



UNAIDS/PCB(20)/07.9  
11 May 2007

**20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board**  
Geneva, Switzerland  
25-27 June 2007

*Provisional agenda item 4.3:*

**Report of the Global Task Team Independent Assessment**

**Additional documents for this item:**

An Independent Assessment of Progress on the Implementation of the Global Task Team Recommendations in Support of National AIDS Responses (*conference room paper*)

**Action required at this meeting - the Programme Coordinating Board is requested to:**

Consider the report and its recommendations, including responsible bodies and costs, if any, per recommendation, as indicated in the Annex.

**Cost implications for decisions:**

Total cost implications are 1,130,000 USD

## Introduction

1. The Global Task Team (GTT) Independent Assessment Reference Group, constituted by the PCB Bureau to oversee the execution of decision 8.7 of the 18<sup>th</sup> UNAIDS PCB, submits to the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB the Executive Summary and Recommendations of the report; "An Independent Assessment of Progress on the Implementation of the Global Task Team Recommendations in Support of National AIDS Responses".
2. Presentation of the Report at the PCB will be introduced through the GTT Independent Assessment Reference Group which will give a statement on the process, and respond to the report and its outcomes.
3. The assessment report and its recommendations were received by the Secretariat after the finalization of the draft Unified Budget and Workplan for 2008-2009 and therefore could not be included. Many of the recommendations should not incur additional costs. For those that do (such as additional studies) indicative costings have been identified. In this regard therefore, the table of recommendations in Annex 1 includes two columns that have been added by the Secretariat: responsibilities for each task as derived from the HLSP report; and costs falling outside the draft UBW for 2008-2009.
4. The PCB is requested to consider the report and its recommendations, including responsible bodies and costs, if any, per recommendation, as indicated in the Annex.

### **Executive Summary** (*Text taken from HLSP report "An Independent Assessment of Progress on the Implementation of the Global Task Team Recommendations in Support of National AIDS Responses"*)

5. The pace of change in the international HIV/AIDS arena has been significant and impressive in the last five to seven years with a number of new funding programmes providing opportunities to scale up prevention, treatment and care and impact mitigation at country level. However, the proliferation of donors and funding mechanisms for HIV/AIDS has also increased the need for improvements in global and national coordination and aid effectiveness.
6. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness represents international donor commitment to reforming the ways in which they deliver and manage aid. In the context of HIV/AIDS, international recognition for the need to use resources and coordinate partnerships more effectively led to the development of the Three Ones Principles. The commitment to harmonising and aligning responses and systems in HIV/AIDS was significantly moved forward in 2005 through a series of UNAIDS-led meetings which discussed the Three Ones in action. One important outcome was the establishment of the Global Task Team on Improving AIDS Coordination among Multilateral Institutions and International Donors (GTT).
7. This report assesses progress with implementation of the Global Task Team (GTT) recommendations in two key areas: technical support provision to the national AIDS response as brokered by the UN system; and harmonisation and alignment of international partners. The report findings, conclusions and recommendations are based on an independent assessment, conducted by HLSP during January-May 2007. This summary crystallizes the main findings in each area, with particular emphasis on key issues related to roles, resources and accountability. While considerable efforts have been made to implement the GTT recommendations, it is important to recognise that these recommendations were made relatively recently and that it is too early to expect major impact at country level. It is also important to acknowledge that, with some exceptions, implementation of the recommendations, and reporting on progress with implementation, has been largely taken forward by multilateral institutions.

8. The objectives of the independent assessment focused on country level progress in implementing GTT recommendations concerning: (a) technical support provision to the national AIDS response as brokered by the UN system and (b) harmonisation and alignment of international partners in order to rationalise and simplify the management of development funding by the national counterparts. The assessment was expected to explore the extent to which implementation of the recommendations fits with country needs and realities, identify examples of good practice and, through analysis of lessons from different countries, consider factors that have supported or hindered progress.

9. HLSP developed an assessment approach based on the methodology set out in the Terms of Reference. This included an agreed set of assessment questions, documentation review and collection of evidence of country progress and experience in Honduras, India, Mozambique, Nigeria, Ukraine and Zambia (country case study reports are available separately). In addition, HLSP conducted over 30 global and regional level key informants interviews.

