-level engagements such as Pacific Urban Forum could only be possible in collaboration with the UN system, UNESCAP, and local gov associations in the respective SIDS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to the Multi-Country Office review, has your entity taken concrete steps to review the appropriate expertise and organizational arrangements in MCO settings, where required? 		As per the reconfiguration, resources are a key factor of success in compliance. Without funds, support to the UN MCOs has been largely remote. Generally, the UN-Habitat's participation in UNCTs is in place and active. However, this is not always possible to ensure presence in-person, and at all working groups level. In Africa, for example, avenues have been created for at least four (4) multi-country and country offices, including in Central Africa, West Africa, East and Horn of Africa, Southern Africa. For the Anglophone Caribbean the modality of Interregional Advisor is being explored. In Asia, provisions are in place for at least three UN MCOs, but so far the support takes place remotely.






³ Source: UN General Assembly resolution 74/297

<i>Efficiencies⁴</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has your entity put in place a system to track efficiency gains, achieved individually as well as jointly with other UN entities? If yes, is the system using the agreed UNSDG common methodology for measuring the impact of efficiency initiatives? 	 ON!	<p>UN-Habitat has implemented the modality of multicounty teams that cover several countries in a subregion from the same hub. This has resulted in efficiency gains. The model has been proven successful in LAC, in West Africa and South East Asia. ROAF are using the performance assessment and periodic review of performance based on the secretariat principles. A methodology for measuring impact is to be developed. For ROAS and ROAP: common gains were assessed and identified through the exercise conducted in the BOS for common services delivery that achieves better quality and cost avoidance</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity report annually to its governing body on (a) entity-specific efficiency gains and (b) contribution to system-wide efficiency gains? 	 ON!	<p>UN-Habitat has informed the Executive Board on the modality of Multi country Hubs to gain efficiency in services provided to countries, particularly in Middle Income Countries (e.g. LAC, South East Asia). In principle, the efficiency gains are about BOS and UN system MCOs. Not about UNH's own MCOs. So far, there has been no reporting to EB whatsoever on these efficiency gains.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What % of your entity's premises are common premises? 	 ON!	<p>As much as possible, UN-Habitat supports the common premises approach. In cases where project offices are located within partner institutions of the host country, UN-Habitat ensures the regular presence at the UN House, often a desk is provided for colleagues as in the case of Azerbaijan or Serbia. Generally, common premises are used in key countries covered by regions, also given the high costs and low availability of space in several UN compounds. For Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC): UN-House in Mexico. Common premises with UNEP in Panama City, Common premises with UNHCR in Bogotá, common premises with UNDSS in Rio de Janeiro (Regional team) and hosted by counterpart in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil substantive team). For the Arab states, 4 out of the 13 COs (Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan, Tunisia) are currently part of common premises. Egypt office will also be part of a common premises scheduled to be ready in</p>







⁴ Source: UN General Assembly Resolution 72/279 and UN General Assembly Resolution 76/4




		2025. In Africa, UN-Habitat complies in Somalia, Senegal, Abidjan, Burkina, Kenya, Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda. For Asia and the Pacific: common premises are used in about half of the countries covered by the agency (e.g. Afghanistan, Philippines, Pakistan).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In how many countries does your entity participate in a Common Back Office? 	 ON!	UN-Habitat is active in the CBO in Kenya. However, this is still work in progress for UN-Habitat. A full report may be submitted to the Executive Board at its next session.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	 ON!	Given the need for establishing services closer to the point of delivery, UN-Habitat continues to search for the best opportunities to achieve full compliance in this point. A full report may be submitted to the Executive Board at its next session.
REINVIGORATING THE ROLE OF THE RC SYSTEM⁵	Yes/No	Please elaborate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the job description of your entity country representatives been revised as appropriate, following the reform, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Recognize the role and responsibility of the Resident Coordinator?  (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?  (c) Reflect the responsibility for active engagement in UNCT?  	 ON!	Corporate guidance was agreed with DCO and shared with all regional and country offices to recognize the role and responsibility of the RC who agrees with UN-Habitat's country representative on certain goal/s towards the joint work of the UNCT and the CF which should be evaluated in the end of performance cycle every year by the RC. In the case of Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia, the new job descriptions align with the close coordination of the agency with RCOs and UNCTs respectively. MAF implementation ongoing. EPAS alignment also initiated since 2021 is recommended as good practice.

