



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA

Distr.: LIMITED
ECA/SA/TCC.UNA/2009/1

November 2009
Original: ENGLISH

**A SUB REGIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR COORDINATING UN
SUPPORT TO RECs BASED ON THE NEPAD
FRAMEWORK AND THE MDGS**

An Issues Note

DRAFT

1. INTRODUCTION

The last decade has been a period of intense reform within the United Nations. A key aspect of this reform has been a review, of the role of the UN system in development cooperation, particularly in developing countries. The review has been premised on the widely held view that the UN system has many unique advantages to offer, particularly given its diversity and broad scope of multilateral assistance. This encompasses economic, social, environmental and humanitarian factors, all underwritten by universally shared values of equity, justice and a people centred participatory approach, which emphasises sensitivity to vulnerable groups. Yet despite its many distinct advantages, the UN system is not entirely coherent and remains fragmented in its delivery of development cooperation.

There are a number of reasons why a coordinated, coherent and harmonised UN presence is imperative at the national, regional and global levels. Following the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness¹ and both the Monterey and Rome commitments, the architecture of development assistance has shifted towards a more integrated approach premised on ownership, harmonisation, alignment and mutual accountability. The UN's support for development cooperation can no longer remain fragmented.

The scale of the UN's contribution to development assistance is small compared to bilateral and multilateral sources. While the strategic value of the system's role may be better captured by its catalytic and advocacy functions, rather than by the scale of its activities and resources, its usefulness still has to be judged on its relevance and ability to fulfil the needs of its many and expanding constituencies. A key challenge for the UN system, therefore, is to significantly align its development cooperation activities at the national, (sub) regional and global levels, in order to leverage its limited resources and exploit the capacities of the entire UN system. This requires a coherent and coordinated.

For the case of Africa, the situation is exacerbated by the severity and persistence of its economic and social challenges. Many countries in the region face major challenges in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and as many African countries are unlikely to achieve these by the target date of 2015. This has led to a significant expansion of the activities of the UN in Africa in recent years and a much greater need for coordination and collaboration to increase the impact of the work of the organization in the region.

The launch by African leaders of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) in July 2001 provided a framework for achieving Africa's development objectives. Thus the General Assembly in resolution 57/7, welcomed NEPAD "as a programme of the African Union that embodies the vision and commitment of all African Governments..". The GA subsequently adopted it as the framework for Africa's development and requested the UN system to intensify its efforts in developing and implementing joint programmes in support of its implementation at the regional level.

NEPAD is a continental framework and is part of the AU's long-term vision to build an Africa Economic Community. The Regional Economic Communities (RECs) are the critical building blocks for the Community. They are the major pillars on which member States can

¹ Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness – Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability, Paris March 2002

build consensus on regional integration issues, as well as directly articulate their collective plans for the development of their respective sub-regions. In this light, the RECs are the implementation arms of NEPAD and the main conduits for UN support to NEPAD at the sub regional level.

The UN system has developed frameworks at the global, regional and country levels for coordinating support in the implementation of NEPAD priorities. At the global level, the Office of the Special Advisor on Africa (OSAA) at UN Headquarters is tasked with the role of global advocacy as well as reporting to the inter-governmental bodies on UN system-wide support to it. The Department of Public Information (DPI) carries out public information and awareness raising activities. At the regional level, the Regional Coordination Mechanism (RCM) provides a forum for interagency dialogue and harmonising UN assistance to NEPAD. Likewise, the United Nations Country Teams (UNCT), through the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), provides a mechanism at the national level for coordinating and integrating UN system-wide support. Without any structures and mechanisms for system wide coordination, the sub regional level represents the missing middle for interagency collaboration.

This weakness was well recognised in the SG's report to the 61st session of the General Assembly² in which he requested the GA to strengthen the sub regional offices of ECA to enable them promote Africa's integration and development agenda through an increased focus on the sub regional dimension. The SG's report delegated, in respect of regional integration activities, to ECA's sub regional offices the "lead role at the sub regional level in coordinating the programmes and activities of the United Nations agencies, thus bringing this perspective to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) framework". To this end, the SG's report recommended that the main vehicle for the delivery of technical cooperation at the sub regional level should be a multi year programme signed with RECs and which directly reflects the priorities of their member States.