10. The country case studies took place between January and April and involved a review of country documentation and key informant interviews with government partners, key UN agencies involved in the UNAIDS division of labour, Joint UN Teams on AIDS, United Nations Theme Groups, bilateral partners and NGOs. Where feasible within the assessment timeframe, draft case study reports were shared with country informants and reports were revised to accommodate feedback and comments. The findings and lessons learned from the case studies have informed this synthesis report.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Technical Support**

#### **UN System Division of Labour**

11. Progress The division of labour for technical support, based on the comparative advantages of UNAIDS<sup>1</sup>, represents a major step forward. At global level, there is broad support for the roles assigned. In all the countries visited for this assessment, UN agencies have adopted and adapted the division of labour to suit local contexts. Additionally, agencies such as UNFPA, UNICEF and the ILO have adjusted their staffing levels in view of their revised responsibilities.

12. Challenges Global informants and donor stakeholders in countries visited for this assessment expressed concern about certain aspects of the division of labour at country level, including:

- The efficiency of adaptation of the division of labour by UN agency country offices;
- The extent to which the division of labour is being applied;
- The extent to which the division of labour is understood by stakeholders outside the UN system;
- The unclear and sometimes lengthy process of accessing technical support under the new division of labour and lack of awareness of the process among national partners;
- Unresolved issues about which is the Lead Organisation in some technical areas, in particular PMTCT, Youth, and HIV prevention;
- The lack of clarity over the roles and responsibilities of Lead Organisations and Main Partners;
- The extent to which the division of labour is bringing about real change and rationalisation in working practices.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report "UNAIDS" refers to the Cosponsors and the Secretariat unless otherwise stated

## Joint UN Teams and Programmes of Support on AIDS

13. Progress There has been significant progress in establishing Joint UN Teams on AIDS. Critical success factors include:

- At regional and country level, senior staff with strong interpersonal skills and a clear understanding of how Joint Teams and Joint Programmes should function;
- The commitment, competency and relationship between the Resident Coordinator, UN Theme Group chair and the UNAIDS Country Coordinator
- The involvement of regional support staff who can ‘troubleshoot’ and support joint planning at country level;
- Clear and unambiguous support from Heads of Agencies for staff to commit time and resources;
- Attention to designing and putting in place transparent, collaborative and efficient management and accountability processes to achieve results;
- Efficient communication strategies with external stakeholders to explain the division of labour, the Joint UN Team on AIDS and the joint programme of support.

14. Joint Teams are promoting dialogue and coordination. They are providing a forum for planning and monitoring Joint Programmes of Support on AIDS. And they are beginning to enable the UN to speak and act as “one” on HIV/AIDS issues.

15. Challenges A number of challenges related to Joint Teams remain. These include:

- Additional work loads with significant demands on agencies with a smaller presence in country;
- Differences in commitment to joint working and in skills and capacity between agencies;
- Duplication of roles and representation between the UN Theme Group on AIDS and the Joint Team on AIDS in some countries and a perception that Joint UN Teams on AIDS have added another layer of bureaucracy;
- Lack of clarity about the roles of the Resident Coordinator, the Chair of the UN Theme Group, and the UNAIDS Country Coordinator with regard to the Joint Team. Furthermore, the respective roles of the Joint Team and the UN Theme Group on AIDS are not well understood by stakeholders outside the UN system;
- Differing views and vision concerning what a Joint Team should look like;

16. Progress There has been mixed progress in the development of Joint Programmes of Support on AIDS. This is due in part to timing, including the length of time that a Joint UN Team on AIDS has been established (since joint programme planning follows the establishment of the Joint Team), and UNDAF and country planning cycles, which provide entry points for Joint Programmes of Support. Planning for Universal Access and consultation on wider UN reform efforts is reported by informants to have taken up a significant amount of UN country staff time and this has also limited progress in developing and implementing joint programmes. As with the Joint UN Teams on AIDS, senior staff with effective interpersonal skills, clear vision, understanding of how to develop joint programmes, and ability to support joint programming processes are essential factors in facilitating progress in this area.