⁵ Source: Management and Accountability Framework

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity ensure that RCs have an opportunity to input on the skillsets and leadership profile in selecting new country representatives? If yes, please briefly describe how your entity monitors compliance of this requirement? 		<p>This is in progress. Consultations with RC on expectations are done through ROs. But no systematic inputs in TOR/classification. As new recruitments are possible, Regional Representatives consult with RCs on recruitments. In Asia and the Pacific: RCs are consulted prior to the launch of VAs, for inputs. In regular meetings/discussions with RCs, ROAP senior managers have usually already captured the needs from the UNRCO/CT perspective. In interview panels, ROAP hiring managers will communicate to fellow panel members the soft skill sets needed in particular country settings. Similar efforts are undertaken in other regions to ensure a swift communication with RC whenever possible.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the performance assessment system of your entity's country representatives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Embed characteristics of the UN leadership framework? (b) Have at least one key result area linked to contribution to collective UNCT results? (c) Include a metric on the number of joint programmes they supported? 		<p>In addition, many country representatives are not full UN staff and do not participate in the electronic performance appraisal system (EPAS), therefore systems have been devised to work on offline consultation.</p> <p>In Asia and the Pacific: in principle, this is goal one in all work plans of country managers, representation and collaboration in UNCT / with UNRCO is mandated. However, joint programming is still to be prioritized, as UN-Habitat too often lacks core resources to solicit interest of large resident agencies. When Joint Programmes are accomplished, then a country manager will be complemented strongly.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what % of countries has the RC provided input into the performance review of your entity representative? 		<p>In process of becoming systematic.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do your country representatives inform the performance assessment of Resident Coordinators by providing feedback on RC behaviors against the RC leadership profile? 		<p>In all regions.</p>
REVAMPING THE REGIONAL APPROACH⁶	Yes/No	Please elaborate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity have a policy in place to ensure your participation in rosters of expertise at regional level? 		<p>There is participation in some regions (e.g. LAC, Africa) on rosters of expertise that are under development. Only in West Africa with the UNISS framework. ROAS was engaged in the roaster of expertise at regional level led by UNESCWA on behalf of the</p>

⁶ Source: Management and Accountability Framework





<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your entity have a policy in place to provide surge capacity when requested by Resident Coordinators on behalf of the UN country teams? 		<p>RCP. This is not the case for ROAP. Surge requests in ASPAC. UN-Habitat provide surge capacity from HQ, regional, sub-regional and programme hubs and subject to availability of financial resources from the demand side to cover cost of services. In Africa, this is the case we the Agency has presence, e.g recently in Malawi.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has your entity made expertise available to the country level through participation in Regional Collaborative Platforms, including the Issue-Based Coalitions? 		<p>Evidently, expertise has been available through RCP and IBC as allow by financial resources availability. ROAP RR and Bangkok office have significantly engaged. In ROAS as well. In Africa as well, as regional directors participated to RCP and experts on issue-based coalition on digital and on climate change. In Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia representation at RCP has been provided by Inter-Regional Advisor and follow up with IBCs to mainstream urbanization and housing issues, has been on an ad-hoc basis. UNH has been active in RCP in Africa through OIBC 3 on digital. Support is being given to Malawi, Botswana, South Africa and Namibia</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do your entity' Regional Directors, as members of the Regional Collaborative Platforms (RCPs), include in their individual performance compacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) their accountability for collective regional results as agreed in the RCP? (b) their role in ensuring implementation of the Management and Accountability Framework at the regional and country level (c) their responsibility in driving joint results at the country level in line with the Cooperation Framework and other inter-agency agreements (d) Their responsibility in ensuring their representatives in countries have the skill sets and profile of leadership that would be particularly relevant in the given 	    	<p>It is done and to be strengthened in next performance cycle 2023-2024. Stronger RCP role for regional CCA/UNSDCF reviews being institutionalized with new resources. Key responsibilities of RR in collaboration with regional HSOs. ROAP addressed this even though - in the current RR performance compact, most issues from (a) to (d) are mentioned in general: e.g. ESCAP collaboration, upholding MAF in countries, country team performance, capacity building support. In ROAS, leadership assessment (d) is one of the competencies tested during the interview and selection process for the recruitment of all country heads. For (a), (b) and (c), the answer is no.</p>