In recognition of the above, the 7th RCM meeting recommended that ECA, in consultation with other UN agencies, the AUC and the NEPAD Secretariat, coordinate discussions on the needs of the RECs in order to improve the alignment and targeting of United Nations support to the AU-NEPAD priorities at sub-regional level. The 8th meeting reiterated this call and proposed the review of existing sub regional arrangements. Specifically, the meeting identified the multi year programming approach with RECs as a possible entry point for establishing SRCMs and requested that this be reviewed to provide opportunity for further consultation and consensus building among UN agencies operating in Africa.

The purpose of this Issues Note is to progress the debate on the development of a framework for coordinating UN system wide activities at the sub regional level to enable SADC implement the NEPAD framework as well as the MDGs. The note sketches current system-wide mechanisms for coordination and harmonisation at the regional and national levels, assesses their merits and attempts to draw out useful lessons that could form the basis of a sub regional level coordination framework. The main issues to be addressed are outlined, as are the principles to guide such coordination. The note makes recommendations, which should help move forward the discussions on an SRCM for UN system support to RECs.

² A/RES/61/471, "Enhancing the role of the sub regional offices of the Economic Commission for Africa", 27 September, 2006.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF CURRENT COORDINATION, HARMONISATION AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION EFFORTS

2.1 The Regional Consultations Meetings

The Regional Consultation Meetings arose from resolution 1998/46 of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which urged the establishment of regional consultative meetings among UN agencies working in each global region. The overall purpose of these regional consultative meetings was to promote synergy and coordination among the agencies and organizations of the UN system, so as to improve the collective response by the UN system in addressing the priority needs of each of the five regions.

The annual Regional Consultations Meeting (RCM)³ of the United Nations organizations working in Africa, convened by ECA, has since become the main operational mechanism for coordinating UN support to NEPAD among the agencies of the UN system. The RCM is not just meant to enhance interagency coherence, coordination and cooperation through increased joint activities and programmes, it is also a tool for improving cooperation between the UN and African continental organizations such as the AU, the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the RECs.

In resolution 57/7, the GA urged the United Nations system to “organize the activities of the United Nations system around thematic clusters based on the priority areas of the New Partnership”. Thus the RCM is organised around thematic clusters that reflect the objectives and priority work areas of NEPAD, with each cluster led by a UN agency as convener. There are currently nine clusters⁴ and these are shown in Annex 1. The clusters provide an essential platform for coordinating the work of the agencies and for identifying priority areas for possible joint actions in support of NEPAD.

In November 2006, the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Chairperson of the African Union Commission (AUC) signed the Framework Agreement for the United Nations Ten-Year Capacity-Building Programme for the AU. The Agreement serves as a basis for United Nations-African Union cooperation, taking into account the needs and strategic priorities of the AU. The implementation of the Agreement is coordinated through the RCM.

The performance of the clusters, as well as that of the RCM as a whole, has been the subject of a number of reviews. Particularly worrisome has been the commonly held view that while the goals and objectives of coherence and coordination of the UN system support to NEPAD are well articulated, the mechanisms for integrating their work have functioned at far less than optimum levels.

The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) examined the existing interagency arrangements for coordination among United Nations agencies working in Africa⁵. Particularly, the JIU assessed the organisation of the work of the agencies in Africa, the clusters and their

³ The 9th RCM changed the name to Regional Coordination Mechanism

⁴ The last RCM meeting held in November 2006 divided the Governance, Peace and Security cluster into Governance (convened by UNDP) and Peace and Security (convened by DPA). Agriculture, Trade and Market Access cluster was also divided into Agriculture, Food Security and Rural Development (convened by FAO) and Industry, Trade and Market Access (convener to be determined)

⁵ JIU/REP/2005/8, “Further Measures to Strengthen United Nations System Support to the New Partnership for Africa’s Development”, 2005

capacities, as well as those of ECA as convener of the RCM. Similarly, in 2006 the Secretary General's Advisory Panel on International Support to NEPAD assessed international support, including that of the United Nations, to NEPAD⁶. The essential issues raised by the Panel were: improving coordination of the United Nations system to better support NEPAD; enhancing collaboration between the entities of the United Nations system and the AU Commission, including the NEPAD programme; and strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to improve support to NEPAD.