17. Challenges Global informant interviews and country case studies highlighted a number of challenges related to Joint Programmes. These include:

- Continued development of joint plans based on individual UN agency imperatives, rather than the development of integrated joint plans that are based on national needs and priorities;
- Lack of clear directives and support from agency headquarters and Heads of Agency in country on how to establish and implement joint programmes;
- Lack of incentives for agency staff to prioritise joint planning and programming;

- Lack of staff and agency capacity, time and experience in developing and implementing joint plans and programmes;
- Competing priorities and multiple UN planning processes at country level;
- Lack of an UNDAF or of inclusion of AIDS in the UNDAF;
- Differences in UN agency planning cycles and financial, administrative and operational procedures;
- Lack of clear understanding by Joint UN Teams on AIDS and the UN Theme Group on AIDS on the implications of wider UN reform for Joint UN Teams on AIDS and joint programmes.

### **Technical Support Plans and Provision**

18. Progress With some notable exceptions such as Zambia and Honduras, progress in assisting countries to develop budgeted technical support plans as a component of Joint Programmes of Support or as a component of national strategic plans on HIV/AIDS has been limited. This undermines the provision of coordinated technical support by UN agencies and other development partners as there is no technical support plan to “align behind”. This results in UN technical support plans that are supply-driven rather than based on national priorities. Where there is no UN technical support plan, provision of technical support remains fragmented.

19. UNAIDS has recognised that lack of national technical support plans and weak coordination of technical support are significant challenges, and the UNAIDS Secretariat proposes to provide guidance and support to national AIDS authorities to develop technical support plans.

20. There are mixed views about the quality, relevance and timeliness of technical support provided or brokered by UN agencies. In some countries, such as Zambia and Nigeria, technical support has been viewed very positively, in others, such as Ukraine and Mozambique perhaps less so.

21. Challenges Specific challenges identified by this assessment include:

- Achieving a shift in the role of UN agencies from a primary focus on direct provision of technical support to brokering or facilitating provision of technical support. In India, for example, some agencies continue to focus on direct provision of technical support rather than helping the government and other partners to mobilise expertise in country. With a few exceptions, for example, UNFPA in Slovakia, there is limited evidence of UN agencies brokering the use of civil society organisations as providers, rather than as recipients, of technical support.
- Slow response time to requests for support and separate application processes and reporting formats, which place a heavy administrative burden on organisations seeking support.

### **Technical Support Mechanisms**

22. Progress Technical support mechanisms such as the Global Joint Problem Solving and Implementation Support Team (GIST), AIDS Strategy Action Programme (ASAP), WHO Knowledge Hubs, and Technical Support Facilities (TSFs) have increased the range of expertise available at country and regional levels. However, in the absence of a system for maintaining an overview of the situation, it is difficult to assess how well known or accessible these technical support mechanisms are or how frequently they are used by national partners.

23. The GIST has addressed a range of country technical, management and policy bottlenecks and global constraints, including policies, procedures and practices of multilateral institutions. Progress reports indicate that the GIST has improved information sharing and coordination between the UN, Global Fund and World Bank, and encouraged multilateral institutions to address wider systemic issues at global level.

24. The ASAP, intended to provide countries with a source of advice and support for strategic and action planning, has developed a self-assessment tool to help countries assess the strengths and weaknesses of their national AIDS strategies and action plans and a repository of resources on strategic planning. The ASAP was established relatively recently and is currently providing assistance to around 25 countries including Honduras. ASAP has communicated its goals and strategies to stakeholders and produces regular progress reports, although documents reviewed for this assessment indicate that communication has focused primarily on the UN family.

25. UNDP, the UNAIDS Secretariat and the World Bank are jointly assisting countries to better integrate AIDS into Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), with positive results in a number of countries. Experience to date indicates that setting realistic budgets and timetables, securing buy-in from key country stakeholders, good relationships between National AIDS Coordinating Authorities and finance and planning ministries, and timing mainstreaming activities to coincide with PRSP planning cycles are critical to successful integration.

26. Challenges This assessment highlighted the following challenges:

- Ensuring effective coordination among the various providers of technical support and clarity about the respective roles and areas of expertise of different technical support mechanisms to minimise duplication.
- Establishing systems for effective management and monitoring of technical support mechanisms.
- Ensuring that national partners and other donors are aware of the existence of these mechanisms, of what technical support they provide, and how to access technical support through them.
- Clarifying and communicating the purpose of the GIST, which is not well understood by informants for this assessment. There are differing perceptions about whether its role is to address implementation problems at country level or systemic issues at global level that impact on country implementation.
- Communicating the role and services of the ASAP to stakeholders outside the UN family. Informants are unclear about how ASAP links to efforts to strengthen AIDS mainstreaming, in particular the Joint UNDP, World Bank, UNAIDS Secretariat Poverty Reduction Strategies Mainstreaming Programme, and to technical support for strategic planning provided by the Technical Support Facilities.