country context ahead of selection and deployment?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do your Regional Directors or equivalent representatives of entities that comprise the UNCT contribute to the performance appraisal of the RCs? 	 ON!	Yes. This is normal practice. Participation in yearly RCP collective review of RCs in ROAP, ROAS and ROAF and in Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION, OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SYSTEM WIDE RESULTS⁷	Yes/No	Please elaborate
<i>Strategic Plans</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	 ON!	UN-Habitat's current Strategic Plan 2020-2023 was extended by the UN-Habitat's Governing Bodies to serve until 2025 to address the need for full compliance with the QCPR cycling requirements. It is expected that a new Strategic Plan will be developed from 2025, which should include arrangements to support full compliance and alignment repositioned UN Development System at regional and country levels. Fully applied in the case of Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	 ON!	Internal communication mechanisms are being reviewed to make sure that all the structures are fit for the purpose of the Reform. ROAS invited the head of DCO in the regional retreat to have a substantive dialogue with the country heads on the UN reforms and delivering as one. Fully applied in the case of Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia. Africa, we support participation of staff to CCA and CF and other strategic discussion at the country level to customize them with the UN Reform. ROAP holds regular regional meetings and retreats to support strategic mgt capacity.

⁷ Source: Management and Accountability Framework

<i>Results Reporting</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity systematically contribute to the annual UN Country Results Report on the implementation of the Cooperation Framework? 	✓	<p>Fully complied, in 2022, in all regions. For ROAS, in all countries.</p> <p>What's more, ROAP HSOs and country managers work within UNCTS for the annual UN Country Reports, where UN-Habitat has a presence and footprint.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity ensure the systematic reporting of its results at the country level on the system-wide UN INFO platform? 	↔ ON!	<p>Due to limited country presence and capacity, inputs in UNINFO are only provided in specific relevant countries, e.g Afghanistan, Indonesia and some Arab States as well as in selected countries in Eastern Europe and, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia-</p> <p>Yes, in Africa, recently in Kenya, Guinea Bissau, Zambia, Mozambique.</p>
FUNDING THE RC SYSTEM AND DELIVERING ON FUNDING COMPACT COMMITMENTS⁸	Yes/No	Please elaborate
<i>Special Purpose Trust Fund for the RC System</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the amounts contributed by your entity to the SPTF as part of the 1% levy tally with the CEB estimates of overall tightly earmarked contributions? If no, how do you explain the difference and what steps the entity has taken to reduce the gap? 	✓	<p>The 1% RC levy is being applied throughout and is a pre-condition for IPMR. The PRC checks on the suitability for each project.</p>
<i>Funding Compact</i>		

⁸ Source: General Assembly resolution 72/279, 76/4 and Funding Compact

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity hold a structured dialogue with its governing body on how to finance the development results in the current strategic planning cycle? 		<p>This is part of the mandate upon UN-Habitat’s Governing bodies.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your governing body monitor implementation of your respective entity’s and Member States’ Funding Compact commitments? 		<p>A recommendation has been included into the Note by the secretariat proposing to issue a specific guidance on this.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What % of your entity’s programming consists of Joint Programmes? 		<p>A common practice in UN-Habitat at country level. In most countries where UN-Habitat is signatory/part of the UNSDCFs, the organization is engaged in joint programming as relevant. Updated estimate could be presented in the next EB meeting</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your entity have a policy guiding country representatives to make use of relevant global pooled funding mechanisms (e.g., Joint SDG Fund, Spotlight Initiative, Peacebuilding Fund)? 		<p>Partially only. Information shared ad-hoc, prioritization of target countries decided in case of strict rules for such decisions only. Yes , but frequent push back from UN agencies as non-resident agency</p>