Both the JIU and SG's panel reports endorsed the RCM and its cluster approach arrangement as a viable mechanism for coordinating UN support to NEPAD. The two reports however recommended a number of actions to improve the functioning of the RCM. The seventh Annual Regional Consultations held in November 2006 considered these recommendations, and suggested a number of improvements to the RCM. These were that the cluster system should be strengthened and coordination revitalised through an improved alignment of programmes and resources to the priorities of the AU, NEPAD and the RECs. That meeting recommended that ECA becomes a strategic coordinator, rather than act as a mere Convener of the RCM and that discussions be started on developing a sub regional coordination framework similar to the RCM. A further recommendation was that the UN system in each sub region develops knowledge and information management systems on the presence and activities of UN agencies and organizations and their areas of competence and concentration. The mechanism should also be accessible to, and contain data and information on, other key development partners and to minimize duplication and create synergy among development actors in meeting development priorities of the sub region.

The subsequent RCMs have reiterated this call. For example, the 8th RCM proposed the review of existing sub regional arrangements, and echoed the view that the multi year programming approach with RECs be reviewed as a possible entry point for establishing the SRCM. The review was viewed as an opportunity for further consultation and consensus building among UN agencies operating in each sub region. Similarly, the 9th RCM suggested that RECs, as the central pillars of sub regional integration, be involved in the development of the SRCM. The mechanism itself should integrate into the RCM as well as build on existing RDT mechanisms operating in the sub regions.

Notwithstanding the above calls, tangible progress on developing an SRCM remains quite slow. Informal discussions have been initiated among the UN agencies but these are yet to agree on a number of issues.

2.2 UNDAFs and UNCTs

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), is the common strategic framework for implementing the operational activities of the UN system at the country level. The UNDAF is part of the implementation strategy of the UNDG plan of action, developed in response to calls for accelerating reform within the United Nations system⁷. The plan of action seeks to align UN development cooperation with new aid modalities such as the Rome

⁶ A/61/138, "Second Report of the Secretary General's Advisory Panel on International Support to the New Partnership for Africa's Development", 2006.

⁷ World Outcome Summit, September 2005.

and Paris declarations on Aid Effectiveness. The UNDG plan of action focuses on three major areas:

- Putting national development plans at the centre of UN programming
- Increasing focus on strengthening national institutions and capacities
- Increasing usage of national systems.

The UNDAF is a results-driven MDG framework whose main purpose is to provide a coherent and integrated UN response to national priorities and needs. In this regard UNDAFs primarily serve two purposes: Firstly, they serve as a basis upon which individual UN agencies, funds and programmes formulate their actions for a programme cycle. Secondly, as part of the UN's response to new aid modalities, UNDAFs serve as the UNs contribution towards the Harmonisation, Alignment and Simplification agenda (HAS) of cooperating partners⁸.

Based on the UNDG guidelines on common programming, the UNDAF is the result of a consultative process involving the UN system, national governments and development partners. An assessment of a country's development challenges is done through analytical work such as a national development plan, a PRSP, or the UNs Common Country Assessment (CCA), the latter being conducted by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT).

The structure of the UNDAF is such that all UN programmes are focussed into two to four thematic areas in which UN agencies have a collective comparative advantage and therefore existing synergies can enhance the impact of UNCT activities. The thematic areas of cooperation are agreed upon at an UNDAF prioritisation retreat that brings together the UNCT (including non resident agencies and UN regional offices), representatives from Government planning departments, civil society and donors. Different UN agencies are given theme groups to lead based on their comparative strength. Common thematic areas include food security, social services and governance while cross cutting issues such as HIV/AIDS, gender and governance are good examples in which entire UNCT members have merged and pooled resources to provide joint UN programmes⁹.