### **National ownership and leadership of technical support to the national response**

27. National ownership and leadership of the national response can be enhanced if countries can identify technical support needs and know where and how to obtain appropriate technical support. Despite the establishment of additional mechanisms to provide technical support to national partners, factors that are currently hindering this process include:

- Limited country capacity to identify and articulate technical support needs and to develop comprehensive technical support plans based on demand, rather than supply.
- Inadequate assistance from multilateral and bilateral agencies to strengthen country capacity to develop comprehensive technical support plans
- Lack of demand or informed demand from government partners for available technical support. This is attributed to low awareness of technical support mechanisms, reluctance to spend funds on technical support which has previously been “free”, and lack of capacity to procure and manage technical support.
- Lack of systems to engage national partners in the process of sourcing technical support and in providing feedback on the quality and relevance of technical support provided by UN agencies and technical support mechanisms.

## Harmonisation and Alignment

### UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors

28. Progress The UNAIDS PCB, UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors have taken steps to support implementation of the GTT recommendations on harmonisation and alignment within the UN system. These include endorsement of the recommendations by the Executive Boards of all Cosponsors, provision of guidance on Joint UN Teams and Programmes on AIDS, and development of the 2008-9 UBW. The GTT recommendations have been on the agenda of all PCB meetings since their endorsement in 2005, and the PCB has consistently reinforced these recommendations.

29. Feedback on the provision of guidance to support the establishment of Joint UN Teams and Programmes on AIDS, specifically the UNDG May 2006 Guidance Paper, is positive, and all Cosponsors have sent the Guidance Paper to their field offices. Some agencies have developed additional guidance for their staff and have taken more active steps to support implementation through training, orientation and awareness-raising for field directors and staff. The East and Southern Africa region appears to have been most active in providing support for implementation of guidance on Joint Teams and Programmes. Additionally, there are plans for UNAIDS (in 2007) to develop practical guidance on how to develop and implement joint plans.

30. Country case studies conducted for this assessment indicate that there has been progress in adapting GTT recommendations and ensuring that Joint programmes are aligned with national plans and coordinated with other actors, for example in Mozambique, Zambia and India. There is also a trend towards use of pooled funding mechanisms, for example, in North East India.

31. Strong leadership from headquarters about the importance of joint working plays an important role in driving forward the harmonisation and alignment agenda, and addressing factors, such as organisational culture and individual attitudes, that can be a barrier. Directives from headquarters on joint programming need to be backed up by harmonised systems and operating procedures, and by incentive structures e.g. job descriptions and performance appraisals that hold staff accountable for joint working and reward them accordingly.

32. Wider UN reform is viewed as an important incentive for agencies to shift towards joint working, with Joint UN Teams on AIDS spearheading practical experience of working as “one”. More specifically, UBW funds are seen by some agencies as an incentive to reorient country support according to the division of labour.

33. Challenges This assessment identified the following challenges to greater harmonisation and alignment and joint working between UN agencies:

- Limited authority of the PCB and Secretariat to ensure that Cosponsors at country level proactively and effectively participate in Joint UN Teams on AIDS and Joint Programmes of Support;
- Differences in operational systems between agencies, including differences in accounting, contracting and procurement procedures, in overhead charges, in monitoring systems, and in financial and budget cycles. Differences in policies, procedures and systems are a significant barrier to the participation of UN agencies in common funding arrangements. The Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) approach is a step in the right direction but is only being implemented by the ExCom agencies – UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP.
- Existing structural incentives encourage UN agencies to work with governments on individual agency mandates instead of working together to implement Joint Programmes of Support. Changes in organisational culture will be required, specifically a shift towards collaborative evidence-based planning and result-based programming.



## **Global Fund and World Bank**

34. Progress in taking forward GTT recommendations on Global Fund and World Bank alignment is mixed. The recommendations of a review of their comparative advantages have not been fully accepted or taken forward. However, there has been a shift from project to programme financing by the Global Fund, and there is evidence of progress in harmonisation and alignment of Global Fund and World Bank programme financing. In the countries where the Global Fund participates in pooled funding arrangements, Mozambique (basket funding for HIV/AIDS) and India (World Bank, Global Fund and other donors adopting a budget support approach), there has been a shift towards joint or consolidated reporting and participation in joint review missions. Progress is also reported towards harmonised Global Fund and World Bank programme management structures in country, and towards joint procurement assessments. Efforts have also been made to coordinate planning and implementation of Global Fund, World Bank and US Government procurement in a number of countries, e.g. Mozambique and Vietnam.

35. Other efforts to improve alignment between multilateral agencies include the development of a Memorandum of Understanding, which pre-dates the GTT, between the Global Fund and UNAIDS (Secretariat and Cosponsors) and, more recently, a meeting between the Global Fund, PEPFAR, WHO and UNAIDS Secretariat on intensifying technical support to assist countries move towards universal access to prevention, treatment, care and support for HIV/AIDS.

## **Bilateral Partners**

36. Bilateral donors have a significant influence on progress on harmonisation and alignment at country level, through both their resource allocation decisions and the extent to which they participate in national coordination mechanisms and donor forums.

37. Although there is evidence of a shift by some donors towards greater harmonisation and alignment in HIV/AIDS, some significant actors do not actively participate in harmonisation and alignment efforts facilitated and supported by the UN and other development partners, and remain outside these processes in some countries, e.g. USAID and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in India. Country authorities report patchy progress towards the “Three Ones” principles; many still deal with multiple donors, projects, processes and procedures and express frustration about the difficulty of getting donors to move from general agreement to harmonisation of specific actions.

38. Bilateral donors also play an important role in supporting or hindering progress towards UN system harmonisation and alignment. While some donors are making funds available for Joint UN Programmes on AIDS, others - sometimes the same donors - continue to fund individual UN agencies at country level, perpetuating separate working and diminishing efforts to promote harmonisation and alignment among UN agencies, such as Department for International Development’s (DFID) support to UN trust funds in India. This is reflected in concerns raised about the lack of coherence between the global commitments and the country level actions of bilateral donors.

## **Ownership and Leadership in Harmonisation and Alignment of the National Response**

39. Effective leadership and ownership of coordination processes by national governments is critical to progress towards harmonisation and alignment among development partners. GTT processes appear to be playing a catalytic role in strengthening government leadership and ownership in countries such as India, Mozambique and Nigeria. Conversely, weak national leadership, e.g. in Ukraine, represents a challenge to harmonisation and alignment.

40. National governments should also play a key role in holding development partners to account for the quality of their aid, and their adherence to GTT and related commitments. UNAIDS has developed the Country Harmonisation and Alignment Tool (CHAT) to assist

national AIDS authorities to assess the participation and degree of engagement of partners in the national response and the degree of harmonisation and alignment among international partners. This tool has been piloted in seven countries and early lessons indicate that the CHAT is a valuable tool that can support Joint Annual Reviews, strengthen engagement of partners and identify stakeholders who are excluded from national coordination, and provide a basis for advocacy with partners about their role in the national response. However, tools such as the CHAT will only be effective if they are fully integrated into Joint Annual Review processes and development partners respond to the findings.

## KEY ISSUES

### Resources, Capacity and Incentives

41. There are mixed views on the adequacy of resources to ensure the effective functioning of Joint Teams, Joint Programmes and the implementation of the technical support division of labour:

- The majority of UN agencies and bilateral donors interviewed for this assessment believe that available resources are adequate for the functioning of Joint Teams and implementation of the division of labour but agencies need to prioritise how these resources are allocated
- Informants indicated, however, that additional resources are necessary to support joint working and to provide an incentive for organisational change;
- While some Cosponsors and bilateral donors are critical of the concept of an 'unfunded mandate' based on a global technical support budget, there is a consensus that available resources for technical support are inadequate. Demand for technical support has increased whilst UN capacity and budgets have been reduced and funds available for technical support are not commensurate with increased funds available for implementation. UNAIDS developed a global Consolidated Technical Support Plan, but donors have provided limited funding for this. However, the majority view is that it is more appropriate to focus efforts on mobilising resources for Technical Support Plans at country level.
- There is also a consensus that additional resources should be conditional on the UN demonstrating good performance and changes in working practices.