A major strength of the UNDAF lies in its results-based approach. Each thematic area of cooperation is associated with clearly identified national priority goals, the UNDAF outcomes, the intended country programme outputs, the role of each implementing UN agency and cooperating partner, as well as resource mobilisation targets. The UNDAF also contains a division of labour matrix showing lead agencies, and a monitoring and evaluation plan that includes indicators, baseline data, sources of verification and underlying assumptions. These elements contribute to a successful implementation of UN programmes at the country level, especially in comparison to the RCM.

While the UNDAF is commonly acknowledged by UNCTs as an efficient and unifying approach to programming, there remains a number of challenges to working together in such a common framework. One of the biggest challenges is the different pace at which agencies and

⁸ In Zambia, the UNDAF is synchronised with, and responds to the country's Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP). It also serves as the UN's contribution towards the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ) through which Cooperating Partners have agreed in to work jointly in supporting government in the realisation of development objectives.

⁹ Zambia's UN joint programme on HIV/AIDS entailed all UNCT HIV/AIDS staff working in one location (UNAIDS) on one programme.

their respective headquarters implement the UN reform agenda in general and the CCA/UNDAF process in particular. UNDAF priorities are always aligned to those at headquarters of the agencies and headquarter support is not therefore always adequate. Another challenge is the lack of adequate technical capacity to enable staff operate solely on joint programmes. Involving Specialised and Non Resident Agencies (NRAs) in UNDAF participation has also been a challenge as their very nature¹⁰ limits their participation at the country level. Previous debate on these issues suggest that the lack of coherence at the country level cannot be completely resolved without a review of mandates of agencies and aligning their work programmes at the Executive Board level and harmonising the notion of “regions”¹¹.

3.0 The key principles to consider in a sub regional coordination framework

Based on current developments on aid effectiveness, harmonisation and alignment of development cooperation activities, several guiding principles can be gleaned from much of the current work in this area¹²:

The programmes of UN support to RECs for implementation NEPAD Framework needs to be OWNED and driven by the RECs themselves. They must exercise leadership in developing and implementing sub regional strategies based on the needs of their member States. The RECs need to further take the lead in coordinating the participation of other stakeholders in the region, such as cooperating partners, civil society and the private sector. The role of the UN system is to provide a partnership, based on its many comparative advantages, through which the REC programme of action can be realised and its capacities to execute that programme strengthened.

The programme of UN support to RECs needs to be ALIGNED to their overall development strategies, procedures and structures. This calls for a framework for a single point entry by the UN, which takes into account the international commitments, such as the MDGs, as well as alignment to NEPAD principles. To this end, thematic coordination based on the priorities of the RECs offers scope for developing such a common framework in which not just the UN but other donors participate. To this end a multi partner, multi year approach under a common REC programme approach appears to be the best option. This is consistent with the RCM and UNDAF coordination mechanisms, which are based on thematic clusters.

Harmonisation of UN system support is critical and where feasible, common arrangements for planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting need to be developed. Based on their comparative advantage and working within their respective mandates, UN agencies need to avoid duplicative actions, promote joint capacity building initiatives and build a community of practice through shared learning from their collective experiences.

The framework that is developed for UN support to RECs must be based on the principles of managing for results. This requires a results oriented programme planning and reporting

¹⁰ NRAs lack operational presence at country level while specialised agencies provide technical support and do not operate as funds. They are also mandated to ensure localisation of internationally agreed protocols and procedures.

¹¹ High level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence, Maputo, 8-9 May 2006.

¹² See Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness – Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability, Paris March 2002

framework that link programming and resources to results. This also requires the strengthening of REC capacities to implement results based management. In this context, the UNDAF approach appears more superior to the RCM one.

4.0 KEY ISSUES TO BE DEBATED

There are several issues that the discussion on a sub regional coordination framework needs to address

Decide on a model for a sub regional system for UN coordination

As earlier outlined, the UN system has many comparative advantages to offer RECs in relation to regional integration given its broad scope of work of development cooperation and its unique attributes of neutral broker and trusted consensus builder. Its support at sub regional level, however, remains fragmented and lacks a framework for coordination. The first issue to be addressed therefore is the decision on a model for a sub regional system for coordinating UN assistance to RECs through the NEPAD framework.