42. A major challenge is to ensure that the UBW is more clearly defined in line with the division of labour. The 2008-2009 UBW is guided by the technical support division of labour, covering core UBW funds, agencies' own resources and supplemental funds mobilised by individual agencies. However, the current UBW planning system that links UN agency involvement in a technical area to financial resources may reinforce the supply-driven nature of UN country Technical Support Plans, reflecting areas of technical support that can be provided by different UN agencies rather than being based on national priorities. It may also, therefore provide limited incentive for UN agencies to broker technical support from other Cosponsors or other technical support mechanisms.

43. A working group was established in July 2005 to develop proposals for an enhanced PAF mechanism to channel larger amounts of funding for technical support to countries. However, progress has been slow and funds are still largely channelled through agency headquarters. Concerns were raised, globally and at country level, about the delay in agreement on a PAF mechanism to get funds to country level and how these funds should be used.

44. Informants highlighted the need for future resource allocation to be used more effectively to increase the results-orientation of UN agencies whilst enabling UNAIDS to improve accountability across Cosponsors.

45. Some UN agencies have taken steps to increase their capacity at country level, to enable them to fulfil their technical support remit under the division of labour. However, there are concerns that not all agencies are allocating adequate resources to country level and that this will result in other agencies having to fill the gaps.

### **Accountability and Measuring Success**

46. Assessment of progress in implementing the GTT recommendations is limited by a lack of clear systems for management accountability at global and country levels. For example, it is unclear what mechanism is responsible for holding Cosponsors to account globally for their part in implementing the GTT recommendations. Neither the UNAIDS Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations nor the PCB appears to have this mandate. Bilateral donors in particular expressed concerns that the UNAIDS Secretariat does not have the authority to hold Cosponsors to account for effectively participating in the Joint UN Teams on AIDS and Joint Programmes of Support. In addition, it is unclear how bilateral donors are held to account for their role in implementing GTT commitments.

47. Some governing boards, e.g. of UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP and WFP, request their respective agencies to provide regular updates on progress in implementing the division of labour. However, there does not appear to be a mechanism with overall responsibility for regular review of the relevance and effectiveness of the division of labour, either at global or country levels.

48. Although the RC is in principle responsible for effective joint programming and implementation at country level - steps were taken in 2005 to strengthen the RC system in the area of governance and accountability, including agreement that the RC will lead the UN system and will be responsible for UN system operational activities in country - there are concerns about mutual accountability for Joint Teams and Programmes on AIDS at country level. Informants highlighted resistance by some agencies to reporting to the RC as a key challenge.

49. UNDG Guidance Paper states that Heads of Agencies will work with the RC and UNAIDS Country Coordinator to determine appropriate performance evaluation mechanisms, incentives and sanctions for Joint Team members. Roles and responsibilities of Joint Team members, Heads of Agencies, UNAIDS Country Coordinators and RCs are expected to be built into individual performance assessments and reviewed annually. The RC is expected to ensure that Heads of Agency are accountable for agency contributions towards Joint Programme deliverables, and to report on performance in the RC annual report. There is, however, some concern about how effectively these accountability processes will work at country level, since not all agencies are consistently implementing basic mechanisms to strengthen incentives for joint working, such as inclusion in staff job descriptions and performance appraisal processes.

50. The co-existence of parallel accountability mechanisms – for example, individual staff reporting to, and performance appraisals by, their respective agencies; Joint Teams and UN Theme Groups on AIDS reporting to and through the RC to UNDG; UNAIDS Country Coordinators and Regional Support Teams also reporting to the UNAIDS Secretariat and the PCB; ExCom agencies reporting to the Secretary-General; and other agencies with their own systems, e.g. WHO reporting through regional offices and ultimately to the World Health Assembly – make it difficult to determine who has an overview of the performance of the Joint Teams and who is responsible for holding Joint Teams and individual agencies to account.

51. A wider weakness of existing accountability processes is the emphasis on UN agencies, and Joint Teams, monitoring their own performance at country level. Opportunities for external review of Joint Team and Joint Programme performance by governments or other partners appear to be limited. The perception that accountability processes are too internally focused on the UN system, with little consideration of how Joint Teams or Programmes to support the national response are accountable to partner governments, is shared by many informants, including Cosponsors. Informants also highlighted the need to ensure that accountability processes and systems for technical support mechanisms are in place and that these too provide opportunities for effective engagement by national governments and other recipients of technical support.