The SG's report to the GA suggests "the possibility of a coordination framework at the sub regional level similar to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework at the country level". Both the UNDAF and RCM are similar in design. They are both based on a cluster approach with each agency coordinating those activities in which its mandate bestow upon it a comparative advantage. One therefore sees a similar arrangement in which a sub regional RCM or UNDAF is clustered around the key areas of REC priorities for regional integration with say ILO providing leadership over skills building employment and training issues; UNAIDS in issues of HIV/AIDS, UNCTAD on trade issues, UNIDO on industrial development, UNDP on social and governance issues; FAO on issues of agriculture and food security and ECA on matters of regional integration.

Decide on a mode of working with RECs

The SG's report to the 61st session of the GA proposes the use of a multi year programme approach as the preferred mode of working with RECs. The SG's report further suggests that cooperation entails "efforts to enhance joint programming of work at the sub regional level" – a long-term system wide objective of coordination and harmonisation. This approach resonates well with the "One UN" thrust and offers scope for participation by other cooperating partners. The multi year, multi-partner approach should be reviewed as recommended by successive RCMs to explore how this can be adjusted to from the bedrock of the proposed SRCM.

Coordination needs a strategic coordinator

Lessons from both the UNDAF and RCM processes emphasise the need to create leadership and capacity to secure effectiveness of coordination arrangements. This requires that a strategic coordinator, rather than just a mere convener, be identified. A strategic coordinator would be responsible for much of the SRCM programme management processes, ensuring that it is aligned to the needs and priorities of RECs, providing strategic support to the clusters, monitoring implementation and reporting on the results achieved. The coordinating agency would also be the main liaison point with the Secretariats of the RECs with annual

reports on activities implemented by the UN system submitted to the REC Summits through their intergovernmental machinery.

As the regional arm of the UN in Africa, ECA has a long history of association with the intergovernmental bodies both at the regional level, such as the AU and NEPAD, and at the sub regional level with the Regional Economic Communities. Much of this work is based on the promotion of regional integration and development – a fundamental pillar of ECA’s work. It is in this light that the SG’s report suggests that ECA’s sub regional offices play a lead role to “translate into specific strategic and sectoral areas of focus stemming from sub regional specificities”.

For the above reasons and given the history of collaboration in regional integration in a number of sectors, as well as tracking the process of regional integration itself, it appears inescapable that UNECA should play the role of “coordinating the United Nations system activities for sub regional integration” as recommended by the SG’s report. This role would fit in seamlessly with the regional level RCM which primarily promotes regional integration. The SG in his report challenges the UN system to “focus on ensuring that regional economic integration issues feature in the different UNDAF processes and to work with UNCTs to build country capacities for effective participation in regional integration processes and programmes”. The modalities of bringing a regional integration perspective to the country level UNDAF process needs to be explored. Current work at ECA on mainstreaming regional integration into national development policies and strategies might offer some perspective on this.

Managing the dispersion of UN activities in space and scope

While the cluster model enjoys conceptual unanimity at both the RCM (regional) and UNDAF (country) levels, scepticism continues to be expressed about its efficiency and effectiveness. Several factors contribute to this. Firstly, the focus of the work and activities of the UN is quite wide. Some organizations focus their work on normative issues while others pitch it towards operational issues. The synergy between the two is not always obvious.

Secondly, the work of the UN in Africa has substantially diversified both in geography and in scope. As earlier outlined, a number of UN organizations are involved in regional, sub-regional and country level activities. The regional and sub regional offices of these organisations naturally programme their activities within their organisational mission and mandates in mind and system wide links are not always obvious, especially at sub regional level.

Thirdly, the cluster approach is always associated with funding limitations. Lack of adequate funding limits the ability of several agencies to participate in cluster meetings at the RCM level. It further reduces incentives for joint programmes and limits the capacity of agencies to provide more technical assistance and other operational support to the intergovernmental machinery.