### **Measuring Success**

52. Coordination and joint working have high transaction costs and it is important to ensure that indicators and systems are in place to measure the impact of greater harmonisation and alignment and improved technical support provision on the national response. Little consideration appears to have been given to defining success in implementing the GTT recommendations and how and by what mechanism this will be measured. Joint Programmes and Technical Support Plans are not always results based and this makes M&E more challenging. Indicators to assess progress with Joint Teams and Programming have not been developed or used consistently across countries.

53. The UN has recognised that this is a weakness and has started to take steps to address the issue of measuring performance, including regional workshops to enhance UN Country Team capacity for measuring the results of collaboration and joint programming, which focus on enabling participants to design effective joint programmes and identify indicators to measure the value added of joint programming.

**Annex 1: UNAIDS Secretariat analysis showing responsible agency and estimated costs of recommendations of the GTT Independent Assessment**

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GTT INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT MADE BY HLSP	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	COST ADDITIONAL TO UBW
<b>Division of Labour:</b>		
1. Resident Coordinators and UNAIDS Country Coordinators to resolve outstanding issues of the division of labour at country levels (such as which agency should lead on technical areas still considered the domain of one or more agency) and develop and agree a mechanism to periodically review the division of labour so it remains “fit for purpose”. Joint team and joint programme annual reviews could be one mechanism to achieve this. Knowing the status of the division of labour at country level, understanding the outstanding issues and monitoring the resolution of these issues could be undertaken by the Regional Directors.	UNDP/RC - UNAIDS Sec./UCC	none
<b>Joint Teams and Joint Programmes of Support:</b>		
2. Resident Coordinators and UNAIDS Country Coordinators should strengthen their public relations and communication strategies with external stakeholders and national partners concerning Joint UN Teams and Joint Programmes of Support on AIDS. This could be done through publishing and distributing brochures, holding face to face meetings with key stakeholders, producing regular progress updates and disseminating these to country partners outside the UN system, and using existing national partnership and donor forums. Communication should cover the workings of the Joint UN Teams on AIDS, including clarification of the roles and responsibilities of Joint Teams vis-a-vis the UN Theme Groups on AIDS and information about key contacts.	UNDP/RC - UNAIDS Sec. / UCC	500,000
3. The UNAIDS Secretariat at global level should develop a quality assurance role for monitoring the quality of outputs from the Joint UN Teams on AIDS, in particular Joint Programmes of Support and technical support plans.	UNAIDS Sec.	300,000
<b>Technical support mechanisms</b>		
4. The UNAIDS Secretariat should put in place a coherent and harmonised system that national partners and stakeholders can use to access technical support through UN agencies and technical support mechanisms.	UNAIDS Sec.	None

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GTT INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT MADE BY HLSP	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	COST ADDITIONAL TO UBW
5. The GIST should undertake a comprehensive review of its Terms of Reference, making the purpose of the GIST clear whilst at the same time clarifying the role of the Joint UN Teams on AIDS, UN Theme Groups and the UNAIDS Country Coordinators in identifying and solving implementation problems at country levels. This task could be undertaken by GIST itself (the GIST Chair and Secretariat) and should include non GIST organisations.	GIST Chair.	None
6. UNAIDS at country level should develop, implement and communicate clear mechanisms for reporting feedback (including to and by national partners) on technical support provided by UN agencies and mechanisms such as the GIST and ASAP. This should include systems to ensure that feedback is used to inform and improve the provision of technical support and to make available summary progress reports to national governments and donors.	UNAIDS Sec.	None
<b>Strengthening accountability mechanisms</b>		
7. UNAIDS Cosponsors and Secretariat should take immediate steps to strengthen the role of UNAIDS Secretariat in holding Cosponsors accountable for effective implementation of Joint UN Teams and Programmes on AIDS and the division of labour. More systematic reporting to the PCB on progress could be one way of taking this forward. Additionally, strengthen the authority of the UNAIDS Country Coordinators to facilitate and coordinate the work of Joint Teams and Programmes on AIDS through recruitment practices, revised job descriptions and accountability mechanisms at country level.	UNAIDS Sec. & Cosponsors	None
8. UNAIDS Cosponsors and Resident Coordinators need to urgently ensure that participation in Joint UN Teams and Joint Programmes on AIDS is embedded in all relevant job descriptions, competency frameworks and performance appraisal systems for country Heads of Agencies and staff, and that the RC holds Heads of Agencies to account at country level on this issue.	UNAIDS Cosponsors - UNDP/RC	None
9. The UNAIDS Secretariat should consider a study that examines in more detail UN and donor agency incentives and governance processes that drive or hinder harmonisation and alignment and recommends appropriate changes in incentive and governance systems. The study should review donor and agency funding behaviour as well as institutional and individual level incentives that influence joined up working, such as performance management, professional development and performance related sanctions and rewards.	UNAIDS Sec.	200,000
10. The UNAIDS Secretariat should develop guidelines which ensure greater engagement by external stakeholders in reviewing Joint Team and Joint Programme performance. Involvement of non-UN stakeholders in	UNAIDS Sec.	None