For the case of NEPAD, commendably a small number of agencies have made progress in pooling their resources around selected joint projects and programmes that directly respond to the needs of NEPAD and not to individual programmes of work of the agencies. To this end, the experiences of the water, infrastructure and environment sectors are cited as instructive at the regional level. Similarly, HIV/AIDS, Gender and Governance are cited as good examples

in which UNCT members have merged and pooled resources to create joint UN programmes at the country level.

An important issue to address therefore is how the UN agencies can better manage and finance the spatial and scalar dispersion of their activities to maximise effectiveness in providing support to RECs. A suggestion that has been mooted at the RCM level is for the General Assembly to be requested to increase material support for joint programmes on regional integration.

Monitoring the effectiveness and impact of interventions

The report of the SGs Panel on International Support to NEPAD emphasises the need to strengthen the monitoring process. To this end, it stresses the importance of paying attention to the monitoring of outcomes, in addition to policy or programme inputs and processes. Outcome-oriented monitoring additionally assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of programme interventions in creating developmental impact.

A sub regional coordination mechanism has much to learn from country level UNDAFs which have a strong results-based approach. There is need to clearly identify sub regional priority goals for economic integration, the intended outcomes, the role of each implementing UN agency and cooperating partner, as well as resource mobilisation targets. Similarly, a sub regional level coordination framework should clarify the division of labour indicating the lead agencies, as well as provide for a monitoring and evaluation matrix that includes indicators to be used to evaluate programme delivery.

Knowledge management and communicating more effectively

An effective UN system at sub regional level needs to manage and disseminate knowledge firstly within the UN community and secondly, to its constituencies in the sub region and beyond. This requires a focal point to act as a node for knowledge management and networking, as well as building and managing communities of practice. This entails that the focal point plays an active role to capture, evaluate, organise knowledge to complement activities taking place within the UN community at the sub regional level. This further requires possible investment in hardware and software, databases, websites and discussion nodes to build up the knowledge network and communities of practice. The SG's report suggests that strengthened ECA sub regional offices could "operate as sub regional nodes for knowledge management and networking". This issue needs to be debated and consensus reached.

The need to create a strong coordination capacity

An important issue, which has repeatedly come up in both the RCM and UNDAF processes, is limitations in capacities for coordination. At the RCM level, for example, suggestions have been made to create a small secretariat to which the UN system can second staff in order to boost capacities for coordination. Similarly, at the country level, suggestions have been made to boost coordination capacities by, for example more strategic focus on coordination activities and creating capacity with the Resident Coordinator's office, as distinct from the Resident Representative activities. Coordination capacities, at both the strategic coordinator and cluster levels need to be addressed.

Annex 2 provides a summary of key issues that would need to be debated

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The issues raised in this note are not exhaustive. However, they are sufficient in respect of initiating a discussion on a sub regional framework for coordinating UN system support to Regional Economic Communities. The guidelines, as given by the General Assembly are quite clear. These constitute mandates, which underpin the UN system development cooperation to its member States.

What is not entirely clear – and needs to be addressed – are the modalities for delivering development cooperation outcomes to the RECs. The UN system has the benefit of hindsight, based on the UNCT and RCM models, on what works, the limitations of current coordination mechanisms and the challenges such mechanisms face in operationalising them. The two existing models are also essentially similar and based on a cluster approach. There is therefore no reason to believe that the sub regional coordination mechanism is going to be any different. Furthermore, the coordination mechanism cannot be developed away from the priorities of the RECs. This therefore means that the RECs should be involved identify suitable theme areas for coordination based on their regional integration objectives and priorities.

What would be the expected outcomes of the meeting? The meeting cannot develop a framework for coordinating UN support at the sub regional level. It can, however, agree on a generic mode and possibly its structure. It can also discuss the modalities of how the process should unfold in order to finalise the framework, including allocating responsibilities and proposing timelines for any actions agreed to. The meeting can also appoint a task force and give it specific terms of reference for concretising the SRCM. This note has suggested the main issues that need to be discussed, among many others, as part of the model-building effort.

REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS
LIST OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS BY CLUSTER

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT: WATER AND SANITATION, ENERGY, TRANSPORT AND ICTS

CONVENER: ECA

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: ADB, FAO, IAEA, IMO, ITU, UNCTAD, UNDP, ECA, UNEP, UNESCO, UNICEF, UN-HABITAT, UPU, WHO/WAC (WHO OFFICE AT THE AU AND ECA), WIPO, AND WMO

GOVERNANCE, PEACE AND SECURITY CLUSTER

CONVENER: UNDP

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: ADB, AU, DPA, DPKO, IMF, NEPAD, OCHA, OSAA, UNDESA, UNDP, ECA, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNOHCHR, THE WORLD BANK, AND WFP

ENVIRONMENT, POPULATION AND URBANIZATION CLUSTER

CONVENER: UN-HABITAT

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: IMO, NEPAD, ECA, UNEP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN-HABITAT, AND WMO

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, EMPLOYMENT AND HIV / AIDS CLUSTER

CONVENER: UNICEF

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: FAO, IAEA, ILO, IOM, UNDP, ECA, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNAIDS, UNICEF, UNIDO, NEPAD, WFP, WHO/WAC, AND WIPO

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND MARKET ACCESS CLUSTER

CONVENER: FAO

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: FAO, IAEA, UNCT AD, UNDP, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNHCR. WFP, WIPO, THE WORLD BANK, AND WTO , IFAD, NEPAD, ADB, ECA

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CLUSTER :

CONVENER: UNESCO, VICE CONVENER: ECA

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: UNESCO, ECA, WIPO, UNIDO, F AO, OSAA, UNEP, WORLD BANK, CGIAR, UNDP, UNU/INTECH, WHO

ADVOCACY AND COMMUNICATIONS CLUSTER

CONVENER: OSAA

CLUSTER PARTICIPANTS: UNEP, UNON, UNHABITAT, WB, NEPAD, UNAIDS, UNHCR, UNESCO, ITU, UNDP, UNICEF, OSAA, DPI, ECA

Annex 2: Summary of issues for consideration in the development of a Sub regional Coordination Mechanism for UN support to RECs

Organisational Issues	Programmatic Issues	Monitoring, reporting and Evaluation	Resources	Communications and Knowledge Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Different programming calendars for agencies. How should this problem be addressed? ▪ How should interactions with RECs be structured? ▪ How will REC's leadership and programme ownership role be exercised? ▪ How will the interactions within the UN system be structured and what will be the respective roles of the agencies. ▪ Who will lead the coordination process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the format of coordination arrangements? ▪ Should this be cluster based as in the case of the RCM and UNDAF ▪ Should there be sub clusters to provide opportunity for as many agencies as possible to lead a cluster or sub cluster ▪ The agencies currently programme REC support within activities of their regular work programme. How will programme re-alignment be achieved? ▪ How should joint programming of activities be approached?? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who coordinates reporting (and compiles progress reports and to who?) ▪ How often should progress report/s be compiled? Annually? ▪ How often should cluster report/s be compiled? Quarterly? ▪ What should be format of report? ▪ How to incorporate RBM into reporting formats ▪ Should there be periodic external/internal evaluation? How often? ▪ How to report to REC intergovernmental structures including the Summit ▪ Report back to intergovernmental bodies of agencies ▪ Report to OSAA in New York HQ through the RCM? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How are coordination activities to be financed? ▪ How should Secretariat be supported- should agencies second people or just appoint focal points within-agency ? ▪ ECA will open a liaison office at REC offices. What will be the linkages between this office and the agencies? ▪ Should there be dedicated programme resources specifically for supporting REC's regional integration activities? 	<p>Communications is at several levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the UN system 2. With member States 3. With RECs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How should communication be structured at these levels. ▪ What tools/methods should be used? ▪ What should be communicated and to whom? ▪ How does communication integrate into the UN information service function? ▪ ECA plans to install a V-sat at some RECs. How should this resource be used /shared with the other agencies? ▪ How should the cost of communication be shared (human, hard ware and financial resources) ▪ How should the communication function be used for consensus building and advocacy work of the UN ▪ How should the agencies proceed in building up knowledge networks and communities of practice?