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GTT INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT MADE BY HLSP	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	COST ADDITIONAL TO UBW
performance assessment of UN Joint Teams and Programmes could be integrated into Joint Annual Review processes.		
<b>Resources</b>		
11. The UNAIDS Secretariat needs to re-examine resources required to implement the GTT recommendations globally (such as GIST) and also provide guidance to country teams to develop budgets and resource mobilisation plans for joint programming.	UNAIDS Sec.	None
12. The UNAIDS Secretariat and Committee of Cosponsoring Organisations should ensure that future UBWs are fully aligned with the technical support division of labour and resources adequately support the levels and areas where agencies are responsible as Lead Organisations or Main Partners in the division of labour. Future UBWs should be used as an accountability tool across Cosponsors by linking resources more closely to UNAIDS required results.	UNAIDS Sec. / CCO	None
13. The UNAIDS Secretariat should take urgent steps to agree an enhanced PAF mechanism or an alternative mechanism to channel funds to country level which can be used for establishing joint teams and implementing joint programmes of support.	UNAIDS Sec.	None
<b>GTT and UN Reform</b>		
14. UNAIDS Cosponsor agency headquarters should provide clear directives to country offices on the development and implementation of Joint Programmes, and ensure that these directives are implemented by Heads of Agencies at country level. These directives should be backed up with effective support to UN country staff for planning and implementation of joint programmes, and by accelerated efforts to harmonise operating procedures and systems. UNAIDS should develop an action plan and timetable for harmonisation and alignment of operating procedures and systems.	UNAIDS cosponsors	None
15. To understand the contribution of GTT processes to ongoing UN reform and gain insights into how GTT priorities will “fit” with UN reform processes in the future, the UNAIDS Secretariat could consider undertaking studies that “track” the implementation of GTT recommendations in UN reform pilot countries.	UNAIDS Sec.	130,000

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GTT INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT MADE BY HLSP	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	COST ADDITIONAL TO UBW
--	--------------------	------------------------

<b>Harmonisation and Alignment</b>		
16. Bilateral partners <sup>2</sup> should fulfil their global commitments to the Rome and Paris Declarations and GTT processes, ensuring that global and country level funding and programming is consistent with these global commitments and supports implementation of the GTT recommendations. Of particular relevance is the need to shift away from funding individual UN agencies and individual programmes to funding Joint Programmes of Support that are consistent with national priorities and the UNAIDS division of labour, and to ensure coordination of technical support provision.	Bilateral partners	None
17. Bilateral partners should act coherently in their role on PCB and Cosponsor governance boards, ensuring that PCB decisions regarding GTT are discussed and actions are monitored by Cosponsor boards.	Bilateral partners	None
18. Bilateral partners are encouraged to work with the UNAIDS Secretariat to devise a process whereby bilateral donors are encouraged to provide brief progress reports on their action and support to GTT recommendations, and broader progress in harmonisation and alignment around HIV/AIDS, ideally using global and country level examples, for the information of board members. These progress reports should be presented during the PCB meetings.	UNAIDS Secretariat - Bilateral partners	None
19. Bilateral partners and partner countries together with UNAIDS should use the CHAT as part of the Joint Review process. This will help to improve accountability and transparency of development partners in the national response, and monitoring their commitments to the Paris Declaration.	Bilateral Partners - UNAIDS Secretariat - Partner countries	None

<sup>2</sup> "Bilateral partner" in this context refers to a donor government or it's funding agency